



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# **COUNCIL ADDENDUM 3**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 26 MARCH 2026**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

**ITEM**

**Page**

**96 MINUTES**

**5 - 88**



**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**4.30pm 26 FEBRUARY 2026**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Grimshaw (Chair), Asaduzzaman, Atkinson, Alexander, Allen, Baghoth, Cattell, Daniel, Earthey, Evans, Fishleigh, Fowler, Galvin, Gauge, Goddard, Goldsmith, Guilmant, Helliwell, Hewitt, Hill, Hogan, Lademacher, Lyons, McGregor, McLeay, McNair, Meadows, Miller, Muten, Nann, Oliveira, O'Quinn, Parrott, Pickett, Robins, Robinson, Rowkins, Sankey, Shanks, Sheard, Simon, Sykes, Taylor, C Theobald, Thomson, Wilkinson, Winder and Williams

**PART ONE**

**89 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 89.1 Councillor Alexander declared a personal and non-pecuniary interests as a Board Member for the Brighton and Hove Food Partnership. She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.2 Councillor Atkinson declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he and his wife both worked for the Sussex Partnership NHS Trust. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.3 Councillor Daniel declared a personal and prejudicial interest as she held a position of management at a community body. She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.4 Councillor De Oliveira declared a personal and prejudicial interest as his wife was employed at the Integrated Care Board. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.5 Councillor Goddard declared a personal and prejudicial interest as his wife was employed by Brighton and Hove City Council and declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was Chair of East Brighton Trust. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.5 Councillor Grimshaw declared a personal and prejudicial interest as she was a Trustee of Royal Pavilion and Museum Trust She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.

- 89.6 Councillor Helliwell declared a personal and prejudicial interest as her partner held a taxi Hackney carriage licence and declared a non-pecuniary interest as she was a Trustee of the Brighton Dome. She confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.7 Councillor Hewitt declared a personal and prejudicial interest as an employee of Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust and holds a position of control within UNISION. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.8 Councillor McGregor declared a personal and prejudicial interest as an employee of an organisation in receipt of funding from Brighton & Hove City Council. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.9 Councillor Muten declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he was an allotment holder, and his wife was a Trustee of the Hangleton and Knoll project. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.10 Councillor Nann declared a personal and prejudicial interest as his partner worked for Brighton and Hove City Council. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.11 Councillor Parrott declared a personal and prejudicial interest as she was a Governor at an NHS Trust. She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.12 Councillor Robins declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he was an allotment holder, was a Trustee at the Royal Pavilion and Museum Trust and Chair of the Fresh Start Charity an organisation in receipt of community funds. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.13 Councillor Shanks declared a personal and prejudicial interest as she was a Trustee of Brighton Youth Centre and the Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust, was an allotment holder. She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.13 Councillor Sykes declared a personal and non-pecuniary interest as he was a Board Member for the Brighton and Hove Food Partnership. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.14 Councillor Thomson declared a personal and prejudicial interest as she was an allotment holder and a Trustee of the Royal Pavillion Museums Trust. She confirmed that she had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.
- 89.14 Councillor Wilkinson declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he was an allotment holder, was employed at an Adult Social Care Provider charity and his partner was

employed by Brighton and Hove City Council. He confirmed that he had been granted dispensation to speak and vote on the item by the Monitoring Officer.

- 89.15 The Monitoring officer confirmed that dispensations had also been granted to Councillors Helliwell and Czolak, no other declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.

## **90 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.**

- 90.1 The mayor gave the following communications:

The mayor called on the Leader of the Council to move a motion to suspend the Council Procedure Rules.

Councillor Sankey moved that Council procedure rules be suspended to the extent necessary to enable today's proceedings to be conducted in accordance with the Special Budget Procedures circulated to Members and published in the addendum 2.

Councillor Taylor formally seconded the motion.

The mayor put the motion to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried unanimously.

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

## **91 GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET, CAPITAL & TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2026-27**

- 91.1 The mayor noted that the principal budget items listed as items 91 and 93 would be debated together, along with Item 92 Supplementary Financial Information, once the proposed budget and various amendments had been moved and seconded.
- 91.2 She therefore invited Councillor Taylor to propose the budget for 2026/27.
- 91.3 Councillor Taylor thanked the mayor and formally moved the budget proposals, together with the Labour Group amendment No 1 on behalf of the Administration.
- 91.4 Councillor Sankey spoke on the budget position and formally seconded the proposals.
- 91.5 Councillor Sykes spoke on the budget and formally moved the Green Group's amendments No's 1 – 4.
- 91.6 Councillor Shanks spoke on the budget position and formally seconded the proposals together with the Green Group's amendments.
- 91.7 Councillor McNair spoke on the budget and formally moved the Conservative Group's amendments No's 1 – 4.

- 91.8 Councillor Meadows spoke on the budget and formally seconded the Conservative Group’s amendment.
- 91.9 The mayor 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 budget position:
- 91.10 Councillors Williams, McLeay, Theobald, Earthey, Atkinson, Nann, De Oliveira, Lyons, Fishleigh, Muten, Pickett, Hogan, Alexander, Lademacher, Parrott, Goldsmith, Rowkins, Allen, Sheard, Fowler, Cattell, Robinson, Goddard and Robins.
- 91.11 The mayor noted that the meeting had been in session for just over two hours and declared that he would adjourn for a refreshment break from 6.32pm to 7.38pm.
- 91.12 The mayor reconvened the meeting at 7.38pm.
- 91.13 Councillor Taylor thanked the mayor and closed the debate and confirmed the amendments could not be accepted. He therefore hoped that the budget proposals would be approved and recommended it to Council.
- 91.14 The mayor stated that in view of the fact that the amendments related to the General Fund, she intended to put each one to the vote.
- 91.15 However, she would call on the Chief Finance Officer 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 and also noted that the outcome of the voting would be recorded in full.
- 91.16 The mayor then put the Conservative Group amendment 1 to the vote.

**Conservative Group amendment 1**

|   |                    | For         | Against | Abstain |    |                 | For         | Against | Abstain |
|---|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1 | <b>Alexander</b>   |             | X       |         | 28 | <b>Mackey</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2 | <b>Allen</b>       |             | X       |         | 29 | <b>McGregor</b> |             | X       |         |
| 3 | <b>Asaduzzaman</b> |             | X       |         | 30 | <b>McLeay</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 4 | <b>Atkinson</b>    |             | X       |         | 31 | <b>McNair</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 5 | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>  | X           |         |         |
| 6 | <b>Baghoth</b>     |             | X       |         | 33 | <b>Miller</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 7 | <b>Cattell</b>     |             | X       |         | 34 | <b>Muten</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 8 | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | <b>Nann</b>     |             | X       |         |
| 9 | <b>Daniel</b>      |             | X       |         | 36 | <b>O’Quinn</b>  |             | X       |         |



|    |             |             |   |  |    |              |             |    |   |
|----|-------------|-------------|---|--|----|--------------|-------------|----|---|
| 10 | Davis       | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 37 | Parrott      |             | X  |   |
| 11 | De Oliveira |             | X |  | 38 | Pickett      |             | X  |   |
| 12 | Earthey     |             | X |  | 39 | Robins       |             | X  |   |
| 13 | Evans       |             | X |  | 40 | Robinson     |             | X  |   |
| 14 | Fishleigh   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 41 | Rowkins      |             | X  |   |
| 15 | Fowler      |             | X |  | 42 | Sankey       |             | X  |   |
| 16 | Galvin      |             | X |  | 43 | Shanks       |             | X  |   |
| 17 | Gauge       |             | X |  | 44 | Sheard       |             | X  |   |
| 18 | Goddard     |             | X |  | 45 | Simon        |             | X  |   |
| 19 | Goldsmith   |             | X |  | 46 | Sykes        |             | X  |   |
| 20 | Guilmant    |             | X |  | 47 | Taylor       |             | X  |   |
| 21 | Helliwell   |             | X |  | 48 | Theobald     | X           |    |   |
| 22 | Hewitt      |             | X |  | 49 | Thomson      |             | X  |   |
| 23 | Hill        |             | X |  | 50 | West         | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | Hogan       | X           |   |  | 51 | Wilkinson    |             | X  |   |
| 25 | Lademacher  |             | X |  | 52 | Williams     |             | X  |   |
| 26 | Loughran    | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | Winder       |             | X  |   |
| 27 | Lyons       | X           |   |  | 54 | Grimshaw     |             | X  |   |
|    |             |             |   |  |    |              |             |    |   |
|    |             |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b> | 5           | 42 | 0 |

91.17 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 5 votes to 42 with 0 abstentions.

