



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

COUNCIL ADDENDUM

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 28 MARCH 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBER - BRIGHTON TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
84	MINUTES	5 - 42
	(b) Minutes of the Budget Council meeting held on the 28 th February 2019 (copy attached); and	
	(c) Minutes of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on the 5 th March 2019 (copy attached).	
87	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	43 - 44
	List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	
88	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	45 - 50
	List of deputations received from members of the public (copy attached).	
91	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.	51 - 62
	List of written questions received and the responses from councillors (copy attached).	
94	PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2019/20	63 - 64
	Extract from the proceedings of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee meeting held on the 21 st March 2019 (copy attached).	

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**BUDGET COUNCIL****4.30pm 28 FEBRUARY 2019****HOVE TOWN HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBER****MINUTES**

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

PART ONE**70 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 70.1 Councillor Simson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 and in particular to Conservative Group Amendment 1 as she was a Trustee and Treasurer of the Deans Youth Project; and confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.2 Councillor Nemeth declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as he was the Chairman of the Friends of Hove Lagoon; and confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.3 Councillor C. Theobald declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as she was the President of Mencap Brighton; and confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.4 Councillor Druitt declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20. He was the General Manager of Brighton & Hove Community Transport which currently operates the Easylink service and is contracted to do so until 31 March, which could be affected by the Green Group Amendment. He also received an income from The Big Lemon, as a shareholder. He also confirmed that his wife was employed by the national HIV and sexual health charity Terrence Higgins Trust, which could be affected if either

Conservative or Green amendments to the budget were passed. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;

- 70.5 Councillor Phillips declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as she was employed by the national HIV and sexual health charity Terrence Higgins Trust, which could be affected if either the Conservative and/or Green amendments to the budget were passed. She was also the partner of Tom Druitt who was the General Manager of Brighton & Hove Community Transport which currently operated the Easylink service and is contracted to do so until 31 March. If the Green Amendment on Easylink was passed, there was a possibility it would impact on the service. She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.6 Councillor Yates declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as his partner was employed by Sanctuary Housing. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.7 Councillor Atkinson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as he and his wife both worked for the Sussex Partnership NHS Trust and the council had a number of jointly funded services with the Trust. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.8 Councillor Robins declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as he rented an allotment from the Council; and confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.9 Councillor Deane declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 73, General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 as her partner worked for the Grace Eyre Foundation; and confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer;
- 70.10 No other declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.

71 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

- 71.1 The Mayor stated that she had been informed of the passing of two former Councillors, David Laing, Councillor for Elm Grove on Brighton County Borough Council, and Peter Willows, Councillor, in Hangleton Ward for 15 years. In addition, she had also been informed of the passing of Mr. Len Stafford, President of Royal Air Forces Association of Brighton. She therefore invited everyone to stand for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

72 ADOPTION OF SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR BUDGET COUNCIL

- 72.1 The Mayor referred to the proposed special budget procedure rules that had been circulated as part of the agenda and were detailed in the addendum, pages 5 – 14 and

proposed that the Council procedure rules be suspended to the extent necessary to enable the meeting to be conducted under the rules as modified by the procedural note as circulated.

- 72.2 **RESOLVED:** That the special procedural rules as circulated be adopted for the meeting and that the Council Standing Orders be suspended to the extent that it enabled the meeting to be conducted under the rules agreed.

73 GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET, COUNCIL TAX AND CAPITAL STRATEGY 2019/20

- 73.1 The Mayor noted that the principal budget items listed as Items 73 and 75 on the agenda would be debated together, along with Item 74 Supplementary Financial Information, once the proposed budget and the various amendments had been moved and seconded. She therefore invited Councillor Yates to propose the budget for 2019/20.
- 73.2 Councillor Yates thanked the Mayor and stated that this budget brought to an end the 4-year planning cycle for the Administration and he wished to thank finance officers, all the officers across the council and Members involved in delivering this budget process. He acknowledged that the council continued to face unprecedented demands and pressures but had sought to tackle these and to bring investment and development into the city. He noted that the Valley Gardens project was coming forward and the development at Preston Barracks would see over 1,000 student units and new homes for residents. The Royal Sussex County Hospital redevelopment was going well, and plans were advanced for improvements to the seafront and West Street. However, the impact of Brexit was something that still needed to be considered and planned for if the city's economy was to continue to grow.
- 73.3 He noted that there were ongoing changes to shopping habits and on-line retail which would have to be accounted for. The city's own retail economy was strong, with the 5th lowest rate for vacant properties in the high street and a key component for the future would be the plans for the Waterfront development. There was also a need to ensure that the city's heritage was protected with valuable icons such as the Royal Pavilion.
- 73.4 He also acknowledged that the council's staff were its most valuable asset and services needed to be supported going forward. He was pleased to note that there had been no compulsory redundancies to date even with the severe reductions in resources and significant changes to welfare reforms etc. He referred to key items in the budget which included support for children and social care, adult social care, investment in cycling and walking infrastructure, the field officer service, housing schemes and support for homeless and rough sleeping.
- 73.5 Councillor Yates stated that the overall budget proposals aimed to enable the council to deliver its services and meet the needs of residents. He believed that the Council had achieved a great deal and was delivering across all its services. He was proud to be able to lead an excellent team and commended the budget to the council.
- 73.6 Councillor Hamilton formally seconded the budget proposals and stated that was grateful for all the work undertaken by officers and his colleagues in securing a balanced

budget for 2019/20. There were significant pressures that still needed to be addressed in certain areas such as the i360 and capital expenditure. He also reminded councillors of the potential impact for future budgets should the council tax increase not be agreed. However, overall, he believed the 4-year programme had been vindicated and hoped that the budget would be supported.

- 73.7 Councillor Wealls formally moved the Conservative Group's amendments 1-3 and stated that he wished to thank the finance officers who had assisted with the budget process and to thank the Members of the Conservative Group for their contributions. He then referred to the Administration's period of office and questioned areas where he believed there were failings e.g. not getting the Dome into Trust status, the King Alfred remaining undeveloped, rough sleeping remained an area to be addressed, the lack of secondary schools being out-standing and under-achievement of young people, the failure to meet the recycling target of 38%, traffic congestion, lost bin collections, the lack of housing in the city, and the general state of the city.
- 73.8 Councillor Wealls questioned whether the current budget proposals would prevent compulsory redundancies and referred to the Conservative amendments which sought to invest in much needed areas and improve residents' lives. He therefore hoped that the amendments could be supported.
- 73.9 Councillor Janio formally seconded the amendments and thanked officers for their assistance with the budget process. He also wished to pay tribute to Councillor Wealls for his services to the Group and as an advocate for the city. The Conservative amendments sought to reduce waste and supported a number of services and put forward a smaller increase in council tax as a clear commitment to residents who would receive improved services at less cost. He therefore urged councillors to support the amendments.
- 73.10 Councillor Sykes moved the Green Group's five amendments relating to the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account. He stated that also wished to thank the finance officers for their support during the budget process. He stated that there was a real need to consider how the proposed increase in council tax could be afforded by those who were in vulnerable positions and questioned the budget proposals which he felt did not address the needs of the city. He believed the Green Group's amendments would have a real impact and should be supported. They would protect services and enable improvements to be made such as to the environment and help to address climate change by investing in the Sustainability Team. He could not support the Conservative amendments and recommended the Green amendments to the council.
- 73.11 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the Green Group's amendments and stated that it there was a need to protect front-line services and ensure value for money was achieved with contracts. There was a need to get the basics right and to improve resources with investment in areas to tackle issues such as climate change. He also wished to thank Councillor Sykes for his work on the budget proposals and scrutiny of the budgets over the last four years.
- 73.12 The Mayor then opened the matter up to a general debate and the following Members of the Council spoke on the various amendments that had been put forward as well as the general prevailing budget proposals and position:

