



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

COUNCIL ADDENDUM 2 Amendments

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 24 OCTOBER 2024

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
32	MINUTES	5 - 8
47	REVIEW OF POLITICAL BALANCE OCTOBER 2024	9 - 14
50	RESTRICTING UNETHICAL AND CARBON INTENSIVE ADVERTISING	15 - 16

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

Agenda Item 32

Subject: Council Minutes - 28 March 2024

Date of meeting: 24 October 2024

Ward(s) affected: All

Officer Amendment

That the relevant changes are made to the following paragraphs in the Minutes as shown below in ~~strike through~~ and **bold italics**:

24 Petition for Debate - Glyphosate

24.1 The Mayor stated that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at the council meeting. There was one petition which had reached that threshold. The petition concerned Keep Brighton and Hove Free of Toxic Weedkillers and she invited Elspeth Broady on behalf of Clara Usiskin to join the meeting and to present the petition.

~~24.2 Elspeth Broady thanked the mayor and stated that the petition had been signed by over 1200 people. The petition stated to propose looking at ways to make the school travel free for all children, following example of London where all bus travel for under 16s is free of charge.~~

24.32 Councillor Rowkins replied. ***Thank you very much, Elspeth, for presenting your petition. I understand you're standing in for Clara. I know she's been following this very closely and I imagine you have as well, along with many other residents. I'm sure you'll be aware that this was definitely not an easy decision for us.***

I want to start just by making a couple of small corrections if I may. The petition states in the body of the text that the Council began a three-year phase out of glyphosate use on pavements and roads in 2019, but that's not accurate. The Council decision in 2019 was, and I'm quoting from the committee report that that documents the decision, to end the use of glyphosate by Brighton & Hove City Council's City Environment Management services with immediate effect.

Now, whilst well-intentioned, this was contrary to the advice of the Pesticide Action Network who recommend, as you suggest, a phase out. But not just a phase out. You can't just gradually stop using herbicides and not replace them with anything. The absence of any proper strategy for managing weed growth in the years since 2019 has, I'm afraid, led to a situation where in some parts of the city, the situation is out of control and we've been forced to act.

The petition also suggest that the Council will be using herbicide on grass verges, but that is not the case. I just want to reassure you of

that. The committee decision in January this year actually explicitly states that we will not be treating any parks at green spaces or verges. Now it is my firm belief that the cliff-edge ban, and the absence of a strategy to manage the problem in years following 2019, has led to the situation in which we now find ourselves. Look, you know, if you ask me the simple question, 'do you want to use glyphosate?', my answer is an easy no. But we don't have the luxury of taking such a simplistic view. We also have to consider our duty to maintain safe and accessible pavements for all of our residents.

I just want to address a few specific points made in the body of the petition. Firstly, I completely agree that creating and maintaining biodiverse green spaces is crucial and, as I said earlier, there will be no treatment from the city's green spaces.

We'll continue to create biodiverse habitats at various locations around the city, including bee banks and of course on the South Downs where we are implementing a landscape-scale intervention to restore wild chalk grassland and move farming practises to a more sustainable future.

Secondly, I just want to pick out one particular line: 'we believe that an effective organic integrated weed management strategy is possible'. Now I think you're probably right, but trying to implement that after five full years of unchecked growth with well-established roots now gearing up for their sixth season is just not realistic. We need to reset the situation back to a manageable level and then begin to implement a more integrated approach alongside a reduction in the use of herbicide.

The control droplet application approved at committee in January mitigates the concerns that you raise and, we believe, strikes a balance between protecting biodiversity as much as possible whilst enabling us to get the problem back under control. Let me assure you that we will be seeking to ultimately phase out the use of herbicides but in a managed and responsible way that does not risk the city streets becoming inaccessible and unsafe.

Thank you again for being here today.

24.43 Councillor Davis **Pickett** moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Hill **McLeay**.

24.54 Councillor Hogan **Theobald and Earthey** spoke on the matter.

24.6—The Mayor congratulated Councillor Hogan on her maiden speech.