91.18 The mayor then put the Conservative Group amendment 2 to the vote.

### Conservative Group amendment 2

|   |             | For | Against | Abstain |    |          | For         | Against | Abstain |
|---|-------------|-----|---------|---------|----|----------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1 | Alexander   |     | X       |         | 28 | Mackey   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2 | Allen       |     | X       |         | 29 | McGregor |             | X       |         |
| 3 | Asaduzzaman |     | X       |         | 30 | McLeay   |             | X       |         |

|    |                    |             |   |  |    |                  |             |    |   |
|----|--------------------|-------------|---|--|----|------------------|-------------|----|---|
| 4  | <b>Atkinson</b>    |             | X |  | 31 | <b>McNair</b>    | X           |    |   |
| 5  | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>   | X           |    |   |
| 6  | <b>Baghoth</b>     |             | X |  | 33 | <b>Miller</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 7  | <b>Cattell</b>     |             | X |  | 34 | <b>Muten</b>     |             | X  |   |
| 8  | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 35 | <b>Nann</b>      |             | X  |   |
| 9  | <b>Daniel</b>      |             | X |  | 36 | <b>O'Quinn</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 10 | <b>Davis</b>       | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 37 | <b>Parrott</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 11 | <b>De Oliveira</b> |             | X |  | 38 | <b>Pickett</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 12 | <b>Earthey</b>     |             | X |  | 39 | <b>Robins</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 13 | <b>Evans</b>       |             | X |  | 40 | <b>Robinson</b>  |             | X  |   |
| 14 | <b>Fishleigh</b>   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 41 | <b>Rowkins</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 15 | <b>Fowler</b>      |             | X |  | 42 | <b>Sankey</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 16 | <b>Galvin</b>      |             | X |  | 43 | <b>Shanks</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 17 | <b>Gauge</b>       |             | X |  | 44 | <b>Sheard</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 18 | <b>Goddard</b>     |             | X |  | 45 | <b>Simon</b>     |             | X  |   |
| 19 | <b>Goldsmith</b>   |             | X |  | 46 | <b>Sykes</b>     |             | X  |   |
| 20 | <b>Guilmant</b>    |             | X |  | 47 | <b>Taylor</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 21 | <b>Helliwell</b>   |             | X |  | 48 | <b>Theobald</b>  | X           |    |   |
| 22 | <b>Hewitt</b>      |             | X |  | 49 | <b>Thomson</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 23 | <b>Hill</b>        |             | X |  | 50 | <b>West</b>      | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | <b>Hogan</b>       | X           |   |  | 51 | <b>Wilkinson</b> |             | X  |   |
| 25 | <b>Lademacher</b>  |             | X |  | 52 | <b>Williams</b>  |             | X  |   |
| 26 | <b>Loughran</b>    | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | <b>Winder</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 27 | <b>Lyons</b>       | X           |   |  | 54 | <b>Grimshaw</b>  |             | X  |   |
|    |                    |             |   |  |    |                  |             |    |   |
|    |                    |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b>     | 5           | 42 | 0 |

91.19 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 5 votes to 42 with 0 abstentions.

91.20 The mayor then put the Conservative Group amendment 3 to the vote.

## Conservative Group amendment 3

|    |             | For         | Against | Abstain |    |           | For         | Against | Abstain |
|----|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|-----------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1  | Alexander   |             | X       |         | 28 | Mackey    | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2  | Allen       |             | X       |         | 29 | McGregor  |             | X       |         |
| 3  | Asaduzzaman |             | X       |         | 30 | McLeay    |             | X       |         |
| 4  | Atkinson    |             | X       |         | 31 | McNair    | X           |         |         |
| 5  | Bagaeen     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | Meadows   | X           |         |         |
| 6  | Baghoth     |             | X       |         | 33 | Miller    |             | X       |         |
| 7  | Cattell     |             | X       |         | 34 | Muten     |             | X       |         |
| 8  | Czolak      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | Nann      |             | X       |         |
| 9  | Daniel      |             | X       |         | 36 | O'Quinn   |             | X       |         |
| 10 | Davis       | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 37 | Parrott   |             | X       |         |
| 11 | De Oliveira |             | X       |         | 38 | Pickett   |             | X       |         |
| 12 | Earthey     |             | X       |         | 39 | Robins    |             | X       |         |
| 13 | Evans       |             | X       |         | 40 | Robinson  |             | X       |         |
| 14 | Fishleigh   | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 41 | Rowkins   |             | X       |         |
| 15 | Fowler      |             | X       |         | 42 | Sankey    |             | X       |         |
| 16 | Galvin      |             | X       |         | 43 | Shanks    |             | X       |         |
| 17 | Gauge       |             | X       |         | 44 | Sheard    |             | X       |         |
| 18 | Goddard     |             | X       |         | 45 | Simon     |             | X       |         |
| 19 | Goldsmith   |             | X       |         | 46 | Sykes     |             | X       |         |
| 20 | Guilmant    |             | X       |         | 47 | Taylor    |             | X       |         |
| 21 | Helliwell   |             | X       |         | 48 | Theobald  | X           |         |         |
| 22 | Hewitt      |             | X       |         | 49 | Thomson   |             | X       |         |
| 23 | Hill        |             | X       |         | 50 | West      | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 24 | Hogan       | X           |         |         | 51 | Wilkinson |             | X       |         |
| 25 | Lademacher  |             | X       |         | 52 | Williams  |             | X       |         |
| 26 | Loughran    | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 53 | Winder    |             | X       |         |
| 27 | Lyons       | X           |         |         | 54 | Grimshaw  |             | X       |         |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |              |   |    |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|---|----|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |              |   |    |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | <b>Total</b> | 5 | 42 | 0 |

91.21 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 5 votes to 42 with 0 abstentions.

91.22 The mayor then put the Conservative Group amendment 4 to the vote.

#### Conservative Group amendment 4

|    |                    | For         | Against | Abstain |    |                 | For         | Against | Abstain |
|----|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1  | <b>Alexander</b>   |             | X       |         | 28 | <b>Mackey</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2  | <b>Allen</b>       |             | X       |         | 29 | <b>McGregor</b> |             | X       |         |
| 3  | <b>Asaduzzaman</b> |             | X       |         | 30 | <b>McLeay</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 4  | <b>Atkinson</b>    |             | X       |         | 31 | <b>McNair</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 5  | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>  | X           |         |         |
| 6  | <b>Baghoth</b>     |             | X       |         | 33 | <b>Miller</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 7  | <b>Cattell</b>     |             | X       |         | 34 | <b>Muten</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 8  | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | <b>Nann</b>     |             | X       |         |
| 9  | <b>Daniel</b>      |             | X       |         | 36 | <b>O'Quinn</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 10 | <b>Davis</b>       | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 37 | <b>Parrott</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 11 | <b>De Oliveira</b> |             | X       |         | 38 | <b>Pickett</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 12 | <b>Earthey</b>     |             | X       |         | 39 | <b>Robins</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 13 | <b>Evans</b>       |             | X       |         | 40 | <b>Robinson</b> |             | X       |         |
| 14 | <b>Fishleigh</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 41 | <b>Rowkins</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 15 | <b>Fowler</b>      |             | X       |         | 42 | <b>Sankey</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 16 | <b>Galvin</b>      |             | X       |         | 43 | <b>Shanks</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 17 | <b>Gauge</b>       |             | X       |         | 44 | <b>Sheard</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 18 | <b>Goddard</b>     |             | X       |         | 45 | <b>Simon</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 19 | <b>Goldsmith</b>   |             | X       |         | 46 | <b>Sykes</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 20 | <b>Guilmant</b>    |             | X       |         | 47 | <b>Taylor</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 21 | <b>Helliwell</b>   |             | X       |         | 48 | <b>Theobald</b> | X           |         |         |

|    |            |             |   |  |    |              |             |    |   |
|----|------------|-------------|---|--|----|--------------|-------------|----|---|
| 22 | Hewitt     |             | X |  | 49 | Thomson      |             | X  |   |
| 23 | Hill       |             | X |  | 50 | West         | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | Hogan      | X           |   |  | 51 | Wilkinson    |             | X  |   |
| 25 | Lademacher |             | X |  | 52 | Williams     |             | X  |   |
| 26 | Loughran   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | Winder       |             | X  |   |
| 27 | Lyons      | X           |   |  | 54 | Grimshaw     |             | X  |   |
|    |            |             |   |  |    |              |             |    |   |
|    |            |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b> | 5           | 42 | 0 |

91.23 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 5 votes to 42 with 0 abstentions.

91.24 The mayor then put the Green Group amendment 1 to the vote.

#### Green Group amendment 1

|    |             | For         | Against | Abstain |    |          | For         | Against | Abstain |
|----|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|----------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1  | Alexander   |             | X       |         | 28 | Mackey   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2  | Allen       |             | X       |         | 29 | McGregor |             | X       |         |
| 3  | Asaduzzaman |             | X       |         | 30 | McLeay   | x           |         |         |
| 4  | Atkinson    |             | X       |         | 31 | McNair   |             | X       |         |
| 5  | Bagaeen     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | Meadows  |             | X       |         |
| 6  | Baghoth     |             | X       |         | 33 | Miller   |             | X       |         |
| 7  | Cattell     |             | X       |         | 34 | Muten    |             | X       |         |
| 8  | Czolak      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | Nann     |             | X       |         |
| 9  | Daniel      |             | X       |         | 36 | O'Quinn  |             | X       |         |
| 10 | Davis       | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 37 | Parrott  |             | X       |         |
| 11 | De Oliveira | x           |         |         | 38 | Pickett  | x           |         |         |
| 12 | Earthey     |             |         | x       | 39 | Robins   |             | X       |         |
| 13 | Evans       |             | X       |         | 40 | Robinson |             | X       |         |
| 14 | Fishleigh   | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 41 | Rowkins  |             | X       |         |
| 15 | Fowler      |             | X       |         | 42 | Sankey   |             | X       |         |

|    |                   |             |   |  |    |                  |             |    |   |
|----|-------------------|-------------|---|--|----|------------------|-------------|----|---|
| 16 | <b>Galvin</b>     |             | X |  | 43 | <b>Shanks</b>    | x           |    |   |
| 17 | <b>Gauge</b>      |             | X |  | 44 | <b>Sheard</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 18 | <b>Goddard</b>    |             | X |  | 45 | <b>Simon</b>     |             | X  |   |
| 19 | <b>Goldsmith</b>  | x           |   |  | 46 | <b>Sykes</b>     | x           |    |   |
| 20 | <b>Guilmant</b>   |             | X |  | 47 | <b>Taylor</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 21 | <b>Helliwell</b>  |             | X |  | 48 | <b>Theobald</b>  |             | X  |   |
| 22 | <b>Hewitt</b>     |             | X |  | 49 | <b>Thomson</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 23 | <b>Hill</b>       | x           |   |  | 50 | <b>West</b>      | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | <b>Hogan</b>      |             | X |  | 51 | <b>Wilkinson</b> |             | X  |   |
| 25 | <b>Lademacher</b> | x           |   |  | 52 | <b>Williams</b>  |             | X  |   |
| 26 | <b>Loughran</b>   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | <b>Winder</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 27 | <b>Lyons</b>      |             | X |  | 54 | <b>Grimshaw</b>  |             | X  |   |
|    |                   |             |   |  |    |                  |             |    |   |
|    |                   |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b>     | 8           | 38 | 1 |

91.25 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 8 votes to 38 with 1 abstention.