Councillors Daniel, Deane, Taylor, Hill, Page, Peltzer Dunn, Inkpin-Leissner, Cattell, Lewry, Phillips, Mitchell, Druitt, G. Theobald, Bewick, Miller, Gibson, Mears, Robins, Littman, Wares, Moonan, Meadows, Bell, Greenbaum, C. Theobald, and Hamilton.

73.13 The Mayor noted that all Members wishing to speak during the debate had done so. She then called on Councillor Mitchell to respond to the debate and the amendments.

73.14 Councillor Mitchell thanked the Mayor and all Members for their contributions during the debate. She wished to reiterate the thanks to the staff involved in preparing the overall budget and noted the tremendous amount of work that went into bringing the proposals to the meeting. She could not accept the Conservative amendments but was happy to support the Green amendment No.1 as it added real value to the budget. She therefore recommended the budget proposals as outlined to the council for approval.

73.15 The Mayor noted that the meeting had been in progress for two and a half hours and stated that she felt a short adjournment should be held. She therefore adjourned the meeting for a period of 20 minutes.

73.16 The meeting was adjourned at 7.10pm and the Mayor reconvened the meeting at 7.35pm.

73.17 The Mayor stated that in view of the fact that the amendments related to either the General Fund or the Housing revenue Account, she intended to put each one to the vote. However, she would call on the Executive Director for Finance & Resources to confirm the budgetary position should any amendment be carried and have an impact on the overall budget as necessary. She would then put the substantive recommendations to the vote as outlined in the procedural rules.

73.18 The Mayor then asked for the electronic voting system to be activated and put the Conservative Group amendments No's.1 to 3 to the vote as detailed below:

Conservative Amendment No.1

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen		X		28	Marsh		X	
2	Atkinson		X		29	Meadows	√		
3	Barford		X		30	Mears	√		
4	Barnett	√			31	Miller	√		
5	Bell	√			32	Mitchell		X	
6	Bennett	√			33	Moonan		X	
7	Bewick		X		34	Morgan		X	
8	Brown	√			35	Morris			
9	Cattell		X		36	Nemeth	√		

10	Chapman		X		37	Norman A	√			
11	Cobb	√			38	Norman K	√			
12	Daniel		X		39	O'Quinn		X		
13	Deane		X		40	Page		X		
14	Druitt		X		41	Peltzer Dunn	√			
15	Gibson		X		42	Phillips		X		
16	Gilbey		X		43	Platts		X		
17	Greenbaum		X		44	Robins		X		
18	Hamilton		X		45	Simson	√			
19	Hill		X		46	Sykes		X		
20	Horan		X		47	Taylor	√			
21	Hyde	√			48	Theobald C	√			
22	Inkpin-Leissner		X		49	Theobald G	√			
23	Janio	√			50	Wares	√			
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls	√			
25	Lewry	√			52	West		X		
26	Littman		X		53	Yates		X		
27	Mac Cafferty		X		54					
							Total	21	30	0

77.20 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **lost** by 21 votes to 30 with no abstentions.

Conservative Amendment No.2

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen		X		28	Marsh		X	
2	Atkinson		X		29	Meadows	√		
3	Barford		X		30	Mears	√		
4	Barnett	√			31	Miller	√		
5	Bell	√			32	Mitchell		X	
6	Bennett	√			33	Moonan		X	

7	Bewick		X		34	Morgan		X		
8	Brown	√			35	Morris				
9	Cattell		X		36	Nemeth	√			
10	Chapman		X		37	Norman A	√			
11	Cobb	√			38	Norman K	√			
12	Daniel		X		39	O'Quinn		X		
13	Deane		X		40	Page		X		
14	Druitt		X		41	Peltzer Dunn	√			
15	Gibson		X		42	Phillips		X		
16	Gilbey		X		43	Platts		X		
17	Greenbaum		X		44	Robins		X		
18	Hamilton		X		45	Simson	√			
19	Hill		X		46	Sykes		X		
20	Horan		X		47	Taylor	√			
21	Hyde	√			48	Theobald C	√			
22	Inkpin-Leissner		X		49	Theobald G	√			
23	Janio	√			50	Wares	√			
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls	√			
25	Lewry	√			52	West		X		
26	Littman		X		53	Yates		X		
27	Mac Cafferty		X		54					
							Total	21	30	0

77.21 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **lost** by 21 votes to 30 with no abstentions.

Conservative Amendment No.3

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen		X		28	Marsh		X	
2	Atkinson		X		29	Meadows	√		
3	Barford		X		30	Mears	√		

4	Barnett	√			31	Miller	√		
5	Bell	√			32	Mitchell		X	
6	Bennett	√			33	Moonan		X	
7	Bewick		X		34	Morgan		X	
8	Brown	√			35	Morris			
9	Cattell		X		36	Nemeth	√		
10	Chapman		X		37	Norman A	√		
11	Cobb	√			38	Norman K	√		
12	Daniel		X		39	O'Quinn		X	
13	Deane		X		40	Page		X	
14	Druitt		X		41	Peltzer Dunn	√		
15	Gibson		X		42	Phillips		X	
16	Gilbey		X		43	Platts		X	
17	Greenbaum		X		44	Robins		X	
18	Hamilton		X		45	Simson	√		
19	Hill		X		46	Sykes		X	
20	Horan		X		47	Taylor	√		
21	Hyde	√			48	Theobald C	√		
22	Inkpin-Leissner		X		49	Theobald G	√		
23	Janio	√			50	Wares	√		
24	Knight		Not present		51	Wealls	√		
25	Lewry	√			52	West		X	
26	Littman		X		53	Yates		X	
27	Mac Cafferty		X		54				
						Total	21	30	0

77.22 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **lost** by 21 votes to 30 with no abstentions.

77.23 The Mayor then asked for the electronic voting system to be activated and put the Green Group amendments No's.1 to 5 to the vote as detailed below:

Green Amendment No.1

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.24 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.2

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		

27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.25 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.3

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	

24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X		
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√			
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√			
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54					
							Total	30	21	0

77.26 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.4

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	

21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.27 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.5

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		

18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.28 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

77.29 The Mayor noted that all three Conservative Group amendments had been lost and that the five Green amendments had been carried. She therefore asked the Executive Director for Finance & Resources to confirm the overall position in relation to the budget and proposed council tax increase.

