

# **COUNCIL ADDENDUM 1**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 26 MARCH 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>98</b>	<b>TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.</b>	<b>3 - 6</b>
<b>100</b>	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</b>	<b>7 - 12</b>
<b>101</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</b>	<b>13 - 16</b>
<b>102</b>	<b>PETITIONS FOR DEBATE</b>	<b>17 - 20</b>

# Brighton & Hove City Council

## Council

## Agenda Item 98

**Subject:** Petitions

**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2026

**Report of:** Director of Governance & Law

**Contact Officer:** Name: Anthony Soyinka  
Tel: 01273 291006  
Email: [anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** All

### 1. Purpose of the report and policy context

1.1 To receive any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

### 2. Recommendations

2.1 That Council notes the petition(s).

### 3. Context and background information

3.1 To receive the following petition:

#### [Safer crossings on Hollingbury Road](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to improve road safety and crossings on Hollingbury Road: We propose putting in a central Island at the Hollingbury Road/ Hollingbury Crescent T junction to divide the road. As well as a zebra crossing outside No 80. Plus, reinstating flattened speed bumps between the Fiveways junction and the turning into Hollingbury Crescent.

The T junction that links Hollingbury Road to Hollingbury Crescent is very wide with cars coming from multiple directions (To cross you need to look in all these different directions -towards Fiveway's, South down Hollingbury road, East down Hollingubry Crescent and Stanmer Park Road). Lots of school children must cross this road in the morning/afternoon which is very busy and often children must wait in the middle of the road between cars, as cars can come from so many directions by the time you get half way the traffic has changed on the other side. Plus, drivers often, either leave their indicator on after leaving Fiveways and are not turning or they forget to indicate and turn last minute creating further confusion. Often cars are speeding off the Fiveways junction using either Hollingbury Road or Hollingbury Crescent as a cut through to Lewes Road. So the speed bumps need reinstating between the Fiveways junction and the turning into Hollingbury Crescent to slow traffic down and discourage cutting through. The current markers for a crossing outside No 80 are also insufficient and

barely visible, with a upwards slope on both sides to enter the road, meaning smaller people are harder to see especially when cars are parked.

A zebra crossing would make crossing at this point safer (and much clearer as a crossing) which is also used by lots of children going to and from school. I have seen on multiple times one car stopping from one direction but not from the other increasing the risk that a child will walk out not realising the other car hasn't stopped. Both Crossings I've mentioned are a through route for children going to Varndean school, Varndean college and Dorothy Stringer school as well as from the other way to Downs infants/ junior school. The combination of a high volume of school children needed to use these routes combined with the dangerous crossing points, heavy traffic and people speeding is a disaster waiting to happen.

3.2 To receive the following petition:

[Saunders park view parking](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to change the hours of the parking permits along Saunders park view. People that live on the preston barrack site including the new houses on saunders park view, now park along Saunders park view between the current parking restrictions and in the evening and weekends. The preston barracks site is suppose to be a car free development. This has effected the residents that lived here before the development was built. There is very limited parking along Saunders park view which has now been made worse by all the new houses and flats being moved into. It will only get even worse when the newest blocks of flats along the end is opened. The problem has been ongoing and gets even worse at weekends and evenings when you don't need a permit. Parking on double yellows, and in the turning circle has become regular especially at night. If there is no parking along Saunders park view we then have to park the other side of Lewes Road.

Extend the current hours to 24 hours a day 7 days a aweek. Or make them 12 hrs a day including weekends.

The other end of Saunders park view has different restrictions? Why are we included in zone U which is the other side of Lewes road?

3.3 To receive the following petition:

[Annual charging for Watercraft owner Saltdean Beach](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to Abolish the proposed annual charging of £110 from 1st April 2026 to 31st March 2027.

Brighton & Hove council intend to start charging £110 from 1st April 2026 to 31st March 2027 to store any watercraft on Saltdean beach. This is a new introduction having not been in operation for the previous years. This has been a great asset to the local community allowing everyone to take to the water for exercise, relaxation and enjoyment.