91.26 The mayor then put the Green Group amendment 2 to the vote.

### Green Group amendment 2

|   |                    | For         | Against | Abstain |    |                 | For         | Against | Abstain |
|---|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1 | <b>Alexander</b>   |             | X       |         | 28 | <b>Mackey</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2 | <b>Allen</b>       |             | X       |         | 29 | <b>McGregor</b> |             | X       |         |
| 3 | <b>Asaduzzaman</b> |             | X       |         | 30 | <b>McLeay</b>   | x           |         |         |
| 4 | <b>Atkinson</b>    |             | X       |         | 31 | <b>McNair</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 5 | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 6 | <b>Baghoth</b>     |             | X       |         | 33 | <b>Miller</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 7 | <b>Cattell</b>     |             | X       |         | 34 | <b>Muten</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 8 | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | <b>Nann</b>     |             | X       |         |
| 9 | <b>Daniel</b>      |             | X       |         | 36 | <b>O'Quinn</b>  |             | X       |         |

|    |             |             |   |   |    |              |             |    |   |
|----|-------------|-------------|---|---|----|--------------|-------------|----|---|
| 10 | Davis       | NOT PRESENT |   |   | 37 | Parrott      |             | X  |   |
| 11 | De Oliveira | x           |   |   | 38 | Pickett      | x           |    |   |
| 12 | Earthey     |             |   | x | 39 | Robins       |             | X  |   |
| 13 | Evans       |             | X |   | 40 | Robinson     |             | X  |   |
| 14 | Fishleigh   | NOT PRESENT |   |   | 41 | Rowkins      |             | X  |   |
| 15 | Fowler      |             | X |   | 42 | Sankey       |             | X  |   |
| 16 | Galvin      |             | X |   | 43 | Shanks       | x           |    |   |
| 17 | Gauge       |             | X |   | 44 | Sheard       |             | X  |   |
| 18 | Goddard     |             | X |   | 45 | Simon        |             | X  |   |
| 19 | Goldsmith   | x           |   |   | 46 | Sykes        | x           |    |   |
| 20 | Guilmant    |             | X |   | 47 | Taylor       |             | X  |   |
| 21 | Helliwell   |             | X |   | 48 | Theobald     |             | X  |   |
| 22 | Hewitt      |             | X |   | 49 | Thomson      |             | X  |   |
| 23 | Hill        | x           |   |   | 50 | West         | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | Hogan       |             | X |   | 51 | Wilkinson    |             | X  |   |
| 25 | Lademacher  | x           |   |   | 52 | Williams     |             | X  |   |
| 26 | Loughran    | NOT PRESENT |   |   | 53 | Winder       |             | X  |   |
| 27 | Lyons       |             | X |   | 54 | Grimshaw     |             | X  |   |
|    |             |             |   |   |    |              |             |    |   |
|    |             |             |   |   |    | <b>Total</b> | 8           | 38 | 1 |

91.27 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 8 votes to 38 with 1 abstention.

91.28 The mayor then put the Green Group amendment 3 to the vote.

### Green Group amendment 3

|   |             | For | Against | Abstain |    |          | For         | Against | Abstain |
|---|-------------|-----|---------|---------|----|----------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1 | Alexander   |     | X       |         | 28 | Mackey   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2 | Allen       |     | X       |         | 29 | McGregor |             | X       |         |
| 3 | Asaduzzaman |     | X       |         | 30 | McLeay   | X           |         |         |

|    |                    |             |   |  |    |                  |             |    |   |
|----|--------------------|-------------|---|--|----|------------------|-------------|----|---|
| 4  | <b>Atkinson</b>    |             | X |  | 31 | <b>McNair</b>    |             |    |   |
| 5  | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>   |             |    |   |
| 6  | <b>Baghoth</b>     |             | X |  | 33 | <b>Miller</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 7  | <b>Cattell</b>     |             | X |  | 34 | <b>Muten</b>     |             | X  |   |
| 8  | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 35 | <b>Nann</b>      |             | X  |   |
| 9  | <b>Daniel</b>      |             | X |  | 36 | <b>O'Quinn</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 10 | <b>Davis</b>       | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 37 | <b>Parrott</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 11 | <b>De Oliveira</b> | X           |   |  | 38 | <b>Pickett</b>   | X           |    |   |
| 12 | <b>Earthey</b>     |             | X |  | 39 | <b>Robins</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 13 | <b>Evans</b>       |             | X |  | 40 | <b>Robinson</b>  |             | X  |   |
| 14 | <b>Fishleigh</b>   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 41 | <b>Rowkins</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 15 | <b>Fowler</b>      |             | X |  | 42 | <b>Sankey</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 16 | <b>Galvin</b>      |             | X |  | 43 | <b>Shanks</b>    | X           |    |   |
| 17 | <b>Gauge</b>       |             | X |  | 44 | <b>Sheard</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 18 | <b>Goddard</b>     |             | X |  | 45 | <b>Simon</b>     |             | X  |   |
| 19 | <b>Goldsmith</b>   | X           |   |  | 46 | <b>Sykes</b>     | X           |    |   |
| 20 | <b>Guilmant</b>    |             | X |  | 47 | <b>Taylor</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 21 | <b>Helliwell</b>   |             | X |  | 48 | <b>Theobald</b>  |             |    |   |
| 22 | <b>Hewitt</b>      |             | X |  | 49 | <b>Thomson</b>   |             | X  |   |
| 23 | <b>Hill</b>        | X           |   |  | 50 | <b>West</b>      | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | <b>Hogan</b>       |             |   |  | 51 | <b>Wilkinson</b> |             | X  |   |
| 25 | <b>Lademacher</b>  | X           |   |  | 52 | <b>Williams</b>  |             | X  |   |
| 26 | <b>Loughran</b>    | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | <b>Winder</b>    |             | X  |   |
| 27 | <b>Lyons</b>       |             |   |  | 54 | <b>Grimshaw</b>  |             | X  |   |
|    |                    |             |   |  |    |                  |             |    |   |
|    |                    |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b>     | 8           | 39 | 0 |

91.29 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 8 votes to 39 with 0 abstentions.

91.30 The mayor then put the Green Group amendment 4 to the vote.



## Green Group amendment 4

|    |                    | For         | Against | Abstain |    |                  | For         | Against | Abstain |
|----|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1  | <b>Alexander</b>   |             | X       |         | 28 | <b>Mackey</b>    | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2  | <b>Allen</b>       |             | X       |         | 29 | <b>McGregor</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 3  | <b>Asaduzzaman</b> |             | X       |         | 30 | <b>McLeay</b>    | X           |         |         |
| 4  | <b>Atkinson</b>    |             | X       |         | 31 | <b>McNair</b>    |             |         |         |
| 5  | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>   |             |         |         |
| 6  | <b>Baghoth</b>     |             | X       |         | 33 | <b>Miller</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 7  | <b>Cattell</b>     |             | X       |         | 34 | <b>Muten</b>     |             | X       |         |
| 8  | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | <b>Nann</b>      |             | X       |         |
| 9  | <b>Daniel</b>      |             | X       |         | 36 | <b>O'Quinn</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 10 | <b>Davis</b>       | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 37 | <b>Parrott</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 11 | <b>De Oliveira</b> | X           |         |         | 38 | <b>Pickett</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 12 | <b>Earthey</b>     |             | X       |         | 39 | <b>Robins</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 13 | <b>Evans</b>       |             | X       |         | 40 | <b>Robinson</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 14 | <b>Fishleigh</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 41 | <b>Rowkins</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 15 | <b>Fowler</b>      |             | X       |         | 42 | <b>Sankey</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 16 | <b>Galvin</b>      |             | X       |         | 43 | <b>Shanks</b>    | X           |         |         |
| 17 | <b>Gauge</b>       |             | X       |         | 44 | <b>Sheard</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 18 | <b>Goddard</b>     |             | X       |         | 45 | <b>Simon</b>     |             | X       |         |
| 19 | <b>Goldsmith</b>   | X           |         |         | 46 | <b>Sykes</b>     | X           |         |         |
| 20 | <b>Guilmant</b>    |             | X       |         | 47 | <b>Taylor</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 21 | <b>Helliwell</b>   |             | X       |         | 48 | <b>Theobald</b>  |             |         |         |
| 22 | <b>Hewitt</b>      |             | X       |         | 49 | <b>Thomson</b>   |             | X       |         |
| 23 | <b>Hill</b>        | X           |         |         | 50 | <b>West</b>      | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 24 | <b>Hogan</b>       |             |         |         | 51 | <b>Wilkinson</b> |             | X       |         |
| 25 | <b>Lademacher</b>  | X           |         |         | 52 | <b>Williams</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 26 | <b>Loughran</b>    | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 53 | <b>Winder</b>    |             | X       |         |
| 27 | <b>Lyons</b>       |             |         |         | 54 | <b>Grimshaw</b>  |             | X       |         |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |              |   |    |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|---|----|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |              |   |    |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | <b>Total</b> | 8 | 39 | 0 |