24.75 Councillor Muten **Rowkins** responded to the debate and did not accept the Green Group amendment.

24.86 **RESOLVED:**

1. That the petition was noted and referred to the relevant decision making body for consideration.

Paragraph 24 to read as follows:

24 Petition for Debate - Glyphosate

- 24.1 The Mayor stated that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at the council meeting. There was one petition which had reached that threshold. The petition concerned Keep Brighton and Hove Free of Toxic Weedkillers and she invited Elspeth Broady on behalf of Clara Usiskin to join the meeting and to present the petition.
- 24.2 Councillor Rowkins replied. Thank you very much, Elspeth, for presenting your petition. I understand you're standing in for Clara. I know she's been following this very closely and I imagine you have as well, along with many other residents. I'm sure you'll be aware that this was definitely not an easy decision for us.

I want to start just by making a couple of small corrections if I may. The petition states in the body of the text that the Council began a three-year phase out of glyphosate use on pavements and roads in 2019, but that's not accurate. The Council decision in 2019 was, and I'm quoting from the committee report that that documents the decision, to end the use of glyphosate by Brighton & Hove City Council's City Environment Management services with immediate effect.

Now, whilst well-intentioned, this was contrary to the advice of the Pesticide Action Network who recommend, as you suggest, a phase out. But not just a phase out. You can't just gradually stop using herbicides and not replace them with anything. The absence of any proper strategy for managing weed growth in the years since 2019 has, I'm afraid, led to a situation where in some parts of the city, the situation is out of control and we've been forced to act.

The petition also suggest that the Council will be using herbicide on grass verges, but that is not the case. I just want to reassure you of that. The committee decision in January this year actually explicitly states that we will not be treating any parks at green spaces or verges. Now it is my firm belief that the cliff-edge ban, and the absence of a strategy to manage the problem in years following 2019, has led to the situation in which we now find ourselves. Look, you know, if you ask me the simple question, 'do you want to use glyphosate?', my answer is an easy no. But we don't have the luxury of taking such a simplistic view. We also have to consider our duty to maintain safe and accessible pavements for all of our residents.

I just want to address a few specific points made in the body of the petition. Firstly, I completely agree that creating and maintaining biodiverse green spaces is crucial and, as I said earlier, there will be no treatment from the city's green spaces.

We'll continue to create biodiverse habitats at various locations around the city, including bee banks and of course on the South Downs where we are implementing a landscape-scale intervention to restore wild chalk grassland and move farming practises to a more sustainable future.

Secondly, I just want to pick out one particular line: 'we believe that an effective organic integrated weed management strategy is possible'. Now I think you're probably right, but trying to implement that after five full years of unchecked growth with well-established roots now gearing up for their sixth season is just not realistic. We need to reset the situation back to a manageable level and then begin to implement a more integrated approach alongside a reduction in the use of herbicide.

The control droplet application approved at committee in January mitigates the concerns that you raise and, we believe, strikes a balance between protecting biodiversity as much as possible whilst enabling us to get the problem back under control. Let me assure you that we will be seeking to ultimately phase out the use of herbicides but in a managed and responsible way that does not risk the city streets becoming inaccessible and unsafe.

Thank you again for being here today.

- 24.3 Councillor Pickett moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group which was formally seconded by Councillor McLeay.
- 24.4 Councillor Theobald and Earthey spoke on the matter.
- 24.5 Councillor Rowkins responded to the debate and did not accept the Green Group amendment.
- 24.6 **RESOLVED:**
1. That the petition was noted and referred to the relevant decision making body for consideration.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

Agenda Item 47

Subject: Review of Political Balance October 2024

Date of meeting: 24 October 2024

Ward(s) affected: All

Officer Amendment

That the relevant changes are made to the following paragraphs and appendices as shown below in ~~striketrough~~ and ***bold italics***:

- 3.8 The proposed allocation of places on each of the committees as detailed above and in Appendix 1 to the report takes into account the principles referred to in paragraph 3.5 in that:
- a. The Labour Group's overall allocation equals ~~45~~ ***44*** seats,
 - b. The Green Group's overall allocation equals 9 seats,
 - c. The Conservative Group's overall allocation equals 6 seats,
 - d. The Brighton & Hove Independent Group's allocation equals 2 seats and
 - e. That in having regard to the convention that the Council has abided to whenever there has been an Independent Member, 1 seat is offered to each of the Independent Members.
- 3.9 The allocations set out at paragraph 3.8 above provides the Green Group, Conservative Group and Brighton & Hove Independent Group with allocations in accordance with their politically proportionate calculations and provides the Labour Group with ~~2~~ ***1*** seat above their initial allocation. This outcome accords as closely as possible with political proportionality for the allocation of ~~2-1~~ unallocated role following initial calculation. The ~~two~~ ***one*** unallocated roles arises due to the need to round up or down to achieve whole numbers for posts and ~~to only 1 independent member taking up the seat offered.~~ ***Previously there was an additional unallocated role as only 1 independent member had taken up the seat offered. However, following a recent request, both Independent Members are now allocated seats.*** The allocations proposed ensure that all committees have a full membership.

Appendix 1

Committees, Sub-Committees, Boards and Joint Committees	No. Seats	Labour	Green	Conservative	Brighton & Hove Independents	Independent
Audit, Standards &	8	5	1	1		1

General Purposes						
Licensing*	15	12 11 10	2 3	1		1
Planning	10	7	1	1	1	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	10	8	1	1		
Overview & Scrutiny People	10	7	2	1		
Overview & Scrutiny Place	10	7	1	1	1	
Total	63	46 45 44	8 9	6	2	1 2

Paragraph 3.8 - 3.9 and Appendix 1 to read as follows:

- 3.8 The proposed allocation of places on each of the committees as detailed above and in Appendix 1 to the report takes into account the principles referred to in paragraph 3.5 in that:
- The Labour Group's overall allocation equals 44 seats,
 - The Green Group's overall allocation equals 9 seats,
 - The Conservative Group's overall allocation equals 6 seats,
 - The Brighton & Hove Independent Group's allocation equals 2 seats and
 - That in having regard to the convention that the Council has abided to whenever there has been an Independent Member, 1 seat is offered to each of the Independent Members.
- 3.9 The allocations set out at paragraph 3.8 above provides the Green Group, Conservative Group and Brighton & Hove Independent Group with allocations in accordance with their politically proportionate calculations and provides the Labour Group with 1 seat above their initial allocation. This outcome accords as closely as possible with political proportionality for the allocation of 1 unallocated role following initial calculation. The one unallocated roles arises due to the need to round up or down to achieve whole numbers for posts. Previously there was an additional unallocated role as only 1 independent member had taken up the seat offered. However, following a recent request, both Independent Members are now allocated seats. The allocations proposed ensure that all committees have a full membership.

Committees, Sub-Committees, Boards and Joint Committees	No. Seats	Labour	Green	Conservative	Brighton & Hove Independents	Independent
Audit, Standards & General Purposes	8	5	1	1		1
Licensing*	15	11 10	2 3	1		1
Planning	10	7	1	1	1	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	10	8	1	1		
Overview & Scrutiny People	10	7	2	1		
Overview & Scrutiny Place	10	7	2	1	1	
Total	63	46 44	8 9	6	2	2

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

Agenda Item 47

Subject: Review of Political Balance October 2024

Date of meeting: 24 October 2024

Ward(s) affected: All

Proposed by: Cllr Davis

Seconded by: Cllr Hill

Green Group Amendment

That the relevant changes are made to the recommendations as shown below in ~~strikethrough~~ and ***bold italics***:

2.1 That the Council appoints/re-appoints its committees with the sizes and allocation of seats between political groups as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, **as amended below.**