No security or service is provided apart from a metal wire to chain watercraft to. The council made no effort to reinforce the policy stated before of removal of any watercraft left after September 2025 deadline as possibly this would have taken up too much time/money so have now installed this fee charging alternative.

Please sign the petition if you feel strongly about this and that this service should be available to all regardless if you can afford it or not.



# Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

## Agenda Item 100

**Subject:** Written questions from members of the public

**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2026

A period of not more than thirty minutes shall be allowed for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority at each ordinary meeting of the Council.

Every question shall be put and answered without discussion, but the person to whom a question has been put may decline to answer. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion.

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

**1. Robert Brown asked:**

This current administration promised “Reliable rubbish collection.” where they “will review where communal rubbish bins are placed and consult with residents and business owners on where they could be better sited.” – this is not the case in Kemptown Ward.

Residents frequently have to deal with overflowing bins, a lack of regular collections and a ‘who knows when’ approach to reporting overflowed bins waiting for them to be emptied and not once have we been consulted on where bins should be placed. Instead, Kemptown Ward have had many bins taken away and not replaced.

There also continues to be no KPIs with which to monitor performance. Will this administration confirm when they will:

- a) consult local businesses and residents on where they feel communal bins should be located;
- b) renegotiate contracts for refuse collections and share what the KPIs are to ensure transparency.

**Reply from Councillor Rowkins, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Net Zero & Environmental Services.**

**2. Daniel Harris asked:**

Bartholomew House — a 32,000 sq ft council building in the Lanes used for housing and homelessness frontline services — is being marketed on a 250 year peppercorn lease for around £5m. The listing allows future residential, hotel or institutional use, despite the city’s severe housing pressures. Recent patterns in Brighton show former council or office buildings being acquired cheaply, then later converted into high yield short let or residential units. With

# Brighton & Hove City Council

long leases, flexible use classes and opaque bidder information, the risk is that another public asset becomes a private revenue scheme rather than housing or community space. Residents deserve clarity on who is bidding and what due diligence has been done.

Before any sale proceeds, will the council publish the full due diligence assessment and beneficial ownership of all bidders for Bartholomew House, and explain how a £5m peppercorn rent lease aligns with the city's housing and social value obligations?

**Reply from Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and City Regeneration.**

**3. Helen Dawson asked:**

Avenue Bridge Club is looking for a permanent base in Hove. Our activities fit exactly with the Council's objectives for the King Alfred re-development area. Is it possible for the club to lease dedicated space within the new building and how could this happen?

We have been based in Hove for over 50 years, largely in Third Avenue premises which were sold in 2022. We are now a registered charity, with 180+ members and open to anybody who has an interest in bridge. We cater for all levels of expertise and run playing sessions and a comprehensive teaching programme.

**Reply from Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries.**

**4. Mike Goodrich asked:**

The only public toilets between the volks railway station by the marina and the pier volks station are located within the children's Peter Pan playground. Those toilets are not set up for adult use. The promenade is heavily used day and night and the lack of toilets has led to fouling on the beach. What are the council's plans to change this?

**Reply from Councillor Rowkins, Cabinet Member – Net Zero & Environmental Services.**

**5. David Gibson/Sarah Gorton (tbc) asked:**

The Right to Buy (RTB) was created under the Thatcher government and continued under Blair, and now under Starmer. Under the RTB, billions of pounds of public housing assets were privatised and 1.8 million social council homes lost on England alone between 1980 and 2015 (estimated loss from discounts was £12.7 billion between 1998 and 2015!) - see Alan Murie) This is a tragic waste of public assets. Thankfully the RTB has been abolished in Scotland and Wales. In Brighton and Hove over 3,000 homes have been sold. Now that the discounts have been reduced, the RTB will slow down in England, but there is nothing to stop the next government putting discounts back up. So will the council write a public letter to the Westminster

# Brighton & Hove City Council

government urging that they follow Scotland and Wales and legislate to abolish the Right to Buy?

**Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.**

**6. Sheila Rimmer asked:**

The councils reserves have been run down so much and the number of homeless households in temporary accommodation has risen costing an estimated £5 million this year alone. All this has led to pleas to government to bail the council out to rebuild reserves and pay for homeless overspends.

Given that government says that austerity is over, please can you explain which of the following factors and council decisions have contributed to the deterioration in council finances?

Excessive cuts to council staff leaving insufficient capacity to deliver council services damaging income collection.

Reduced council housing allocations to homeless households in temporary and emergency accommodation contributing to soaring numbers and costs.

Falling HRA rent collection rates currently costing around £1.5 million a year.

Selling off too many council assets, “family silver” which previously provided a steady income for the council coffers.

**Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.**

**7. Diane Montgomery asked:**

I met a young couple who in good faith bought a share of a one-bedroom home in Lewes Road Brighton. They diligently saved the £6000 deposit, along with help from family. Their service charge rocketed from £130 to £450 per month in three years. Both have average income jobs and have since had a child and need a larger home. They can't sell as who wants to buy a part of a property with an ever-growing service charge, pay rent and a mortgage on top. They are under stress due to the increase, being trapped in a property that no longer meets their needs. This is not what they were promised.

Given the council agrees that shared ownership is not an affordable housing offer, and doesn't reduce housing waiting lists, will you publicise the risks, so others do not become trapped like this couple?

**Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.**

**8. Alison Woolfenden asked:**

The Council's new Constitution requires public questions be submitted two days before agenda and reports are published. Effectively, residents are expected to ask questions about decisions and reports they've not seen. That doesn't enable scrutiny; it turns public participation into guesswork. It risks excluding residents —those who want to read reports, understand proposals, or who aren't familiar with council procedures. A system that only works for insiders isn't an inclusive one.

# Brighton & Hove City Council

Until recently, residents could submit questions 48 hours after the agenda was published—I did so myself last year. The Council has already acknowledged that this rule is flawed for Scrutiny Committees and has corrected it.

If the rule is recognised as flawed elsewhere, why is Full Council—the city’s highest decision-making body—still operating under it, and will you commit tonight to restoring the 48-hour post-publication deadline and confirming when the Constitution will be amended?

**Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council.**

**9. Lyn ora Knott asked:**

Recent figures show that under the current administration the number of homeless households in temporary and emergency accommodation has increased by over 250. Life in private temporary and emergency homeless accommodation is insecure and unhealthy. It is very costly. Recent estimates of cost to the council are around £5m and have caused the council to ask government for bailout loans. As a critical friend the Living Rent Campaign welcomes that the council is looking to increase the allocations for homeless households and is continuing with and expanding the previous approach buying of blocks for temporary homeless accommodation. No stone should be left unturned which is why we ask the council to further alleviate this crisis by designating a greater percentage of home purchase purchases as temporary accommodation (which also saves money) until the number of households in temporary accommodation have fallen back to the levels inherited in 2023 (1715 households)

**Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.**

**10. David Gibson asked:**

When asked about the need for step change increases in social housing grant, the Housing lead, Gill Williams stated that the £39 billion housing investment from over 10 years was exactly what we are wanting. Sadly if she looks at the detail, it isn't. The £39 billion spread over 10 years fund is not solely for more council homes and only provides for a maximum of 18,000 social homes a year. Yet since the Right to Buy around 45,000 council homes have been sold on average each year in England. To make an impact we need 90,000 additional homes a year. This could be actually achieved if the money already earmarked for social housing was brought forward to years 27/28-28/29. I know you agree with the need to urgently increase social housing to tackle the housing crisis. Will you raise this with government so they can make a real difference?

**Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.**

**11. Ian Needham asked:**

## **Brighton & Hove City Council**

Key worker housing is clearly needed, given that private rents in Brighton and Hove are comparable to those in London (and given that government in England is still refusing to bring in rent controls). The Living Rent campaign argues that key worker housing must be truly affordable and swallow no more than a third of income after tax. Given that typical incomes for key workers would be approximately:-

Nurse 35 K, Teacher 40K refuse collector 28K, and a care worker earns around 25K. Do you agree that rents for these key workers should be set at levels less than the Local Housing Allowance?

**Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.**



**Subject: Deputations from members of the public.**

**Date of meeting: 26 March 2026**

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 spokesperson for the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification that three deputations have been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

**1. Community Campaign for the Brighton General Hospital Site**

Supported by:

Clare Jones (Sussex Defend the NHS)  
Charles Harrison (Brighton & Hove Housing Coalition)  
Diane Montgomery (Living Rent Campaign)  
Sarah McCarthy (Hanover & Elm Grove Communities Forum)  
Jerome Cox-Strong (Pankhurst Pantry)  
Dinah Clark (Hanover Action)  
Nick Wells (Brighton & Hove Citizens)  
Luke Walker (Community Campaign for the Brighton General Hospital site)

Summary of Deputation:

Our campaign is endorsed by the following groups listed in Appendix 1

We are a non-party political campaign and welcome much of the motion for today's meeting (which we, along with Citizens, would have preferred to be proposed as a joint cross-party motion). We see the motion as a positive step forward but believe it should go further and be more specific in several important places. Our main campaign goals for the hospital site development are that the site are listed in Appendix 2:

When our group highlighted these goals in our deputation on 10th July 2025 to the council meeting, we welcomed assurance at that meeting that the council are already working on these goals and particularly that they are keen to acquire the site for social and key worker housing, and for community benefit more widely. We were also pleased that the council response pointed out that 'we the people own the NHS and its Trusts and that our government

# Brighton & Hove City Council

should and can block the private sale to developers of NHS land and insist on its transfer back to the council.'

So, we ask that the motion put proposed by Labour councillors is strengthened to include some specific assurances from the council, namely that the council will:

- 1) Urge the city's MPs that belong to the government to use their influence to prevent the private sale of any part of the site and to ensure that the trust be compelled to offer sale of the site (except the area earmarked for the health hub) to the council at a price that allows for its development for public benefit (primarily housing and community facilities).
- 2) Work on the creation of a genuinely inclusive people's plan for the site as a priority, jointly with the Community Campaign for the Brighton General Hospital Site, following a process agreed with us, and noting that this is a broad-based community group.
- 3) Insist that any housing identified as for 'key workers' should be truly affordable and in line with the excellent planning guidance (PAN) proposed to cabinet (19th March), which states that affordable housing should be social affordable rented provision (not shared ownership since the council rightly states that 'affordable home ownership products are generally provided at costs which are out of reach for most households in need'\*). We believe that any 'key worker' rents must also meet this affordability standard and should not exceed the Local Housing Allowance ceiling.
- 4) Undertake a Health Impact Assessment to evaluate and to quantify the social value outcomes that are achievable through the site's development for social housing and affordable housing and community facilities as compared with a private housing development. And within this process, to ensure the NHS Trust is fulfilling its duties to reduce health inequalities in the City.

Please in your response state clearly which of these asks you will agree to.  
Thank you

\* p.5 Planning Advice Note 'Affordable Housing'

## Supporting Information

### **Appendix 1- Supporting organisations of the community campaign for the Brighton General Hospital site**

Brighton & Hove Housing Coalition, Hanover & Elm Grove Communities Forum, Sussex Defend the NHS, Hanover Action, Living Rent Campaign, Friends of William Clarke Park, Who Owns Brighton, Brighton & Hove Citizens, Albion Life, Brighton & Hove Community Land Trust (BCLT), B&H Older People's Council, Hanover Community Association

# Brighton & Hove City Council

## **Appendix 2 – Campaign goals**

1. Be held/remain in public/community ownership
2. Prioritise much-needed social housing and genuinely affordable housing (500+ homes)
3. Achieve a health hub and community health facilities (possibly including step-down beds)
4. Deliver new spaces and facilities for the local community, developed with healthy planning principles
5. Be developed around the fullest engagement with residents and stakeholders, on a 'people's plan' guided by these principles
6. Maximise sustainability and biodiversity.