91.31 The mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been lost by 8 votes to 39 with 0 abstentions.

91.32 The mayor then put the Labour Group amendment 1 to the vote.

### Labour Group amendment 1

|    |                    | For         | Against | Abstain |    |                 | For         | Against | Abstain |
|----|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1  | <b>Alexander</b>   | X           |         |         | 28 | <b>Mackey</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2  | <b>Allen</b>       | X           |         |         | 29 | <b>McGregor</b> | X           |         |         |
| 3  | <b>Asaduzzaman</b> | X           |         |         | 30 | <b>McLeay</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 4  | <b>Atkinson</b>    | X           |         |         | 31 | <b>McNair</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 5  | <b>Bagaeen</b>     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | <b>Meadows</b>  |             | X       |         |
| 6  | <b>Baghoth</b>     | X           |         |         | 33 | <b>Miller</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 7  | <b>Cattell</b>     | X           |         |         | 34 | <b>Muten</b>    | X           |         |         |
| 8  | <b>Czolak</b>      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | <b>Nann</b>     | X           |         |         |
| 9  | <b>Daniel</b>      | X           |         |         | 36 | <b>O'Quinn</b>  | X           |         |         |
| 10 | <b>Davis</b>       | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 37 | <b>Parrott</b>  | X           |         |         |
| 11 | <b>De Oliveira</b> | X           |         |         | 38 | <b>Pickett</b>  | X           |         |         |
| 12 | <b>Earthey</b>     | X           |         |         | 39 | <b>Robins</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 13 | <b>Evans</b>       | X           |         |         | 40 | <b>Robinson</b> | X           |         |         |
| 14 | <b>Fishleigh</b>   | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 41 | <b>Rowkins</b>  | X           |         |         |
| 15 | <b>Fowler</b>      | X           |         |         | 42 | <b>Sankey</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 16 | <b>Galvin</b>      | X           |         |         | 43 | <b>Shanks</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 17 | <b>Gauge</b>       | X           |         |         | 44 | <b>Sheard</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 18 | <b>Goddard</b>     | X           |         |         | 45 | <b>Simon</b>    | X           |         |         |
| 19 | <b>Goldsmith</b>   | X           |         |         | 46 | <b>Sykes</b>    | X           |         |         |
| 20 | <b>Guilmant</b>    | X           |         |         | 47 | <b>Taylor</b>   | X           |         |         |
| 21 | <b>Helliwell</b>   | X           |         |         | 48 | <b>Theobald</b> |             | x       |         |

|    |            |             |   |  |    |              |             |   |   |
|----|------------|-------------|---|--|----|--------------|-------------|---|---|
| 22 | Hewitt     | X           |   |  | 49 | Thomson      | X           |   |   |
| 23 | Hill       | X           |   |  | 50 | West         | NOT PRESENT |   |   |
| 24 | Hogan      |             | x |  | 51 | Wilkinson    | X           |   |   |
| 25 | Lademacher | X           |   |  | 52 | Williams     | X           |   |   |
| 26 | Loughran   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | Winder       | X           |   |   |
| 27 | Lyons      |             | x |  | 54 | Grimshaw     | X           |   |   |
|    |            |             |   |  |    |              |             |   |   |
|    |            |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b> | 42          | 4 | 1 |

91.33 The Mayor then put the General Fund Revenue Budget, Capital and Treasury Management Strategy 2026/27 as set out in item 91 together with the Supplementary Financial information and revised council tax resolution to the vote.

#### Budget vote

|    |             | For         | Against | Abstain |    |          | For         | Against | Abstain |
|----|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|----|----------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1  | Alexander   | X           |         |         | 28 | Mackey   | NOT PRESENT |         |         |
| 2  | Allen       | X           |         |         | 29 | McGregor | X           |         |         |
| 3  | Asaduzzaman | X           |         |         | 30 | McLeay   |             | X       |         |
| 4  | Atkinson    |             |         | x       | 31 | McNair   |             | x       |         |
| 5  | Bagaeen     | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 32 | Meadows  |             | x       |         |
| 6  | Baghoth     | X           |         |         | 33 | Miller   | X           |         |         |
| 7  | Cattell     | X           |         |         | 34 | Muten    | X           |         |         |
| 8  | Czolak      | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 35 | Nann     | X           |         |         |
| 9  | Daniel      | X           |         |         | 36 | O'Quinn  | X           |         |         |
| 10 | Davis       | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 37 | Parrott  | X           |         |         |
| 11 | De Oliveira |             | X       |         | 38 | Pickett  |             | X       |         |
| 12 | Earthey     | X           |         |         | 39 | Robins   | X           |         |         |
| 13 | Evans       | X           |         |         | 40 | Robinson | X           |         |         |
| 14 | Fishleigh   | NOT PRESENT |         |         | 41 | Rowkins  | X           |         |         |
| 15 | Fowler      | X           |         |         | 42 | Sankey   | X           |         |         |

|    |            |             |   |  |    |              |             |    |   |
|----|------------|-------------|---|--|----|--------------|-------------|----|---|
| 16 | Galvin     | X           |   |  | 43 | Shanks       |             | X  |   |
| 17 | Gauge      | X           |   |  | 44 | Sheard       | X           |    |   |
| 18 | Goddard    | X           |   |  | 45 | Simon        | X           |    |   |
| 19 | Goldsmith  |             | X |  | 46 | Sykes        |             | X  |   |
| 20 | Guilmant   | X           |   |  | 47 | Taylor       | X           |    |   |
| 21 | Helliwell  | X           |   |  | 48 | Theobald     |             | x  |   |
| 22 | Hewitt     | X           |   |  | 49 | Thomson      | X           |    |   |
| 23 | Hill       |             | X |  | 50 | West         | NOT PRESENT |    |   |
| 24 | Hogan      |             | x |  | 51 | Wilkinson    | X           |    |   |
| 25 | Lademacher |             | X |  | 52 | Williams     | X           |    |   |
| 26 | Loughran   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | Winder       | X           |    |   |
| 27 | Lyons      |             | x |  | 54 | Grimshaw     | X           |    |   |
|    |            |             |   |  |    |              |             |    |   |
|    |            |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b> | 33          | 13 | 1 |

91.34 the mayor confirmed that the budget resolution had been carried by 33 votes to 13 with 1 abstention.

91.35 **Resolved:**

### Formal Council Tax Resolution

- 1) It be noted that at on 22 January 2026 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2026/27
  - (a) for the whole Council area as 96,316.1 (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 – 1,775.2
    - Hanover Crescent Enclosure – 41.1
    - Marine Square Enclosure – 73.7
    - Royal Crescent Enclosure – 29.7
- 2) Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2026/27(excluding Parish precepts) is £210,010,000
- 3) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2026/27 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

- (a) £936,216,280 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) £726,137,420 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (c) £210,078,860 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) £2,181.14 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) £105,960 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act
- (f) £2,180.04 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by 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) £2,218.83 Rottingdean Parish  
 £2,461.21 Hanover Crescent  
 £2,353.96 Marine Square  
 £2,608.52 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:<br>Parts of the Council's area | A*<br>£  | A<br>£   | B<br>£   | C<br>£   | D<br>£   | E<br>£   | F<br>£   | G<br>£   | H<br>£   |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Rottingdean Parish                             | 1,232.68 | 1,479.22 | 1,725.76 | 1,972.29 | 2,218.83 | 2,711.90 | 3,204.98 | 3,698.05 | 4,437.66 |
| Hanover Crescent                               | 1,367.34 | 1,640.81 | 1,914.27 | 2,187.74 | 2,461.21 | 3,008.15 | 3,555.08 | 4,102.02 | 4,922.42 |
| Marine Square                                  | 1,307.76 | 1,569.31 | 1,830.86 | 2,092.41 | 2,353.96 | 2,877.06 | 3,400.16 | 3,923.27 | 4,707.92 |
| Royal Crescent                                 | 1,449.18 | 1,739.01 | 2,028.85 | 2,318.68 | 2,608.52 | 3,188.19 | 3,767.86 | 4,347.53 | 5,217.04 |
| All other parts of the the councils area       | 1,211.13 | 1,453.36 | 1,695.59 | 1,937.81 | 2,180.04 | 2,664.49 | 3,148.95 | 3,633.40 | 4,360.08 |

\* Entitled to disabled relief

- 4) To note that the Police and 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.

| Band: | A* | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|-------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|-------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|                                    |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner | 156.62 | 187.94 | 219.26 | 250.59 | 281.91 | 344.56 | 407.20 | 469.85 | 563.82 |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

\* Entitled to disabled relief

|                            |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>Band:</b>               | <b>A*</b> | <b>A</b> | <b>B</b> | <b>C</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>E</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>G</b> | <b>H</b> |
| East Sussex Fire Authority | 65.27     | 78.33    | 91.38    | 104.44   | 117.49   | 143.60   | 169.71   | 195.82   | 234.98   |

\* Entitled to disabled relief

- 5) That the Council, in accordance with Section 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 2026/27 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

| Valuation Band:<br>Parts of the Council's area | A*<br>£  | A<br>£   | B<br>£   | C<br>£   | D<br>£   | E<br>£   | F<br>£   | G<br>£   | H<br>£   |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Rottingdean Parish                             | 1,454.57 | 1,745.49 | 2,036.40 | 2,327.32 | 2,618.23 | 3,200.06 | 3,781.89 | 4,363.72 | 5,236.46 |
| Hanover Crescent                               | 1,589.23 | 1,907.08 | 2,224.91 | 2,542.77 | 2,860.61 | 3,496.31 | 4,131.99 | 4,767.69 | 5,721.22 |
| Marine Square                                  | 1,529.65 | 1,835.58 | 2,141.50 | 2,447.44 | 2,753.36 | 3,365.22 | 3,977.07 | 4,588.94 | 5,506.72 |
| Royal Crescent                                 | 1,671.07 | 2,005.28 | 2,339.49 | 2,673.71 | 3,007.92 | 3,676.35 | 4,344.77 | 5,013.20 | 6,015.84 |
| All other parts of the the councils area       | 1,433.02 | 1,719.63 | 2,006.23 | 2,292.84 | 2,579.44 | 3,152.65 | 3,725.86 | 4,299.07 | 5,158.88 |

\* Entitled to disabled relief

- 6) 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 2026/27 is not excessive.