77.30 The Executive Director for Finance & Resources stated that following the approval of the Green Group's amendments No's. 1, 2 and 5 there was a need to revise the council tax resolution prior to a vote on the overall budget.

77.31 The Mayor stated that she would adjourn the meeting for a short period to enable officers to revise the council tax resolution and circulate copies to Members.

77.32 The meeting was then adjourned at 19.52pm.

77.33 The Mayor reconvened the meeting at 20.03 and confirmed that Members had received copies of the revised council tax resolution and asked for the electronic voting system to be activated. The Mayor then put the proposed General Fund Revenue Budget as amended based on a 2.99% council tax increase to the vote as detailed below:

General Fund Budget proposal

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	

4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane			Ab	40	Page			Ab
14	Druitt			Ab	41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson			Ab	42	Phillips			Ab
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum			Ab	44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes			Ab
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight		Not present		51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West			Ab
26	Littman			Ab	53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty			Ab	54				
						Total	20	21	10

77.34 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **lost** by 20 votes to 21 with 10 abstentions and as such the Council had failed to approve a Budget. In having regard to the need to set a Budget, the Mayor stated that she would adjourn the meeting for a period of 30minutes to enable the Group Leaders and Groups to discuss matters and find a way forward.

77.35 The Mayor then adjourned the meeting at 20.06pm.

77.36 The Mayor reconvened the meeting at 22.45pm and stated that she had been made aware of a further Green amendment to be considered and noted that procedural rules would need to be suspended, in order to enable the additional amendment to be taken. She also noted that there would be a need to move the previous 5 Green amendments should they form part of the new budget motion.

77.37 Councillor Yates formally moved the suspension of procedural rules to the extent necessary to enable the meeting to be conducted under the rules as modified by the procedural note as circulated and to enable the additional Green amendment to be taken into consideration.

77.38 Councillor Sykes formally seconded the motion.

77.39 The Mayor then put the motion to the vote as detailed below:

Suspension of Procedural Rules

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	

19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√			
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X		
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X		
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X		
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X		
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X		
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√			
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√			
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54					
							Total	30	21	0

77.40 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment to suspend procedural rules had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

77.41 Councillor Yates formally moved the revised budget recommendations which included the 5 Green amendments as detailed in the addendum papers together with a further Green amendment No.6 as circulated, which the Labour Group were happy to support.

77.42 Councillor Mitchell formally seconded the motion.

77.43 Councillor Sykes formally moved the Green Group amendments No.'s 1-6 and stated that it provided for funding to be allocated to the sustainability action fund.

77.44 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the amendments and acknowledged that the new amendment No.6 was similar to the Conservative Group amendment No.2.

77.45 The Mayor noted that the six amendments had been moved and seconded and asked for the electronic voting system to be activated in order that she could put each amendment to the vote:

Green Amendment No.1

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		

7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight		Not present		51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.46 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.2

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	

4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight		Not present		51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.47 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.3

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.48 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.4

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		

27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.49 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.5

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	

24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
Total						30	21	0	

77.50 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

Green Amendment No.6

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	

21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.51 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions.

77.52 The Mayor noted that the six amendments had been carried and therefore put the General Fund Revenue Budget based on a 2.99% council tax increase as amended; together with the supplementary financial information to the vote as detailed below:

General Fund Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Capital Strategy 2019/20 and
Supplementary Financial Information

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	

15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

77.53 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 against with no abstentions.

77.54 RESOLVED:

Formal Council Tax Resolution

1. That It be noted that on 24 January 2019 the council calculated the Council Tax Base 2019/20:
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 90,038.5 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")); and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special items relate: -
 - Rottingdean Parish – 1,572.40
 - Hanover Crescent Enclosure – 40.10
 - Marine Square Enclosure – 78.00
 - Royal Crescent Enclosure – 30.60
2. That the Council Tax requirement for the council's own purposes for 2019/20 (excluding Parish precepts) is calculated as £143,679,000.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2019/20 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

- (a) £698,251,740 being the aggregate of the amounts which the council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils;
- (b) £554,524,000 being the aggregate of the amounts which the council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;
- (c) £143,727,740 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act);
- (d) £1,596.29 being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts);
- (e) £75,973 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act;
- (f) £1,595.45 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by the Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special items relates;
- (g) £1,626.45 Rottingdean Parish
 £1,797.37 Hanover Crescent
 £1,737.19 Marine Square
 £1,859.50 Royal Crescent
 being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 3(f) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the relevant amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for the dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

Valuation Band: Parts of the Council's area	A* £	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Rottingdean Parish	903.58	1,084.30	1,265.02	1,445.73	1,626.45	1,987.88	2,349.32	2,710.75	3,252.90
Hanover Crescent	998.54	1,198.25	1,397.95	1,597.66	1,797.37	2,196.79	2,596.20	2,995.62	3,594.74
Marine Square	965.11	1,158.13	1,351.15	1,544.17	1,737.19	2,123.23	2,509.27	2,895.32	3,474.38
Royal Crescent	1,033.06	1,239.67	1,446.28	1,652.89	1,859.50	2,272.72	2,685.94	3,099.17	3,719.00
All other parts of the council's area	886.36	1,063.63	1,240.91	1,418.18	1,595.45	1,949.99	2,304.54	2,659.08	3,190.90

* Entitled to disabled relief

4. That it be noted that the Police & Crime Commissioner and the Fire Authority have issued precepts to the council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the council's area as indicated in the table below.

Valuation Band:	A* £	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner	105.51	126.61	147.71	168.81	189.91	232.11	274.31	316.52	379.82

* Entitled to disabled relief

Valuation Band:	A* £	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
East Sussex Fire Authority	52.04	62.45	72.85	83.26	93.67	114.49	135.30	156.12	187.34

* Entitled to disabled relief

5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2019/20 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Valuation Band: Parts of the Council's area	A* £	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Rottingdean Parish	1,061.13	1,273.36	1,485.58	1,697.80	1,910.03	2,334.48	2,758.93	3,183.39	3,820.06
Hanover Crescent	1,156.09	1,387.31	1,618.51	1,849.73	2,080.95	2,543.39	3,005.81	3,468.26	4,161.90
Marine Square	1,122.66	1,347.19	1,571.71	1,796.24	2,020.77	2,469.83	2,918.88	3,367.96	4,041.54
Royal Crescent	1,190.61	1,428.73	1,666.84	1,904.96	2,143.08	2,619.32	3,095.55	3,571.81	4,286.16
All other parts of the councils area	1,043.91	1,252.69	1,461.47	1,670.25	1,879.03	2,296.59	2,714.15	3,131.72	3,758.06

* Entitled to disabled relief

6. That in accordance with Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 the Council determines its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2019/20 is not excessive.

74 SUPPLEMENTARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR BUDGET COUNCIL

Note:

- 74.1 The item was taken into consideration as part of the overall budget debate and included in the votes on the amendments to the General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2019/20 and Supplementary Financial Information recommendation 2.1 and the final vote on the overall General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2019/20 as detailed under Item 73 above.