Committees, Sub-Committees, Boards and Joint Committees	No. Seats	Labour	Green	Conservative	Brighton & Hove Independents	Independent
Audit, Standards & General Purposes	8	5	1	1		1
Licensing*	15	12 <i>11 12</i>	2 <i>3 2</i>	1		
Planning	10	7	1	1	1	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	10	8	1	1		
Overview & Scrutiny People	10	7	2	1		
Overview & Scrutiny Place	10	7 <i>6</i>	1 <i>2</i>	1	1	
Total	63	46 <i>45</i>	8 <i>9</i>	6	2	1

Appendix 1 to read as follows if carried:

Committees, Sub-Committees, Boards and Joint Committees	No. Seats	Labour	Green	Conservative	Brighton & Hove Independents	Independent
Audit, Standards & General Purposes	8	5	1	1		1
Licensing*	15	12	2	1		
Planning	10	7	1	1	1	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	10	8	1	1		
Overview & Scrutiny People	10	7	2	1		
Overview & Scrutiny Place	10	7 6	1 2	1	1	
Total	63	46 45	8 9	6	2	1

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

Agenda Item 50

Subject: Restricting unethical and carbon intensive advertising

Date of meeting: 24 October 2024

Proposer: Councillor Evans

Seconder: Councillor Sheard

Ward(s) affected: All

Notice of Motion

Labour Group Amendment

That deletions are made as shown with ~~striketrough~~ below and additional recommendations are added as shown in ***bold italics*** below:

This Council notes:

- 1) Brighton & Hove currently restricts the advertising of High Fat, Sugar, and Salt (HFSS) products on all council owned and managed advertising spaces across the city.
- 2) Some companies are getting around this such as by advertising other non-HFSS junk food, particularly sugar free sodas.
- 3) Our support for cities such as Sheffield that have adopted wider bans on their advertising. This includes carbon intensive products such as airlines, airports, fossil fuel powered cars and fossil fuel companies as well as HFSS and gambling advert bans.
- 4) The importance of prioritising climate action and the health and wellbeing of people within the city over financial profits of advertisers.
- 5) The need to limit wherever possible exposure to advertising for gambling, betting and cryptocurrency linked trading platforms.
- 6) An increase in advertising preying on the financially vulnerable as a result of the cost-of-living crises.
- 7) The Council can only directly influence advertising on Council properties and that national legislation change is needed to influence other advertising spaces in a local authority area.

Therefore, resolves to:

- 1) ***Request Officers prepare a report to consider how the Council can implement an ethical advertising policy, to include estimates of potential loss of income streams.***
- 2) ***Request the report be presented to the Place Overview & Scrutiny for their consideration and any recommendations.***

~~1) Request that Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee considers creating a Task & Finish group to define an ethical advertising policy to recommend for adoption by Cabinet.~~

~~2) Request that the CEO of BHCC writes to the Prime Minister to request action on national policy on ethical advertising in line with our position. In addition, to ask for changes to planning laws to allow local councils to have planning powers over new advertising sites.~~

Recommendations to read if carried:

This Council notes:

- 1) Brighton & Hove currently restricts the advertising of High Fat, Sugar, and Salt (HFSS) products on all council owned and managed advertising spaces across the city.
- 2) Some companies are getting around this such as by advertising other non-HFSS junk food, particularly sugar free sodas.
- 3) Our support for cities such as Sheffield that have adopted wider bans on their advertising. This includes carbon intensive products such as airlines, airports, fossil fuel powered cars and fossil fuel companies as well as HFSS and gambling advert bans.
- 4) The importance of prioritising climate action and the health and wellbeing of people within the city over financial profits of advertisers.
- 5) The need to limit wherever possible exposure to advertising for gambling, betting and cryptocurrency linked trading platforms.
- 6) An increase in advertising preying on the financially vulnerable as a result of the cost-of-living crises.
- 7) The Council can only directly influence advertising on Council properties and that national legislation change is needed to influence other advertising spaces in a local authority area.

Therefore, resolves to:

- 1) Request Officers prepare a report to consider how the Council can implement an ethical advertising policy, to include estimates of potential loss of income streams.
- 2) Request the report be presented to the Place Overview & Scrutiny for their consideration and any recommendations.