## 92 SUPPLEMENTARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR BUDGET COUNCIL

### 92.1 Note:

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 2026/27 and Supplementary Financial Information recommendation 2.1 – 2.3 and the final vote on the overall General Fund Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2026/27 as detailed under Item 91 above.

## 93 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET & CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2026-27 AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

- 93.1 The mayor noted that the Housing Revenue Account Budget and Capital Investment Programme 2026/27 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy had been taken into consideration as part of the overall budget debate as detailed under Item 91 above.

- 93.2 The mayor then put the recommendations as detailed in the report to the vote.

### Housing Revenue Account Budget and Capital Investment Programme 2026/27 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy

|   |           | For | Against | Abstain |    | For    | Against     | Abstain |
|---|-----------|-----|---------|---------|----|--------|-------------|---------|
| 1 | Alexander | X   |         |         | 28 | Mackey | NOT PRESENT |         |

|    |             |             |   |  |    |              |             |   |   |
|----|-------------|-------------|---|--|----|--------------|-------------|---|---|
| 2  | Allen       | X           |   |  | 29 | McGregor     | X           |   |   |
| 3  | Asaduzzaman | X           |   |  | 30 | McLeay       | X           |   |   |
| 4  | Atkinson    | X           |   |  | 31 | McNair       |             | X |   |
| 5  | Bagaeen     | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 32 | Meadows      |             | X |   |
| 6  | Baghoth     | X           |   |  | 33 | Miller       | X           |   |   |
| 7  | Cattell     | X           |   |  | 34 | Muten        | X           |   |   |
| 8  | Czolak      | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 35 | Nann         | X           |   |   |
| 9  | Daniel      | X           |   |  | 36 | O'Quinn      | X           |   |   |
| 10 | Davis       | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 37 | Parrott      | X           |   |   |
| 11 | De Oliveira | X           |   |  | 38 | Pickett      | X           |   |   |
| 12 | Earthey     | X           |   |  | 39 | Robins       | X           |   |   |
| 13 | Evans       | X           |   |  | 40 | Robinson     | X           |   |   |
| 14 | Fishleigh   | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 41 | Rowkins      | X           |   |   |
| 15 | Fowler      | X           |   |  | 42 | Sankey       | X           |   |   |
| 16 | Galvin      | X           |   |  | 43 | Shanks       | X           |   |   |
| 17 | Gauge       | X           |   |  | 44 | Sheard       | X           |   |   |
| 18 | Goddard     | X           |   |  | 45 | Simon        | X           |   |   |
| 19 | Goldsmith   | X           |   |  | 46 | Sykes        | X           |   |   |
| 20 | Guilmant    | X           |   |  | 47 | Taylor       | X           |   |   |
| 21 | Helliwell   | X           |   |  | 48 | Theobald     |             | X |   |
| 22 | Hewitt      | X           |   |  | 49 | Thomson      | X           |   |   |
| 23 | Hill        | X           |   |  | 50 | West         | NOT PRESENT |   |   |
| 24 | Hogan       |             | X |  | 51 | Wilkinson    | X           |   |   |
| 25 | Lademacher  | X           |   |  | 52 | Williams     | X           |   |   |
| 26 | Loughran    | NOT PRESENT |   |  | 53 | Winder       | X           |   |   |
| 27 | Lyons       |             | x |  | 54 | Grimshaw     | X           |   |   |
|    |             |             |   |  |    |              |             |   |   |
|    |             |             |   |  |    | <b>Total</b> | 42          | 5 | 0 |

93.3 The mayor confirmed that the recommendations had been carried by 42 votes to 5 with no abstentions.

**93.4 RESOLVED:**

That Council:

- 1) Approved the HRA Revenue Budget for 2026/27 as outlined in table 1 of the main report and Appendix 1.
- 2) Approved the new Capital Programme Budget of £79.640m for 2026/27 be agreed as part of the revised capital budget of £126.339m (which includes reprofiles of £46.699m from 2025/26).
- 3) Approved the earmarking of £1m reserves against disrepair claims for 2026/27.
- 4) Approved the 5-year capital programme as set out in Appendix 3 to the report.

**94 CLOSE OF MEETING**

94.1 The mayor thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 8.01pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2026



**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**4.30pm 18 DECEMBER 2025**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Grimshaw (Chair), Asaduzzaman, Atkinson, Alexander, Allen, Bagaeen, Baghoth, Czolak, Daniel, Earthey, Fishleigh, Fowler, Galvin, Goddard, Helliwell, Hewitt, Lademacher, Lyons, McGregor, McLeay, McNair, Meadows, Miller, Muten, Nann, Oliveira, Parrott, Pickett, Robins, Robinson, Rowkins, Sankey, Shanks, Sheard, Simon, Sykes, Taylor, C Theobald, Thomson, West, Wilkinson and Williams

**PART ONE**

**48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

48.1 There were no declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda.

**49 MINUTES**

49.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2025 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings.

**50 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.**

50.1 The Mayor gave the following communications:

Good afternoon, Councillors, Colleagues and Residents. It's a pleasure to be with you all here today - our last meeting of 2025. The past couple of months have been a whirlwind, and I can hardly believe we've reached the end of the year.

Before we move on to today's agenda, I would like to take a moment to announce two significant accolades that highlight Brighton & Hove City Council's commitment to fairness and excellence:

Firstly, we have been granted the Sutton Trust Fair School Admissions Award at gold level. This prestigious award recognises organisations that have made substantial changes to their schools admissions policies, ensuring fair access for all pupils regardless of socio-economic background.

I would like to call Councillor Taylor to come forward to receive the certificate.

Our Planning team has also been recognised for the speed and quality of its decision-making. Each year, planning authorities across the UK are ranked by Planning Resource, the sector's leading publication. In the latest rankings, published last month, Brighton & Hove City Council achieved a gold standard classification – a remarkable improvement from bronze in 2024.

At the beginning of November, I had the privilege of joining our local cadet forces and the Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal team as we raised funds at Brighton & Hove Albion's home match at the Amex. Thanks to the cadets' dedication and persistence, and the generosity of the supporters and fellow councillors who joined me there, we raised over £8,000. I was honoured to stand on the pitch with the players as the entire stadium observed a two-minute silence to remember our heroes. The poppy display from fans on the north terrace was so moving it brought me to tears. And to round off an already unforgettable afternoon, the Seagulls even secured a win.

I am pleased to confirm that the current total raised in our city for the Poppy Appeal stands at £52,000 and the counting is still ongoing. A huge thank you goes to Andy Brown, the Southeast Poppy Appeal Manager for East Sussex, and to all the volunteers for their incredible hard work and dedication.

In the days that followed, I attended several services and ceremonies marking Remembrance. These included the Brighton Parade and Services on Remembrance Sunday, the civic memorial service at All Saints, and services hosted by the Association for Jewish Ex-servicemen and Women at the Brighton & Hove Hebrew Congregation, and the Sussex Masons.

I also joined the Lord Lieutenant at a Regimental Dinner hosted by the University Hospitals Sussex Armed Forces Network, which helped raise vital funds for the Chavasse Clinic at the Royal Sussex County Hospital - this helps support serving personnel and veterans.

I am incredibly proud of our city and the thoughtful, heartfelt tributes it led to honour our armed forces. To have attended these services as Mayor was a true honour. I want to extend my sincere thanks to the Remembrance Committee, faith leaders, local partners, community organisations, and Sussex Police for ensuring these events ran smoothly and for helping bring our city together to honour the fallen.

I had the pleasure of co-hosting the launch of Brighton & Hove Buses' Santa Bus Appeal at Brighton Town Hall. It was wonderful to welcome Santa and all the fantastic chosen charities, along with my own mayoral charities, into the Council Chamber. I even found myself joining Santa, his elves and the charities in a conga around the Chamber, which I'm fairly sure was a historic first.

In early December, along with my consort, Father David, the Civic Office Team and my charities we had the pleasure of hopping aboard the Santa Bus. Together we danced, cheered, waved and walked through the city, raising vital funds along the way. It was a joy to see the excitement on the children's faces (and on plenty of adults too) as they spotted the glowing bus, heard the music and caught sight of Santa. I was delighted to receive so many waves and cheers - many whom thought I was Mrs Claus. I hope many of you will have the opportunity to see the Santa Bus as it continues its journey around the city until 23 December, before Santa dashes back to the North Pole. My heartfelt thanks go to Brighton & Hove Buses for their generous support and for arranging such a wonderful initiative for our city.