75 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2019/20 AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

- 75.1 The Mayor noted that the Housing Revenue Account Budget and Capital Investment Programme 2019/20 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy had been taken into consideration as part of the overall budget debate as detailed under Item 73 above. She also noted that an amendment (Green No.1) had been agreed, and therefore asked for the voting system to be activated and put the recommendations of the Policy & Resources Committee (1-5) as amended to the vote as detailed below:

Housing Revenue Account Budget and Capital Investment Programme 2019/20 and
Medium-Term Financial Strategy

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	√			29	Meadows	√		
3	Barford	√			30	Mears	√		
4	Barnett	√			31	Miller	√		
5	Bell	√			32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett	√			33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown	√			35	Morris			
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth	√		
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A	√		
11	Cobb	√			38	Norman K	√		
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn	√		
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson	√		
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor	√		
21	Hyde	√			48	Theobald C	√		
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G	√		
23	Janio	√			50	Wares	√		
24	Knight	Not present			51	Wealls	√		
25	Lewry	√			52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				

						Total	51	0	0
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	-----------	----------	----------

- a. The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** by 51 votes with none against with no abstentions.
- b. **RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the updated HRA revenue budget for 2019/20 as shown in Appendix 2, (as amended by the Green amendment No.1) to the report (as amended for any change to reserves arising from recommendations (3) and (5) below) be approved;
 - (2) That the capital programme budget of £26.964m for 2019/20 be approved and the 3-year programme as set out in Appendix 4 to the report (as amended for any change to the capital programme arising from recommendations (4), (5) and (6) below) be noted;
 - (3) That a HRA Rent Support Reserve of £1.050m be created, through a reduction in the reserve funding of the HRA capital programme by borrowing the same, and to apply this reserve in the form of a subsidy over the lifetime of modelled new schemes in order to support the provision of new council homes at lower rents, particularly social rents and 27.5% living wage rents;
 - (4) That the Purchase Properties budget be increased by £3.500m and added to the 2019/20 HRA Capital programme to be funded by HRA borrowing and Right to Buy receipts; and
 - (5) That a budget of £3.500m be added to the 2019/20 HRA Capital programme to purchase buildings to provide emergency homeless accommodation for inhouse delivery by the council to be funded by HRA borrowing and RTB receipts.

76 CLOSE OF MEETING

76.1 The Mayor thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 11.07pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2019

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL****4.30pm 5 MARCH 2019****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

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

PART ONE**77 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

77.1 There were no declarations of interest in matters appearing on the agenda.

78 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

78.1 The Mayor reminded councillors of her forthcoming charity events and her sleep out at the i-360 on Saturday 6th April.

79 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

79.1 The Mayor noted that no public questions relating to the item on the agenda had been submitted.

80 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

80.1 The Mayor noted that one oral question had been submitted but stated that she had been informed Councillor Yates had withdrawn his question since the publication of the agenda.

81 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS IN COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO POSITIONS OF SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY

81.1 Councillor Yates introduced the report of the Chief Executive and stated that it was important that the Council was governed in accordance with its constitution. It was therefore necessary to recognise the changes in the size of the respective Groups

represented on the Council and to review the committee allocations to ensure that the political balance was reflected appropriately. However, he did not see the need to change the administration of the council or the positions of special responsibility at this late stage given the impending elections in May; and therefore, moved the amendment on behalf of the Labour Group that had been circulated with the addendum.

- 81.2 Councillor Mitchell formally seconded the amendment and reserved her right to speak in the debate.
- 81.3 Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that whilst he recognised the need to review the allocations to committees, he did not see the need to change the make-up of the council prior to the elections in May. He believed the Conservative Group was attempting to take advantage to derail projects such as Valley Gardens and in this regard, he would be supporting the amendment. There would be an opportunity for residents to express their views in due course, but in the meantime, they needed a degree of confidence in the Council and its services.
- 81.4 Councillor Janio stated that the situation had arisen because of a change in numbers to the Groups and it was convention that the largest Group then became the Administration. As the Conservative Group was now the largest Group, they should form the Administration and should not be prevented from doing so by the Labour and Green Groups. He therefore hoped that the convention would be upheld.
- 81.5 Councillor Deane stated that she felt the Green Group found themselves between a rock and a hard place, and in having consideration for the best for the city and the need for continuity it was evident that they should support the amendment.
- 81.6 Councillor Hamilton referred to the outcome of the previous elections and the percentage split in favour of the Labour party and argued that any changes at this point in time to the Administration of the Council would not reflect the views of the electorate or the democratic mandate that had been given to the Labour Group. He therefore supported the amendment.
- 81.7 Councillor Littman stated that the Group faced a difficult choice and had to consider what meant the least harm for the city and to do the right thing for residents who could then make their views known in May.
- 81.8 Councillor Inkpin-Leissner stated that there was a need to change the politics which had become a charade and did not deliver what the city needed. However, he would support the amendment and enable some continuity to continue until May.
- 81.9 Councillor West stated that he found no pleasure in having to attend today's meeting and in giving consideration to the need to safeguard projects in the run up to the elections would support the amendment.
- 81.10 Councillor Mears stated that she had listened to the debate with interest and noted that the previous Conservative Administration had protected council services, whilst both the Green and Labour Groups had failed to deliver value for money. She believed that the Conservative Group should be recognised as the Administration as it was now the largest Group on the Council.

- 81.11 Councillor Bewick stated that both the current Labour and previous Green Administrations had been able to sustain public services during a period of austerity and he did not believe that the Conservative Group really wanted to take control at this point. He acknowledged that the Green Group were in a difficult position and stated that it would be better to wait and leave the matter to the electorate. He hoped that at that point, they would the return a Labour majority to run the Council and serve the city with the residents' interests at heart.
- 81.12 Councillor Gibson welcomed the proposal to appoint Councillor Hill as Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee and stated that he could not agree with Councillor Mears given that the Conservative Group had sought to cut the budget that was agreed last week rather than support additional funding being put back to help to deliver new council homes.
- 81.13 Councillor G. Theobald stated that a decision to approve the amendment would be undemocratic and went against the conventions that the council had upheld since there had been a situation of no overall control for any Group. The Conservative Group were now the largest Group on the Council and therefore should form the Administration and hold the various positions of responsibility. He therefore urged all councillors to think about the matter carefully.
- 81.14 Councillor Page stated that he was aware the Conservative Group had requisitioned this meeting as a result of the change in numbers for their Group. However, this was only 2 weeks and 2 days ahead of the start of the election campaign and he had wanted to hear the reasons for seeking the changes. However, he had not heard anything to justify any change other than the need to reallocate seats on committees and could not support any other changes at this time.
- 81.15 Councillor Miller stated that he found it ironic that the Opposition Groups were voting against change and noted that they had adapted a Conservative amendment at the Budget Council meeting to meet their needs.
- 81.16 Councillor Phillips queried the need for the current meeting and the expense of having to meet today in view of the timing of the elections. She believed the electorate deserved better and that matters should have been left until the elections in May.
- 81.17 Councillor Peltzer Dunn questioned the views of the two other main Groups and their desire to retain the current position for the remaining 2 weeks and 2 days. He stated that he was surprised by their willingness to vote against having a Conservative Administration and believed this would be recognised in May.
- 81.18 Councillor Druitt stated that whilst he could not accept some of the points made in the debate, he did acknowledge the point made about the convention for the largest Group to form the Administration. However, that was usually at the start of a term of office and not towards the end with only 8 weeks left. It was better for the current Administration to see out the term of office having been elected to do so.
- 81.19 Councillor Mitchell stated that the Administration intended to complete the next committee cycle and all the relevant business that was coming forward. There was a

clear need to ensure that projects such as Valley Gardens were taken forward and the council and residents needed stability in the run up to the elections in May.