## **2. Urgent Concerns Regarding the Effect of Southdown/UOK Service Redesign on The Wellbeing Hub At Preston Park.**

### Supported by:

1. Patrick Ward
2. Cheryl Collins
3. Alison Reeves
4. Sophie Harris
5. Paula Brookes
6. Zorenah Chapman
7. Julia Helen Marshall
8. Maria Loughram

### Summary of Deputation:

This deputation is submitted by residents and service users of the Wellbeing Hub. Redesign of mental health services under Southdown/UOK to the NHS Neighbourhood Mental Health Team (NMHT) model creates a catastrophic cliff edge for current service users of the Wellbeing Hub, a preventative service for crisis services.

The service is planned to be reduced from 5 days a week of structured, staff-led support to a few hours of unstructured, limited, open-access time with the risk of 400 vulnerable clients with moderate to severe mental health challenges and multiple protected characteristics losing their safety net and connection with their peers.

**False Economy:** The impact will increase pressure and cost on NHS crisis services due to severe decline of mental and physical health of clients. Cutting preventative support does not save money - it shifts the financial

## Brighton & Hove City Council

burden, leading to higher demand for emergency services and significant strain on adult social care budgets. The redesign has already caused deterioration in clients.

**Failure of Duty of Care:** There is currently no robust transition plan or risk assessment to find alternative equivalent support and essential continued connection with their peers. Removing a lifeline without a replacement is a failure of our city's duty to some of its most vulnerable citizens.

**Lack of Transparency:** To date, there has been no comprehensive, transparent Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) or meaningful public consultation regarding the cumulative impact of these cuts. Nor has there been a fully co-created NMHT design at the earliest stages of development with regard to the benefits the Wellbeing Hub provides to clients.

We therefore urge the council to:

1. Challenge the ICB and Southdown/UOK by formally questioning the long-term cost implications for the city's statutory services by cutting the Wellbeing Hub service.
2. Start an inquiry into how Southdown/UOK implemented a redesign that included neither a needs assessment, impact assessment or comprehensive transition plan.
3. Support an immediate stay by pausing all service changes until a full, transparent public consultation and impact assessment are completed. Otherwise the council risks a financial burden, funding a mental health service that is not fit for purpose and risks people's lives.

# Brighton & Hove City Council

**Council**

**Agenda Item 102(a)**

**Subject:** Petition for Debate

**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2026

**Report of:** Director of Governance & Law

**Contact Officer:** Name: Anthony Soyinka  
Tel: 01273 291006  
Email: [anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** All

## FOR GENERAL RELEASE

### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 Under the Council's Petition Scheme if a petition contains more than 1,250 signatures and is not petition requesting officer evidence, it will be debated by the Full Council.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the petition is noted.

### 3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION / CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 To receive the following petition:

#### **Save Wellington House Learning Disability Day Centre in Brighton & Hove**

We, the undersigned, call on Brighton & Hove City Council to immediately withdraw the proposal to close Wellington House Day Options. This is the last remaining council run Day Centre for Adults with Learning disabilities and Complex needs in Brighton & Hove.

We urge the Council to protect this essential, specialist service for adults with complex learning disabilities and ensure that the city's most vulnerable community members are not forced to pay the price for budget cuts.

Wellington House is not just a building—it is a lifeline.

Why this closure is a disaster for our city:

Expertise That Can't Be Replaced: Wellington House supports adults with high-level, complex needs and challenging behaviour. The staff are specialists

# Brighton & Hove City Council

in de-escalation and safety. Independent providers are often unable or unwilling to take on this level of care.

Preventing Family Breakdown: For parents and sibling carers, Wellington House provides the only reliable respite in their week. Without it, many families will reach a breaking point, leading to the collapse of home care arrangements.

A False Economy: Closing this centre to save money today will cost the taxpayer more tomorrow. When these placements fail, the Council will be forced to fund expensive, emergency out-of-area residential care.

The proposals to close the centre are due to be discussed at the cabinet meeting on 12th February and then voted on at the budget meeting on 26th February, but there has been no publicity about the proposal nor opportunity for impacted families or local residents to have their say. We need to show the Council that the people of Brighton & Hove value dignity and safety over short-term savings.