I've been out and about across the city recently, from visiting Pelican Parcels' Open Warehouse Day, to handing out awards at the Hangleton & Knoll Project Community Awards. I stood in solidarity with our Trans community on the Trans Day of Remembrance, hosted the Martha Gunn Trust in the Mayor's Parlour, and attended the White Ribbon Day event at Jubilee Library. And, in a personal highlight, I'm now practically best friends with Nigella Lawson after meeting her at the opening of Team Domenica's wonderful new pub, The North Star.

I also had the honour of speaking at the Brighton & Hove World AIDS Day vigil at New Steine Gardens, where I read the names of those lost to this devastating disease. And joined my dear friends at Lunch Positive for their World AIDS Day community lunch.

The end of year festivities have been a joy. I switched on the Shelter Hall Christmas lights, watched Coombe Road Primary School's brilliant end of year play, wrapped Christmas gifts with the team at Together Co, attended advent and Christmas concerts, and even served as a judge at the Drag Christmas Snow Ball Show at the Dome.

There are still several engagements to come before Christmas, including the Nine Lessons and Carols at All Saints, the opening night of *Jack and the Beanstalk*, and the Love and Light Service at St George's - a deeply moving candlelight service for the babies and children who have lost their lives at the Royal Sussex County Hospital.

I know this time of year can be difficult -whether you're missing loved ones or simply carrying more than usual. I hope you're able to find moments of rest, connection or joyful chaos with the people who matter the most. Whatever this year has looked like for you, even if surviving it was the achievement, that is enough.

Wishing you all happy Hanukkah, a joyful Christmas or Winter Festival, and a happy, healthy New Year. Thank you.

**51 APPOINTMENT OF THE DEPUTY MAYOR FOR BRIGHTON AND HOVE FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2025/26**

- 51.1 The mayor invited nominations for the position of Deputy Mayor for the remainder of the municipal year 2025/26.
- 51.2 Councillor Fowler was proposed by Councillor Sankey and seconded by Councillor Thomson.
- 51.3 The mayor put the nomination to the vote, and it was carried that Councillor Fowler be appointed as Deputy Mayor for Brighton and Hove for the rest of the municipal year 2025/26.
- 51.4 Councillor Fowler made and signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office as Deputy Mayor and was presented with their badge of office by the mayor.

## **52 LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 52.1 The Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holders' gave the following communications:

A very warm welcome to this meeting of Brighton & Hove City Council, our last in 2025, to everybody attending. A particular welcome not only to our councillors, to officers supporting tonight's business, but to residents and partners that are joining us in person in Hove Town Hall and also online. As we gather in this festive season of December, the council extends heartfelt wishes to all those celebrating Christmas, Hanukkah and other festivals of light and renewal, as well as those of no faith who cherish this time of goodwill, reflection and community togetherness.

Hanukkah, which always falls in the winter months, is a Jewish celebration of cultural survival and spiritual resilience, marking the triumph of light over darkness, the importance of religious freedom and the power of faith in challenging times. In light of this week's anti-Semitic terrorist attack against Jews celebrating Hanukkah in Australia, I want to extend this council's heartfelt sympathies to everyone affected, which includes our Jewish community here in the city which has close links to the community that was targeted in Australia. Rabbi Zalman Lewis's cousin was killed, leaving a young family behind.

This chamber exists to serve the people of Brighton & Hove and today's agenda, from petitions through to responses to residents' questions and notices of motion, is part of that responsibility. To scrutinise, for us to listen, and to decide openly on the issues that matter to our communities. In that spirit of light over darkness, hope over fear, and unity over division, this council begins its business this afternoon.

Since we met in October, we've continued to move forward as an administration, making progress across the city. The multi-use games area in Hangleton has been refurbished and is looking fantastic. Also the games area at Saltdean is refurbished, investing in facilities that our residents need to stay healthy and play sports. We've rolled out real-time bin collection tracking, all

part of our ambitious modernisation of the service; and most recently, food waste collections are being rolled out across the west of the city. Our plans for a new swimming pool in Withdean have received planning permission - the first new swimming pool in the city for 40 years; while our draft budget will protect our offer of free swimming for under 18 in our council-run swimming pools.

We've received two gold awards already mentioned this afternoon. First from the Sutton Trust for our package of school reforms earlier this year, meaning that our secondary school admissions policy is now one of the most progressive in the country, putting Brighton and Labour's values into action. And our council's Planning team, which has jumped, as you've highlighted Madam Mayor, from bronze to gold rating in one year by Planning Resource, the sector's leading publication highlighting the speed and quality of its decision making.

We've participated in the 16 days of activism, highlighting the council services and third party organisations available to support women and girls facing domestic abuse. We've commemorated World AIDS Day and renewed our achievable commitment to end all new transmissions in the city by 2030. And we've commemorated Trans Day of Remembrance, remembering trans lives lost to violence.

We have formed part of the government's official bid for the Women's World Cup in 2035. We've launched the best of Brighton & Hove Fund, a new ring-fenced fund to invest in local communities, and we've put residents in the driving seat for deciding how the over £700,000 should be spent. We've recently just extended the deadline to that fund to the 1st of January so please keep sending in your suggestions everybody.

We've also approved a new city transport plan, a new high-quality active travel scheme for the A259 coast road from Fourth Avenue to the lagoon, and we've launched a new campaign on the harm caused by particle pollution from wood burners, much to Councillor Lyons' upset. We've also launched a new consultation on community safety and I would encourage everybody to look at that and to respond. And we've launched a new homelessness strategy which speaks to our Labour government's new homelessness strategy, with a particular focus on children, young people and prevention.

I'm really proud to announce that we've also started operating women's only emergency and temporary accommodation in response to feedback about the lack of safety that some women experienced who've been housed by us due to their experiencing homelessness. I think this is a really important intervention and I'm very glad that we've been able to do that this year. We are taking bold action to fix the housing crisis using our asset base to raise money needed to directly purchase our own temporary accommodation and accelerating house building. Last month, we approved hundreds of new council and affordable homes for Sackville Road and, as well as building new council homes, we're making continual progress on our action plan following the Regulator of Social Housing report last year.

The administration has continued work on a robust financial strategy in the face of intense pressures created by years of chronic underfunding of local government. And although our Labour government now gives us real terms increases in funding each year in contrast to the austerity years, the previous government's left us a ticking time bomb which means our services continue to be stretched like never before. This was evidenced by our CQC inspection report published earlier this month, where finances have constrained our service delivery. But we are pushing ahead implementing again there an action plan to improve outcomes.

Against this backdrop, we've published our draft budget and made difficult decisions regarding library sustainability. I'm pleased that we've been able to maintain library provision in Rottingdean for one year ahead with a view to working towards a community model over the longer term. And our decisions to close the library service offered in the Old Boat Community Centre and to close Westdene Library were difficult ones, taken on the basis of comparing usage, community need and the geographic spread of our libraries across the city. Even after these decisions, we will maintain greater library provision than the national average and our neighbours in East and West Sussex. I hope that the potential mitigations we've been discussing with the communities affected will bear fruit so that we can maintain access to books for school children at Westdene School and potentially look at a community model to that provision through the better Brighton & Hove Fund, which I've already mentioned this evening.

Alongside this, the council has been working hard on proposals for wider devolution and local government reorganisation. Our proposal on local government reorganisation, which would see us merge with Falmer, East Saltdean, Peacehaven and Telston Cliffs, is one of the proposals being consulted on by government as part of a statutory consultation for local government organisation across Sussex. The deadline for responses is the 11th of January and since we met last October the government has also now confirmed a £38 million investment fund for Sussex and Brighton, with a portion of that fund to be turned on next year when we establish a mayoral combined authority in May. Because while the mayoral elections may have been delayed we, together with partners in East and West Sussex, are still on track to step up this regional body and start taking decisions and investing in our communities on behalf of residents.

Last week Brighton was selected as one of only eight local authorities to pilot the Labour government's Young Futures Hubs Initiative, a cornerstone of the National Youth Strategy, creating youth led spaces for ten- to 18-year-olds, and for those up to 25 with special educational needs. This is all intended to boost opportunities, improve mental health and well-being, and to reduce crime. As an earlier adopter, the city will co-design this work with young people and partners shaping national delivery to fit local needs.

With that news, now let's turn to our agenda today. Council will debate a series of important notices of motion, petitions and deputations that capture

the energy, the priorities and the democratic vitality of our city - offering fresh opportunities to build on progress and tackle shared challenges together.  
Thank you, Madam Mayor.

### **53 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.**

53.1 The mayor stated that she had been notified of two ordinary petitions to be presented today. She advised that petitioners had up to three minutes to outline the petition and to confirm the number of signatories and that the petition would then be responded to by the relevant Cabinet Member.

53.2 Robert Brown presented a petition titled 'Parking along St George's Road, Kemptown'.

53.3 Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure replied:

Thank you, Robert for bringing the residents' petition to this meeting today. Thank you for your email and I accept your apology – I'm more than happy to look at ways we can engage around these issues. Emails are not a bad starting place, Contact your Councillor where you can go by ward councillors, and I'm more than happy to meet with either yourself or residents, ward councillors and officers to resolve any matters.

Members will be reassured to know that this matter is already under active consideration. Officers and I, as Cabinet Member, have met Kemptown ward councillors Wilkinson and Mackay to discuss parking pressures in the area, including concerns raised by residents, businesses and others.