81.20 Councillor Yates stated that in 8 weeks and 3 days the various parties would know the will of the people and he took nothing for granted. In the meantime, whilst he acknowledged the point raised by Councillor Theobald about convention, if the largest Group could not carry the confidence of the Council then it could not be placed to run the Council. Hence the importance of the forthcoming vote on the matter and the need to support the amendment.

81.21 The Mayor noted that an amendment had been moved and asked for the electronic voting system to be activated and put it to the vote as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	Not present			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris	Not present		
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A	No vote recorded		
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	
19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	

22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X		
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X		
24	Knight	√			51	Wealls		X		
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√			
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√			
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54					
							Total	30	20	0

81.22 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 30 votes to 20 with no abstentions.

81.23 The Mayor then put the recommendations as amended to the vote as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	√			28	Marsh	√		
2	Atkinson	Not present			29	Meadows		X	
3	Barford	√			30	Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		31	Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		32	Mitchell	√		
6	Bennett		X		33	Moonan	√		
7	Bewick	√			34	Morgan	√		
8	Brown		X		35	Morris	Not present		
9	Cattell	√			36	Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman	√			37	Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		38	Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	√			39	O'Quinn	√		
13	Deane	√			40	Page	√		
14	Druitt	√			41	Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	√			42	Phillips	√		
16	Gilbey	√			43	Platts	√		
17	Greenbaum	√			44	Robins	√		
18	Hamilton	√			45	Simson		X	

19	Hill	√			46	Sykes	√		
20	Horan	√			47	Taylor		X	
21	Hyde		X		48	Theobald C		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	√			49	Theobald G		X	
23	Janio		X		50	Wares		X	
24	Knight	√			51	Wealls		X	
25	Lewry		X		52	West	√		
26	Littman	√			53	Yates	√		
27	Mac Cafferty	√			54				
						Total	30	21	0

81.24 The Mayor confirmed that the recommendations had been **carried** by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions. She also noted that the allocations to committees had not been notified and therefore would be confirmed by Group Leaders following the meeting in accordance with the note on the Addendum.

81.25 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the appointment of Councillor Hill to the position of Chair of Housing & New Homes Committee, for Councillor Hill to replace Councillor Meadows as Chair of Homes for Brighton and Hove; the appointment of Councillor Platts as Chair of the Procurement Advisory Board be approved; and otherwise it be agreed to make no other changes to any special responsibility positions including the Leader, Deputy Leader, Chairs of Committees and Lead Member roles;
- (2) That the appointment/re-appointment of committees with the sizes and allocation of seats between political groups as set out in the amended Appendix 2 to the report be approved;
- (3) That subject to (2) above, having received nominations to the committees from the 4 political groups, such nominations be agreed, and the committee places filled accordingly;
- (4) That an urgency sub-committee for each committee be appointed in accordance with Procedure Rule 22 (such committee being politically balanced but not included in the total number of seats for the purpose of allocating seats); and
- (5) That the exemptions from political proportionality requirements currently in existence (Personnel Appeals Panel etc.) be continued.

82 **CLOSE OF MEETING**

82.1 The Mayor thanked everyone for attending and closed meeting.

The meeting concluded at 5.15pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2019

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 question has been received from a member of the public.

1. QUESTION From: Christopher Hawtree

Would Councillor Daniel please tell us the current state of the earlier decision to stock our libraries with every classic work?

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

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

Notification of three Deputations has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

(1) Deputation concerning Milan Urban Food Partnership**Spokesperson Vic Borrill**

Supported by Brighton & Hove Food Partnership:

Emily O'Brien

Vic Borrill

Jess Crocker

Chloe Clarke

Victoria Williams

Ward affected: All

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

(2) Deputation concerning Grassroots Brighton & Hove Action Plan**Spokesperson Mark Stack**

Supported by:

Bill Smith (Latest Music Bar)

Sally Ann Oakenfold (The Hope and Ruin)

Will Moore (The Prince Albert)

Toni Coe-Brooker (The Green Door Store)

Ward affected: All

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

(1) Deputation concerning The Milan Urban Food Policy

On behalf of Brighton and Food Partnership I am requesting that the city of Brighton and Hove becomes a signatory to the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact.

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact is an international voluntary agreement. There is no financial contribution needed, and no specific obligation to do anything as a result. It is a pledge, if you like, with the core message that we will seek to develop “sustainable food systems that are inclusive, resilient, safe and diverse.” It was initially signed by over 100 international cities in Milan in 2015, and now has been signed by 181 cities. The existing UK signatories are London, Birmingham and Bristol.

We are recommending that Brighton & Hove becomes a signatory as the aims and ethos closely reflect the city’s existing approach, as set out in our city-wide Food Strategy, and our city’s vision of developing a ‘healthy, sustainable fair food for all.’ Becoming a signatory will add value and prestige to our existing local activity and be a chance to promote it to a wider audience.

Signing up will also support our city’s bid to become the first Gold Sustainable Food City in the UK, which we are on track to achieve in 2020.

Finally, becoming a signatory will showcase our city’s approach and achievements to an international audience. With 200 actions and 100 partners, and with cross-party support, our city’s Food Strategy Action Plan has been described by Sustainable Food cities as the most ambitious example of a food partnership approach in the UK. Indeed, we are sometimes asked why, given our leading global position on a joined-up citywide approach to food, Brighton & Hove is not already a signatory.

Thank you for your consideration.

Spokesperson

Vic Borrill, for Brighton & Hove Food Partnership

In terms of the process, an authorised representative of the local authority needs to sign a document, committing on a voluntary basis to the following, all of which our city is already doing:

- “We will work to develop sustainable food systems that are inclusive, resilient, safe and diverse, that provide healthy and affordable food to all people in a human rights-based framework, that minimise waste and conserve biodiversity while adapting to and mitigating impacts of climate change;
- We will encourage interdepartmental and cross-sector coordination at municipal and community levels, working to integrate urban food policy considerations into social, economic and environment policies, programmes and initiatives, such as, inter alia, food supply and distribution, social protection, nutrition, equity, food production, education, food safety and waste reduction;
- We will seek coherence between municipal food-related policies and programmes and relevant subnational, national, regional and international policies and processes;
- We will engage all sectors within the food system (including neighbouring authorities, technical and academic organizations, civil society, small scale producers, and the private sector) in the formulation, implementation and assessment of all food-related policies, programmes and initiatives;
- We will review and amend existing urban policies, plans and regulations in order to encourage the establishment of equitable, resilient and sustainable food systems;
- We will use the Framework for Action as a starting point for each city to address the development of their own urban food system and we will share developments with participating cities and our national governments and international agencies when appropriate;
- We will encourage other cities to join our food policy actions.”