## **4. PROCEDURE:**

4.1 The petition will be debated at the Council meeting in accordance with the agreed protocol:

- (i) The Lead petitioner will be invited by the Mayor to present the petition and will have up to 3 minutes in which to outline the petition and confirm the number of signatures;
- (ii) The Mayor will then open the matter up for debate by councillors for period of 15 minutes and will first call on the relevant Cabinet Member to respond to the petition and move a proposed response. The Mayor will then call on those councillors who have indicated a desire to speak in the matter, before calling on the relevant Cabinet Member to respond to the debate;
- (iii) An amendment to the recommendation in paragraph 2.1 of the report or to add additional recommendations should be submitted by 10.00am on the day before the meeting; otherwise it will be subject to the Mayor's discretion as to being appropriate. Any such amendment will need to be formally moved and seconded at the meeting;
- (iv) After the 15 minutes set aside for the debate, the Mayor will then formally put:
- (v) (a) Any amendments in the order in which they are moved, and  
(b) The substantive recommendation(s) as amended (if amended).

# Brighton & Hove City Council

**Council**

**Agenda Item 102(b)**

**Subject:** Petition for Debate

**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2026

**Report of:** Director of Governance & Law

**Contact Officer:** Name: Anthony Soyinka  
Tel: 01273 291006  
Email: [anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** All

## FOR GENERAL RELEASE

### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 Under the Council's Petition Scheme if a petition contains more than 1,250 signatures and is not petition requesting officer evidence, it will be debated by the Full Council.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the petition is noted.

### 3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION / CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 To receive the following petition:

#### **Petition to Save Our Service, SOS, the Wellbeing Hub**

We, the undersigned, oppose the proposed cuts to the Wellbeing Hub at Preston Park — a vital mental health service that many people rely on to stay well and out of crisis.

The current plans will reduce the Hub from five days a week of structured support and activities to just six hours a week, with no group programme. For people with moderate to severe mental health challenges, this is not a minor change — it is the loss of a lifeline.

Run by the not-for-profit Southdown under UOK Brighton & Hove, the Wellbeing Hub provides consistent therapeutic support, community, and stability. While wider Sussex mental health services are being redesigned due to budget pressures, these cuts disproportionately and severely impact existing Hub clients. Proposed satellite services across Sussex cannot replace the depth of support or sense of safety the Hub provides.

# Brighton & Hove City Council

There is no meaningful transition plan for current clients. Many report feeling devastated and unsafe, and fear their mental health will deteriorate — increasing reliance on already overstretched crisis services.

We call on Southdown, UOK Brighton & Hove, Brighton & Hove City Council, and NHS Sussex to:

- Reject the current proposals to drastically reduce the Wellbeing Hub's services
- Fund safe and gradual transitions for existing clients
- Fully consult staff, clients, and people with lived experience for a genuinely co-produced approach
- Monitor and publish the impact on client wellbeing and crisis services

Preventative mental health support saves lives and reduces pressure on emergency services. These cuts must be halted.

## 4. PROCEDURE:

4.1 The petition will be debated at the Council meeting in accordance with the agreed protocol:

- (i) The Lead petitioner will be invited by the Mayor to present the petition and will have up to 3 minutes in which to outline the petition and confirm the number of signatures;
- (ii) The Mayor will then open the matter up for debate by councillors for period of 15 minutes and will first call on the relevant Cabinet Member to respond to the petition and move a proposed response. The Mayor will then call on those councillors who have indicated a desire to speak in the matter, before calling on the relevant Cabinet Member to respond to the debate;
- (iii) An amendment to the recommendation in paragraph 2.1 of the report or to add additional recommendations should be submitted by 10.00am on the day before the meeting; otherwise it will be subject to the Mayor's discretion as to being appropriate. Any such amendment will need to be formally moved and seconded at the meeting;
- (iv) After the 15 minutes set aside for the debate, the Mayor will then formally put:
- (v) (a) Any amendments in the order in which they are moved, and  
(b) The substantive recommendation(s) as amended (if amended).