As you will appreciate, St George's Road is a key route through the area and any changes to parking must carefully balance the needs of local businesses, residents, pedestrians, disabled access, emergency vehicles and the need to maintain safe traffic flow.

Ward councillors have formally requested a review into parking arrangements in the area, including short-stay parking provision, pavement parking issues and the relevant legislation and enforcement options available to the council. Officers will consider options that best serve the community and will be informed by safety considerations, accessibility and traffic movements.

Following review, we will add this to our next Traffic Regulation Order which we will be advertised in spring next year. A TRO is required to change any restrictions such as this. Pavement parking is antisocial, can restrict access especially to those with limited mobility, damages pavements and we welcome the government's commitment to bring about legal changes to inhibit and make our communities safer.

For these reasons, whilst we welcome the petition; the administration is already progressing this and will ensure ward councillors representing the community remain closely involved.

53.4 The mayor stated that the petition on 'Redirect the new 3X bus down Ellen Street instead of Clarendon Road' was deferred to the next meeting of Council for consideration.

53.5 **RESOLVED:**

1) That the Petition concerning 'Parking along St George's Road, Kempdown' be noted.

**54 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

54.1 The mayor reported that 13 written questions had been received from members of the public and invited them to come forward and address the council.

**1. On behalf of Jenny Gibson, Councillor Thomson asked:**

For the majority of my 10 years living in Brighton my street has only ever had one good cleaner. For some months now we haven't had any cleaning done. The street referenced is Windlesham Avenue from the junction of Windlesham Gardens/Windlesham Road to junction with Clifton Hill/Vernon Terrace. Why are we not getting a service which we pay for? My local councillor will confirm this complaint which I make on a regular basis. What action will be taken and when?

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

I'm sorry that they've experienced what they perceive to be a decline in service there in recent months. I'd like to reassure you that this area has always had coverage from street operatives and the current operative is scheduled to be on that street every Thursday – that's Thursday every week. It's worth saying that during the autumn, obviously our operatives have the additional and not insignificant burden of dealing with fallen leaves, often in very large quantities and that inevitably impacts their capacity for other day-to-day tasks.

We're continuing across the service to look at ways of improving the service in street cleansing and I've asked the team to do a deep dive into the work being completed on that particular road and in that general area with a view to having a greater visible impact. There's a report coming next year in March to cover some of the improvements that we're planning for our street cleansing service as we continue to improve the whole of our environmental services, from waste collections to street cleansing.



I also just want to take the opportunity to say a huge thank you to all of our staff in Environmental Services. I think that the weather today illustrates their dedication in getting up very very early in the morning to go out in some pretty horrific conditions to do the very important work of looking after our city. They're a credit to this council and they're a credit to us as a city.

**2. Michael Hutley asked:**

BHCC owns a plot of land in West Saltdean, behind Looes Barn Close, designated as Local Green Space in the West Saltdean Neighbourhood Plan. Several years ago, BHCC sold nearby land and the access track to a farmer. The Saltdean Climate Action Network intends to enhance biodiversity on this plot, but the farmer will not permit volunteers to use the track for access.

Please could BHCC review the sales documents to clarify whether ownership of the track was transferred or exclusive access rights were granted, as this has left the Council and community unable to reach the land? Resolving this is essential, as the Council currently lacks practical access to its own property. The community seeks access urgently to begin biodiversity improvements and ensure ongoing management of this important green space.

**Reply from Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration:**

Thank you to the Saltdean Climate Action Network for their work in that area in the city. I know Saltdean well but I did have to consult officers on this specific bit of land but they have looked into it following your question. So the council does own a plot of land behind Looes Barn Close as you say, but apparently has never owned, and therefore did not sell the adjacent land on which there is an access track to the council's land. We do have access rights along that track to gain access to the plot of land that we do own.

Obviously, the council is aware of the interest from the Climate Action Network to access the land that we do own to carry out potential works to enhance biodiversity, as you say. To do that, the council would need to grant the Network a license or similar permission for you to do this. That isn't yet in place but I am supportive of that being explored as quickly as possible with you.

The council would also presumably need to grant or transfer the access rights over to your group or negotiate it with the owner of the land. That also we're happy to explore and look forward to doing so. Should we meet in the New Year to discuss?

**Michael Hutley asked a supplementary question:**

We understand that there are legal provisions should it be the case that there are no existing access rights, such as easements and access orders under the access to Neighbourhood Land Act 1992.

**Councillor Taylor replied:**

That's helpful. We'll certainly look at that and that's what we can discuss with estates officers and legal in the New Year. Thank you.

**3. Laura King asked:**

It has now been over 18 months since Brighton and Hove City Council decided to replace its committee form of governance with a cabinet form of governance in May 2024.

Has the promised review of this change taken place yet and, if so, how has the switch to a cabinet system improved democracy and public engagement over the committee system as was promised?

**Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council & Cabinet Chair:**

When the new governance arrangements were implemented, two actions were promised: one was that member allowances would be reviewed, and this was completed in May 2025; the second was that the constitution would be kept under review. This has been the case, with regular reports coming to Full Council to approve changes where a need has been identified. So, for example, as part of these regular reviews, we have included the introduction of new contract standing orders to reflect new procurement legislation; we've updated officer delegations to reflect our organisation redesign; and most recently our decision to increase the number of Overview and Scrutiny meetings and double the number of Overview and Scrutiny tasks and finish groups, as well as extending the deadlines for submission of public questions so that residents can review Overview and Scrutiny agendas before they submit their question.

Further, an independent review was undertaken in April of this year by the Corporate Peer Challenge team, supported by the Local Government Association, whose published report can be found on the council's website. The corporate peer challenge is a highly valued improvement and assurance tool. In relation to the cabinet system the challenge team concluded that, and I quote, 'the council has successfully transitioned from a committee system to a leader and cabinet model, marking a significant change in how decisions are made and how strategic direction is exercised; the cabinet system has been implemented effectively in a short period of time'. They stated that, and I quote again, 'the recent move to a leader and cabinet model of

governance provides an opportunity for greater strategic clarity, more effective decision making, and enhanced political leadership'. They found that the transition had been, and I quote, 'well managed', and I quote, 'represents an important step forward in streamlining decision making and strengthening accountability'.

We will continue to keep our constitution under review and we'll be working with the Corporate Peer Challenge team next year when they come back for a day in March to ensure our continued focus on improvement and assurance. The outcome of this further work with them will also be published.

**Laura King asked a supplementary question:**

In view of the fact there was no Brighton & Hove city referendum on the change of council governance from committee to cabinet, and its subsequent rewriting of the council constitution to reverse the previous Brighton & Hove city referendum of 2001, which voted against an elected mayor and in favour of continuing the committee system, would this council agree with me that a cabinet council has now been operating for the past 18 months illegitimately, and that all decisions made under this cabinet during this time, including undemocratically denying certain councillors access to information concerning their own ward if they are not part of the relevant cabinet, are therefore also rendered illegitimate and need to be reversed pending a fresh city referendum?

**Councillor Sankey replied:**

Miss King, I would say to you as a recovering lawyer myself, no that is not accurate. It's a complete misrepresentation of the constitution, the law, and how local government governance works. And I would also say, respectfully, this kind of myth making and, essentially, sort of conspiracy theory approach really undermines faith in our institutions; it undermines democracy. I'm concerned that it may, make residents feel as though something bad or illegitimate, is happening when it's not. Everything that has been done under my watch in this council has been perfectly lawful and within our local government governance framework.

**4. Robert Brown asked:**

Anti-Social Behaviour continues to rise across Kemptown Ward, with victims now having to wait over a year before action is taken and relief is given. Many of these perpetrators are BHCC tenants. So it seems as if BHCC are not following their own advice on their own policy.

Victims dealing with BHCC are met with indifference, delays, non response from council officers and a lack of support. It is felt that the perpetrators are given leniency at every step and victims are feeling let

down by BHCC as they are continually asked to do the work of the Council themselves, risking additional ASB towards them.

Will the Cabinet Member for Housing give assurances that they will look at the policy, timings and triggers for action within that policy to ensure victims are not having to wait over a year before action is taken and decisions are made?

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

Of course we do recognise the impact that antisocial behaviour has on victims and communities, and we are indeed committed to improving the responses. So I am very sorry to hear that victims of antisocial behaviour are reporting that they experience an unsatisfactory response from officers, and I'm sorry to hear that.

We are, though, committed to improving support and communication, and we've invested quite a lot in our frontline tenancy services. We hold regular meetings, regular multi-agency meetings to coordinate action and reduce reliance on victims gathering evidence, which I do appreciate is very difficult and can be alarming.

Now the Council follows its ASB policy, but in some cases, particularly those requiring tenancy enforcement, they require legal proceedings, these can take an awful lot of time due to evidence requirements and national court delays, and unfortunately this does extend resolution times and we recognise that.

We do not give leniency to perpetrators. Each case is assessed on risk and harm and we work closely with Sussex Police and partners to take proportionate, lawful action and interim measures such as warnings, acceptable behaviour agreements and closure orders are used where possible to provide relief while these legal processes are taking its course, and I do appreciate sometimes they do take a long time.

But we are also committed to continuous improvement and there is at the moment an Overview and Scrutiny task and finish group which is reviewing all our antisocial behaviour responses and we are launching a hate incident policy and co-producing work with tenants on sensitive lets to strengthen safeguarding and community safety.

**Robert Brown asked a supplementary question:**

As I was saying before, in the most recent case where we had a conclusion happen this week, even though we had been reporting things since January, they weren't actually logged by the council on the same thing since July.

