

# CABINET ADDENDUM ONE

**2.00PM, THURSDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2026**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website [www.brighton-hove.gov.uk](http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk). Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

# ADDENDUM

<b>ITEM</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>121</b>	<b>PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT</b>	<b>3 - 4</b>
<b>122</b>	<b>ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>5 - 8</b>
<b>124</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS FROM OPPOSITION MEMBERS</b>	

Representation from Cllr Shanks on Item 127 Targeted Budget Management (TBM) 2025/26 Month 9 (December).

Representation from Cllr Hill on Item 127 Targeted Budget Management (TBM) 2025/26 Month 9 (December).

# Brighton & Hove City Council

**Cabinet**

**Agenda Item 121(b)**

**Subject: Public Questions**

**Date of meeting: 12 February 2026**

A period of not more than thirty minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public.

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

**(1) A259 (King's Road) Seafront Highway Structures ('Arches') Phases 4& 5– Mark Strong**

"Item 129 sets out plans for major works on the A259 Kings Road Arches. While I fully support the intentions of this work, there are concerns about impact on users during construction, especially on Active Travel. Previous phases (listed in para 3.12) had significant effects on people walking, wheeling and cycling for long periods, especially during works at the Shelter Hall.

I note that the stakeholder list does not include representatives of any user groups including those representing Disabled People. In addition, the EqIA does not address the period of the works but just the outcome.

Can the Cabinet give an assurance that a much more inclusive approach will be taken during the works (using experience of other projects in the city) and that the stakeholders will expressly include Active Travel and Disability Groups. In addition, could there be a place for a stakeholder rep on the Project Board?"



# Brighton & Hove City Council

## Cabinet

## Agenda Item 122(a)

**Subject: Member Questions**

**Date of meeting: 12 February 2026**

A maximum period of fifteen minutes in total shall be made available at each meeting of the Executive for questions from Members of the Council. The questions included on the list of questions referred to above shall be taken as read at the Cabinet meeting. The question will be answered either orally or at the discretion of the Chair by a written answer circulated after the meeting. Officers may assist the Leader or a Cabinet Member with technical answers to questions. No supplementary questions shall be permitted.

The following written questions have been received from Members:

**(1) Councillor Hill- Adult Social Care Improvement Plan**

Does the administration accept that a 2016 Adult Social Care restructuring process was a key contributor to the lack of capacity to assess care packages in 2024 which meant only 29% of people's care packages were assessed that year? The 2016 proposals cut non-registered assessors and my understanding is the aim now is to reach a 55% assessment rate.

**(2) Councillor Hill- Adult Social Care Improvement Plan**

How does the proposed closure of Wellington House fit with this plan? My residents have told me this will have a devastating impact on the city's most vulnerable adults with learning disabilities and their families.

**(3) Councillor Lademacher - Brighton & Hove Outdoor Events Strategy**

Residents living in the Valley Gardens and St Peter's Church area have expressed the significant impact that the low-level background noise at late night events has on their quality of life. Will the administration commit to reviewing alternatives to the current low-level background noise, including a fixed cut off time after which no background music can be played?

**(4) Councillor Shanks- Brighton & Hove Outdoor Events Strategy**

Residents suggested a levy for their communities from outdoor events. Is this part of the strategy and how will it be run?

**(5) Councillor Shanks- Targeted Budget Management (TBM) 2025/26 Month 9 (December)**

The council has recently received government money for Youth Hubs but it is using this to prop up existing youth services and family hubs. Is this legal?

**(6) Councillor Shanks- Targeted Budget Management (TBM) 2025/26 Month 9 (December)**

Will the administration ensure us that the ring-fenced grant for Public Health is being used correctly as it is being used to prop up existing services which it didn't previously fund

**(7) Councillor Shanks- Targeted Budget Management (TBM) 2025/26 Month 9 (December)**

What other options for the Arches were explored e.g. finding private money and not restoring to the original design?

**(8) Councillor West- Transport Capital and Maintenance Programme 2026-27**

The new cycle lanes alongside Preston Park are very bumpy. They are uncomfortable and tiring for cyclists to use. When challenged with a request that the installation contractor improve them, Councillor Muten declared them good enough. They are far from good enough, they are a huge disappointment and discouragement to frequent use. They fail to meet the high standards of surfacing cyclists in the city expect, need and deserve. Cycling is a healthy, low carbon form of transport, which also helps reduce traffic congestion and air pollution - all matters the Council seeks to champion. In order to better support uptake and the safety of cycling, can councillor Muten assure us, please, that when future cycle lanes are laid, as part of the transport programme, that they will all be machine laid, and not laid like these, on the cheap, by hand?

**(9) Councillor West- Brighton & Hove Outdoor Events Strategy**

Worryingly, the report refers variously to the proposed strategy applying to the period 2026-36 but also 2025-35. Appendix 1 is neither included nor linked so it isn't possible to see the strategy when composing this question. However, from the table of priorities it seems clear that parks and open spaces are viewed as a commercial opportunity and the impact of events upon the primary purpose of parks - their quiet enjoyment by park users - is not seen as a concern. Parks are vital open spaces that support health and wellbeing, and are especially important for many residents without access to private outdoor space. Loss of space to events, noise and disturbance, all impact negatively upon this benefit. We need policies for parks, set with their local communities, that protect their primary purposes and place acceptable limits on use for events. Why does this consideration not feature in this strategy?

**(10) Councillor Goldsmith- A259 (King's Road) Seafront Highway Structures (Arches) Phases 4 & 5**

I'm pleased to see these necessary works going ahead, but businesses using these arches are understandably concerned about their future. Some of the businesses have been in place for many years – can the council

confirm that as well as a fair compensation deal, all businesses will be given priority for either a return to their original location or, where appropriate, an alternative location to allow them to continue trading?

**(11) Councillor Goldsmith- Response to notice of motion from October Council**

The motion passed at Full Council included an explicit reference to a document that defines 'Involved Companies' as “companies which aid or assist in the commission of Israel’s serious breaches of peremptory norms of international law, which may foreseeably assist in the commission of genocide and violations of the Geneva Conventions”, yet this report uses an alternative definition, going against the requests of the Council's supreme decision-making body. Will Cabinet ensure that a new report is created as soon as possible, using the correct definition, ensuring the requests made by Full Council are properly implemented, as constitutionally required?

**(12) Councillor De Olivera- Adult Social Care Improvement Plan**

Given the Care Quality Commission “Requires Improvement” outcome and a Section 50 notice triggered by a score of 1 for “Assessing Needs” (waiting times, “waiting well”, and annual reviews), what guaranteed capacity and resources (staffing numbers, budget, and caseload controls) are being committed to deliver this plan—especially while vacancy/recruitment controls are explicitly listed as a risk—so that improvements are sustained rather than short-term?

**(13) Councillor De Olivera- Adult Social Care Improvement Plan**

The report says there are “no direct financial implications”, yet it also says changes must be delivered within the available budget and will inform the medium-term financial strategy. What is the net cost/saving assumption behind each major action (digital tools pilots, dedicated review team, reablement expansion, prevention work), and what is the risk if savings are assumed but don’t materialise?