If we do not sign-up, there are no specific implications, but we lose the opportunity to promote our good practice locally and on an international stage. There is also an award scheme to recognise exceptional achievement by cities around the world, which we can only apply for if we are a signatory.

Milan Urban Food Pact website: <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/>

Commitment and Suggested Framework for action: <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/text/>

Signatory cities: <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/signatory-cities/>



(2) Deputation concerning Grassroots Brighton & Hove Action Plan

Grassroots Brighton & Hove is a new organisation. It is the city's core grassroots music venues coming together and making a collaborative association for the benefit of all. Its objective is to provide a focal point and facilities to foster greater local community activity and bring residents, the local business community, artists and smaller organisations together to improve the quality of life in Brighton & Hove. It offers strong working relationships with other local community services A base for outreach and signposting people to other local services.

Live music in Brighton generates an estimated £112m PA for the local economy and is an essential force in giving the city its dynamic and vibrant edge. This deputation is to make Councillors and council staff aware the unique and pivotal role that Grassroots Brighton & Hove undertakes, our important role as community hubs and what we will now bring to the city as a formal association. We want to explain what we can do for you and what help we are asking in return.

Spokesperson

Mark Stack

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answer as detailed below:

(1) Councillor: Druitt

What measures are being taken in advance of the summer to maintain safety in the city centre, most especially in and around Regency Square, Clarence Sq., Bedford Sq., Norfolk Sq., St Nicholas' green spaces, Duke Street and Western Terrace which suffer high levels of anti-social behaviour, drug taking and even public defecation for much of the year but most especially during the summer, bearing in mind neither the council nor the police have been able to do very much about the problems in previous years?

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

The council works closely with partners to ensure that issues such as those described by Cllr Druitt are addressed as quickly and appropriately as possible.

Monthly partnership tactical tasking and co-ordination meetings are held to discuss and adopt solutions for issues / individuals / locations that are causing particular concern in the city. Relevant council departments are also involved.

I will ensure that that the locations identified by Cllr Druitt are included in these discussions and actions identified to address them.

(2) Councillor Druitt

The independent traders in the city centre are much of what gives Brighton & Hove its vibe and its appeal for visitors. Yet many continue to struggle with high rents, unfair business rates, and antisocial behaviour on their doorsteps. Many of the issues (e.g. rents and rates) are not ones the council has direct control over, but the council does have control over other things such as street cleanliness, graffiti, levels of anti-social behaviour and the way it collects business rates and enforces arrears. What is the council doing to support businesses struggling to stay afloat, especially those in areas that have faced declining trade such as Preston Street and Duke Street?

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

Preston Street and Duke Street are visited on a daily basis and cleaned both by a street cleansing operative on foot and by the mechanical sweeper.

The Environmental Enforcement Service has joined the council, having previously been delivered by an external contractor. City Environment has been reviewing their future deployment arrangements, as well as coming up with new ideas on how to tackle environmental offences, including littering, fly-tipping and graffiti. Environmental Enforcement Officers have also recently completed a series of educational visits to businesses across the city to remind them of their responsibilities with regards waste management.

A Graffiti Reduction Strategy was agreed at Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee in January 2019. City Environment is currently developing an action plan detailing how the strategy will be delivered by the council and its partners. The Strategy focuses on four key areas to reduce and remove graffiti to enhance the local environment through: prevention, enforcement, removal, and monitoring and measuring.

Brighton BID

The Council also works with the Brighton BID which is a private limited company that supports 517 businesses in the BID area. Preston Street is in the BID but Duke Street is not. The BID levy is 1.25% of a businesses' ratable value, currently bringing in £1.8m over five years. The BID delivers projects which include the provision of on street City Centre Ambassadors and a range of additional services to help make the BID levy as cost neutral as possible, for example, negotiated reductions with NCP car parking, a business cost reduction services to bring down utilities outgoings as well as discounts on professional services and advertising. In terms of the key issues raised:

- **Street Cleansing:** Since the BID came in to being in 2006, there has been an 'agreement' with the City Clean for additional cleansing in the city centre. The BID Ambassadors are in regular contact with the team at City Clean and call in issues as and when such as fly tipping, homeless community paraphernalia etc.
- **Graffiti removal:** The BID does not get involved with direct removal of graffiti but suggests to its members to get private sector support or to ask the council for help.
- **Anti-Social Behaviour:** The City Centre Ambassadors are at the front end of managing anti-social behaviour on a daily basis with excellent links with Sussex Police and the Business Crime Reduction Partnership and regularly attend agency meetings convened to support the street community. An increasing amount of work is spent engaging with the Street Community at around 50% of their time.

Economic Strategy

The Council has recently agreed a new Economic Strategy and Visitor Economy Strategy as part of creating the conditions for businesses to thrive. Our vision for the Economic Strategy is underpinned by five themes which are vital to delivering economic growth and providing a greater quality of life for residents. A diverse set of actions have been identified to support the delivery of this strategy over the next five years. The five themes are:

- **A growing city** that unlocks its capacity for growth, through the delivery of homes, space, and infrastructure and through the evolution of a better connected economy.
- **An open city** that achieves its potential evolving as an attractive, welcoming and modern place for investors and visitors alike
- **A talented city** which recognises the role that skills and the labour market has to play in driving economic productivity and inclusive growth outcomes.
- **A fair city** which is inclusive and responsible, encouraging engagement and participation across our communities and working to ensure the benefits of growth are distributed fairly.
- **A sustainable city** which looks to the future, focusing its economy on sustainable solutions to future challenges in order to protect and enhance the health and wellbeing of its residents and act as a leader in developing a robust response to climate change.

Living Wage Campaign and Campaign to End Unpaid Work Trial Shifts

- The work the Council is doing around the Living Wage campaign and the campaign to end unpaid trial shifts supports the end to any form of exploitation within the city. By making this a priority within the city's economy the council is ensuring that through decent wages there is more money circulating and therefore more spend with local businesses.

(3) Councillor Janio

At the last Full Council, I asked why the Labour Administration did not attempt to remove Hangleton Bottom from the Waste and Mineral Sites Plan. Her answer informed me who the other partners were in the plan, when it was signed and what period it covers. It did not answer the question. I am not permitted to ask the same question again, but could Cllr Mitchell explain any investigations that the Labour Administration has taken to identify other sites that could be safeguarded for use as a Waste Transfer Site in preference to Hangleton Bottom – an area that is more suitable for mixed use Development.

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

The site at Hangleton Bottom is allocated for waste management use in the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan 2017. It is important that we have an up to date Waste and Minerals Sites Plan in place.

You can be assured that during the preparation of this Plan, officers did review the allocation. A comprehensive site search exercise was undertaken with 97 potential locations across Brighton & Hove and East Sussex which were assessed in detail against 29 different criteria. This process led to three safeguarded site allocations included in the Plan – Hangleton Bottom is the only

waste allocation in Brighton & Hove. The other are two sites in East Sussex (at Lower Dicker and Hailsham).

The site allocations proposed were carefully considered by the independent Planning Inspector during the Public Examination of the Sites Plan and were considered 'sound'.

The need for waste management sites and the site allocations will be next revisited at the review of the Sites Plan before 2026.

(4) Councillor West

The Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan offers a considerable opportunity to support an increase in active travel with all the clear benefits that will bring, including: reducing carbon footprint, traffic congestion, air pollution and the cost of travel, while also improving health and road safety.

It's very clear in the DfT guidance that the LCWIP should be a collaborative project with stakeholders fully engaged in the process, and not merely seen as consultees to a consultant led plan.

The first stage of the LCWIP process is to agree on governance. That should rightly be done by a steering group comprising members, including our cross-party cycle champions, and at least two co-optees representing local cycling and walking organisations. A key initial task for this group should be to develop with officers the LCWIP brief for consultants. It should also be tasked with informing spending priorities for additional LTP funds and development of a multi-million-pound capital bid to the LEP for active travel funding.

Would Councillor Mitchell agree that such an inclusive approach, ensuring the strengths of our active travel community are properly embraced in shaping and delivering investment in active travel, is the best and right approach; and will Councillor Mitchell therefore take the opportunity to initiate this?

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

The Government's recommendation that councils should develop a Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (or an L C WIP as it has become known) is fully recognised and, as I have confirmed on previous occasions, I am pleased to be able to report that work is now underway to enable the plan to be produced in a timely manner.

And I can fully reassure you that the work is being led by officers; but support from consultants will need to be sought at the appropriate time, especially to fulfil the technical requirements and techniques that the Government would like to see included, such as the use of modelling tools. The £75,000 pounds that has been secured within the Budget for 2019/20 will enable this to happen, and also ensure that the process is fully resourced to enable a comprehensive plan to be produced – a comprehensive plan that will be based on good governance, and informed and shaped by stakeholder engagement and public involvement.

These will be a critical part of the first stage of the process and they will be set out, within an anticipated timescale, in a Scoping Report that will be brought to the next meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee in June to enable members to consider it and approve it. At that point, we will also know which Administration will be leading this work, and which councillors will be in roles that will enable them to be fully briefed about the L C WIP, and to also participate in the process as it moves forward.

Officers will therefore be following the approach set out in the Governments' guidance document– scoping the plan, gathering information, planning cycling and walking networks, and proposing prioritised improvements – and, through the agreed governance arrangements, they will be ensuring that each stage is fully completed. They will therefore leading the strategic planning that is required and are already developing the brief that we will need consultants to follow to help us develop the plan. The brief will be significantly shaped by the technical guidance issued by the Government, and that work needs to be started now to enable us to develop the plan and be ready at the earliest opportunity to bid for external funding, or allocate our own budgets, to invest in the cycling and walking infrastructure improvements that the city's residents and visitors both need and deserve.

I hope that I have therefore reassured you that this will not be a consultant-led plan which excludes or marginalises stakeholder input from any sector within the city, but that it will be a plan that draws on all the local knowledge and experience that exists amongst people, organisations and communities within the city which will provide safe, high quality and accessible routes and facilities that allow people to make walking and cycling their first choice for local journeys.

(5) Councillor Gibson

If all projected (received up till April 1st, 2023) and usable RTB receipts (already received) were utilised to build new council homes at the 30% rate allowed by government what would the estimated total spend be? If this total spend produced new council homes at an average cost of £220,000 a home how many new council homes would this yield?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The total usable RTB receipts received and those projected up to 1st April 2023 total £87.266m. This level of receipts would support the delivery of 396 homes assuming an average cost per property of £0.220m. At this point in time receipts assumed for quarter 4 of 2018/19 and beyond are based on projected receipts, therefore the total usable receipts are subject to change.

(6) Councillor Gibson

What is the total number of homes sold under the RTB so far this financial year (as of 20th March 2019)? And adding this total for this year so far to RTB sales

in previous years since 1st April 2015, how many homes had been sold as of the 20th March (between 1st April 2015 and 20th March 2019)?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The total number of homes sold under the RTB as at 20th March 2019 is 55. Since 1st April 2015 the council has sold a total of 232 homes under the RTB

(7) Councillor Gibson

Can you confirm that the table which collates rough sleeper count and estimate data below is correct and given that the table that rough sleeper estimates in the same year have been consistently higher than counts undertaken in the same year was it wise to switch from estimates to counts in November 2018 (in an election year)?

Rough sleeper counts and estimates

Year	10/11	2011	12/13	2013	2014	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19
Rough sleeper count	14	36	43	50	41	?	?	?	64 (Nov)
Rough sleeper estimate		76		90	132	78	144	178	?
% of estimate that is a count in the same year		47%		56%	31%				

Reply from Councillor Moonan, Lead Member for Rough Sleepers

The official November count is not the way Brighton & Hove City Council monitors levels of rough sleeping. Other ongoing robust methods are used throughout the year, which enable us to say with confidence that the number of rough sleepers has reduced significantly.

These methods are the B'think multi agency IT system which records rough sleepers as well as those in supported accommodation. This system allows us to look at the changing picture of rough sleepers over weeks, months and years.

The cumulative number of individuals recorded on Bethink for at least one night per month is below. It does not mean that all of these number of people were rough sleeping every night of the month, many will have been on the streets for a much shorter period of time. There is a constant change of individuals within the rough sleeping community as people are supported off the streets, and as more arrive. The number of rough sleepers also includes those who are known to have accommodation but have been found rough sleeping.

March 2019 (to date): 85 individuals
February 2019: 72 individuals

January 2019: 78 individuals
December 2018: 67 individuals
November 2018: 118 individuals
October 2018: 96 individuals

This data is used in conjunction with the regular street counts undertaken by St Mungo's and as set out below.

March 2019	66 people found
January 2019	30 people found
November 2018	64 people found (national count)
September 2018	78 people found

This data is part of the monitoring agreed with the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government as part of our grant funding. The November national count represents a one day snap shot within these wider data gathering activities.

The table is not wholly correct as the estimates undertaken in 2013 and 2014 were not undertaken in November, they were undertaken in March so they are not directly comparable with the count figures which were undertaken and verified in November.

The official counts and estimates undertaken in November have all been undertaken to strict guidance laid down by the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government and independently verified by Homeless Link. Both methods have their limitations and only seek to produce a one night snapshot of the situation in the city. The guidance provided is clear on who can be counted and the definition of rough sleeping that is to be used. We have been clear that the count in 2018 and the estimate in 2017 are not comparable to each other due to the different methodologies used.

(8) Councillor Gibson

The much heralded, very welcome and desperately needed additional 10 (government funded) Housing First Placement support packages are due to start 3 days after full council on Monday 1st of April. Can you confirm that 10 additional properties have been identified along with 10 ("revolving door") homeless clients are lined up to go and ready to move in as soon as the money is available?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

Officers from Health and Adult Social Care and Housing are working through options to secure the 10 units of accommodation to support the expansion of Housing First. Officers are currently reviewing 4 units of temporary accommodation that could be utilised to support the expansion and looking at other options.

Where individuals are eligible under the housing allocation policy will also be supporting people to access properties through the Council Interest Queue.

(9) Councillor Gibson

If 10 Housing First placements are not yet ready to move into accommodation, how many properties and people have been identified so far?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

There are a number of suitable clients identified and the sources of accommodation as set out support those who would be eligible through the housing allocations policy and the Council's Interest Queue and also those that currently do not but who might benefit from the Housing First Model.

The support for those people placed into accommodation under the Housing First model will be provided by St Mungo's who are mobilising staff teams in preparation for the expansion of the service. The support that is offered under the Housing First model provides a highly personalised approach to working with individuals often with multiple and complex needs and the existing housing first units have demonstrated the positive impact this model can have on outcomes for those in the service.

(10) Councillor Gibson

Given that BHCC has had many months to make arrangements for Housing first placements and given that they will make an important contribution to helping 10 individuals and easing pressure on supported accommodation at a time when the closure of the West Pier project is putting services under strain, how do you think the MHCLG will react if we do not have the placements up and running on the 1st of April? Will failure to do this on schedule damage our credibility with MHCLG and jeopardise our prospects for securing further funding?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The Council has been successful in securing significant additional investment from the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and Council Officers are in regular contact with them regarding progress on the mobilisation and outcomes of this funding.

Any expansion of Housing First needs to be carefully managed and units of accommodation scaled up in a planned way.

The plans submitted to the MHCLG reflects the needs to expand this model in a planned way and ensure that individuals are settled in well to their property and accessing the support provided, the MHCLG are fully supportive of this approach.

(11) Councillor Gibson

Given Housing and New Homes Committee's desire to redress the under allocation of properties to the council interest queue and given that over the period since the commencement of the allocations plan the queue has been under allocated, can this under allocation be redressed by making Housing First allocations with immediate effect in conjunction with an associated support package?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The Council has taken action to redress the previous under-allocation to the Council's Interest Queue through working with Health and Adult Social Care and Families, Children's and Learning and we are on target to achieve the full 10% this year. We work more closely now with colleagues in Health and Adult Social Care and Families, Children and Learning to ensure that we are maximising the Council Interest Queue. We are currently actively looking to see how many of the properties in the Council Interest Queue we can use for Housing First. We need to do this alongside other schemes which, for example, use the Council Interest Queue to prevent children being looked after by the Local Authority. Housing First clients placed in council properties through the Council Interest Queue will need to be eligible under the housing allocation policy and have substantial support in place right from the beginning of their tenancy.

(12) Councillor Gibson

Given that the very welcome all year night shelter is funded to open from 1st April 2019, can you confirm that a building has been obtained for use? And if it is not ready, when you plan for the shelter to open?

Reply from Councillor Moonan, Lead Member for Rough Sleepers.

We are very pleased that due to careful financial management we were able to identify funding, approved last month, for an all year-round night shelter for rough sleepers for the coming year. This will complement our current SWEP provision, which operates on one of the lowest triggers in the country. We hope to open the all year-round night shelter as soon as possible, so officers are working to identify an appropriate property at the moment. Once a suitable building has been identified officers will work to procure a service provider with experience of running homeless services. Opening the all year-round night shelter is a high priority, but we do have to find a building that is suitable so that a really effective service can be provided.

(13) Councillor Gibson

National figures on how well councils used their borrowing opportunities (under the cap) reveal that on 1st April 2018, Brighton and Hove Council were in the top quarter of councils failing to spend the borrowing available under the cap and

that neighbouring councils of Lewes, Eastbourne, Adur and Wealden had all used proportionately more of the borrowing available. Having not made the most of borrowing opportunities so far and given the housing crisis in our city, (given we now have a new chair of housing) will you undertake to use the 31m + unused borrowing under the previous cap and more to ramp up the council house building programme so that it achieves its potential in the future?

Reply from Councillor Hill, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The borrowing cap sum for each authority was calculated by the Government back in 2011 using a complex set of calculations which were in part based on assumed levels of debt for each authority at that time. It is therefore very difficult to make comparisons between authorities and the use they have made of the borrowing available to them. Since self-financing was introduced for HRA's in 2012, Brighton & Hove City Council's HRA has only needed to borrow in order to increase the supply of new homes (new build or purchase). Conversely, many other authorities have needed to borrow to fund their own capital programme and will therefore always have higher levels of new borrowing. It is also the case that the HRA has made efficiency savings and in-year cost savings which have enabled it to fund more works directly from revenue rather than needing to borrow. In summary, to use the amount of new borrowing as a measure of investment in new homes will not give an accurate picture. Overall, a better measure is how many new homes have been delivered. Since the council started building council homes again it has developed 197 new homes across around 16 projects. It has another 12 currently under construction at Kensington Street, and sites are currently identified for a total of around 500 more homes.

The council is committed to increasing the supply of affordable housing in the city as demonstrated in the recent report 'HRA Borrowing Cap' to Housing and New Homes Committee on 13th March 2019. This outlines the work to date and the ongoing pipeline of projects for building and purchasing new affordable homes as well as the resources being invested for supporting such an ambitious programme. Also, Budget Council recently approved the HRA capital Investment Programme for 2019/20, and indicative budgets for 2020/21 and 2021/22, with a total investment of £53.6m in new homes, £37m of which is estimated to be funded through borrowing. This exceeds the £31m which the council had available to it before the removal of the borrowing cap.

(14) Councillor Deane

How many prosecutions against perpetrators of tagging and graffiti have there been during the past year, two years and five years?

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

Over the last five years, the following have been issued:

Year	Number of Fixed Penalty Notices Issued	Number of Prosecutions
2014/15	0	0
2015/16	1	0
2016/17	17	0
2017/18	2	0
2018/19	3	0

One of the issues with tagging and graffiti is identifying the offender. The police and the council do attempt to identify and prosecute; however, it can be difficult to identify those responsible as they are often well practiced at avoiding detection by tagging at night and keeping hidden from CCTV cameras.

If an alleged offender does not pay their Fixed Penalty Notice, the case may go to prosecution. The case may go straight to prosecution if the offence is major e.g. racist graffiti. For both situations, the offender needs to be identified.

Council

28 March 2019

Agenda Item 94

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Pay Policy Statement 219/20

Extract from the proceedings of the Policy Resources & Growth Committee meeting held on the 21 March 2019

Date of Meeting: 28 March 2019**Report of:** Executive Lead Officer for Strategy, Governance & Law**Contact Officer:** Name: Lisa Johnson Tel: 01273 291228E-mail: lisa.johnson@brighton-hove.gov.uk**Wards Affected:** All**FOR GENERAL RELEASE*****Action Required of Council:***

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

Recommendation: That the Council adopts the pay policy statement for 2019/20 as attached in Appendix 1 to the report.

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
POLICY RESOURCES & GROWTH COMMITTEE**

4.00pm 21 MARCH 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Yates (Chair) Hamilton (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mac Cafferty (Group Spokesperson), Bell, Daniel, Miller, Mitchell, Peltzer Dunn, and Sykes.

PART ONE

139 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2019/20

139.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee recommends to Council the adoption of the pay policy statement for 2019/20 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.