We very much appreciate the fact if we are included in that review of the ASB policy so we can actually see what the KPI is, what the

triggers are for residents and to be aware of how things are moving forward.

I'm asking if we can be involved in that policy along with the residents. As I say, I have seen the policy online and the key thing is residents would like to know what the triggers are for that.

**Councillor Williams replied:**

I am not quite sure what the supplementary question was, but yes we can send you the policy. You can look at the policy yourself at anytime you wish.

**5. Jerome Cox-Strong asked:**

Cardiac arrest statistics are terrifyingly clear. For every minute that passes without access to a defibrillator, someone's chances of surviving decreases by 10%. It's because of this simple, life-saving maths that the nearest accessible defibrillator should never be more than 200m away.

Yet the reality in our city is stark. My area, Hanover & Elm Grove, remains a defibrillator desert - for those in deprived areas like Pankhurst, the nearest defibrillator might be as much as 20 minutes away. This is inequality extending brutally, literally, into a matter of life and death.

I'm campaigning locally to secure charitable funding for new defibrillators for Hanover & Elm Grove that could save lives. But this is a citywide emergency that will continue without citywide, statutory intervention. Will the council commit to undertaking a formal review of public defibrillator access across the city, and to centrally funding new defibrillators in areas like mine?

**Reply from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care:**

Yes, you're right, defibrillators are lifesaving, and the council does agree that they should be easily accessible. We do have a total of 197 defibrillators across the city, with 123 of them being accessible to the public. Our public health team are currently mapping the gaps in public accessible defibrillators, and we are currently looking at ways the defibrillator gaps can be funded.

I will be working with all ward councillors and public health officers in recognising where the gaps currently are and how these gaps can be funded in the near future. And just to say also as a resident, as well as ward councillors, you can always suggest the defibrillator in your area as part of the current Better Brighton & Hove Funds consultation.

**Jerome Cox-Strong asked a supplementary question:**

I just encourage Council to speak to a groups like DS43 Hartlepool who undertook this work before and really look at the way that communities can be involved in this. I ask again that people like myself and forums like Hanover and Elm Grove Communities Forum could be involved in these conversations. Obviously, I appreciate that the Better Brighton Fund has been one thing, but I think there's lots of other good ideas there so having a separate fund for defibrillators might be quite good if possible.

**Councillor Alexander responded:**

You're right - I think sometimes residents and community groups do have a part to play in stuff like this. I'm a councillor covering the Coldean area and I know the community have got together over the last couple of years and fundraised themselves for defibrillators. So I think stuff like this, it takes a whole village as it were, so thank you for bringing this forward.

**6. Tom Sargant asked:**

Has Brighton and Hove City Council located the original plans for the gardens of Adelaide Crescent and Palmeira Square by the great Sussex-born horticulturalist Henry Phillips?

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

We were intrigued by the question, we're all aware of the often-told story of the great conservatory that collapsed at Palmeira Square. As far as we know, those original plans are not in the council's possession. However, knowing Henry Philips' connection with the Royal Surrey Gardens in Kensington, we are happy to explore if they have any knowledge of the whereabouts of the original designs. We have also contacted The Keep who hold all sorts of local records to see if they have any original copies of the plans.

**Tom Sargant asked a supplementary question:**

Work stopped on Adelaide Crescent in 1834 and only resumed in 1839-40 into the 60s, by which time Philips was dead. It's not at all clear who the designer of Palmeira Square North was. Does the council have any knowledge of who that designer might be?

**Councillor Robins replied:**

The designs that I think we've looked at are from the 1940s, rather than the 1840s, and they are certainly the oldest record we have of what

was going on in Palmeira Square North, so that would be what we were working for.

I think that you'll find that work stopped at Palmeira Square North from about 1833 for 17 years, so you would be looking at between 1850 and 1860 and to the best of my knowledge we haven't got any records, and what we would do with the records I don't know because the original design, as you know, collapsed and was a complete and absolute failure and remained uncleared for 17 years. So, certainly, if you want to speak to me about it offline or out of this format, then I'd be happy to speak to you.

**7. On behalf of Elroy F, Ellen Watts asked:**

Will the Council publish recent passenger-usage data, boarding figures, and cost-per-passenger for the 3X bus service at the bus stops on the east end of Nevill Avenue, and explain how this evidence justifies maintaining the current routing and level of service—given that buses are frequently empty and usage appears minimal—and also set out when residents will be formally engaged in reviewing whether the 3X route and stop locations on Nevill Avenue remain appropriate, including whether options such as reduced frequency, rerouting, or consolidating stops will be considered as part of that evidence-based review?

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Brighton & Hove buses introduced the 3X in September with council support through our Bus Service Improvement Plan. The 3X aims to deliver fast across-city journeys to employment, education and local amenities and services. Many residents have contacted both the council and Brighton & Hove Buses to express their appreciation of this increasingly popular service.

The operator undertook a significant marketing campaign, including flyers to households near the route. Nevill Avenue was chosen to create a direct link between Hangleton, West Blatchington and Hove railway station, whilst avoiding duplication of existing services and congestion on other corridors. This includes many secondary schools, sixth formers and university students and staff living in Hangleton, West Blatchington, Hove Park, Goldsmid, Seven Dials and beyond to access the Nevill campus of Hove Park School and West Blatchington School; commuters, including nearby Legal & General offices, those who come to sports events and recreational facilities at the nearby Greyhound Stadium, Hove Park and Nevill Sports grounds, including Brighton & Hove Cricket Club and allotment holders at the North Nevill Allotments. All very close to the Nevill Avenue bus stop. The 3X provides better citywide access to health

facilities of Mill View Hospital and Hove Polyclinic along Nevill Avenue, hence its route.

We continue to review and monitor, with Brighton & Hove Buses, route performance closely; delays, congestion, punctuality, patronage and feedback from residents and passengers with adjustments possible. The 3X does provide an excellent and welcome option. It's attracting new passengers, reducing car journeys and air pollution in a busy corridor, including along Nevill Avenue, close to this bus stop.

**Ellen Watts asked a supplementary question:**

Personally, I know from experience that no residents on Nevill Avenue were provided with pamphlets, and given that residents on Clarendon Road have submitted a petition raising similar concerns about the impacts of the 3X bus route on their street, does the Council accept that this indicates patterns and systematic issues in how the route has been implemented and can it explain how this cumulative evidence is being used to assess the overall suitability, routing and stop locations of the 3X service, including on Nevill Avenue, and whether it will now trigger a board review of the route.

**Councillor Muten replied:**

I think I'll just repeat that point - we continue to review and monitor, with Brighton & Hove Buses, this route performance and usage. We have a partnership, an enhanced partnership, under our BSIP agreement with Brighton & Hove buses. We routinely monitor their data and we're content to engage further with Brighton & Hove Buses, and with the community. We're happy to review the routes, its usage, and if there's a review about bus stops as well, we're happy to consider those. So we're more than happy to hear further comments and we will definitely be looking at the data and working in partnership with Brighton & Hove buses.

**8. On behalf of Emma Andrews, Councillor Fishleigh asked:**

Given that the new leisure centre is proposed to open on the west of the site with its main entrance and plaza directly facing an area scheduled for demolition and multi-year housing construction, what assessment has been made of the combined impact of this overlapping construction period on the centre's early operation — including noise, dust, air quality, construction traffic, access restrictions, the functioning of the entrance plaza and public realm opposite an active construction zone, and any risks to the building fabric and internal systems such as HVAC air intake drawing in demolition or construction dust or abrasive effects on glazing and external surfaces — and will this full assessment be completed and published before the planning submission?



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

The future residential-led redevelopment to the eastern side of the King Alfred site will be a separate project undertaken by a private developer. The demolition of the existing King Alfred Leisure Centre will be subject to a planning application and will require a construction environmental management plan, a CEMP, to be agreed as part of the planning determination.

The CEMP will set out the methods and procedures that will be adopted with consideration to minimizing the impact of the development on the local community, residents and businesses, the public and environment. It will address the potential environmental impact of the construction and methods to mitigate the specific environmental disturbances such as noise and vibration. Given the adjacency of the new King Alfred Leisure Centre, this will particularly focus on minimising impact to the staff and customers of the new facility, including those using the new public realm.

**Councillor Fishleigh asked a supplementary question on behalf of Emma Andrews:**

Can the Council assure residents that the new centre will be safe and usable while directly next to demolition and construction works?

**Councillor Robins replied:**

It will need to commit to that in the planning application and the determination. So yes, it's part of the planning.

**9. Lynn-Ora Knott asked:**

It has been reported that the number of homeless households in the city has been increasing despite continued progress increasing the supply of council homes. Previously when the supply of additional council homes was increasing under the old allocations policy the number of households having to live in temporary accommodation or sleep rough was falling.

Given that the increasing cost of homeless accommodation is putting a huge strain on the council's it is important to know how well the new allocations policy is working in terms of reducing the number of homeless households

Since the new allocations policy was brought in what percentage of home allocations went to homeless households?

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

Yes, sadly I'm sorry to say this - demand for homeless services is rising with Shelter reporting that 1 in 77 residents experienced homelessness in June 2024. This is really hard for me to say, but this is the truth.

So, to meet these challenges though, we've produced hundreds of new affordable homes, including 318 in 2023/24, 226 in 2024/25 and in 2025/26 another 452 homes are expected. So this is really significant progress, but demand for social housing still far exceeds supply with many thousands on our housing register as I'm sure you're aware.

To your question, since April, 148 social and affordable homes, around 42% of allocations, have gone to homeless households. Alongside this though, we're focused on prevention, and changes to our allocations policy now means households whose homelessness is prevented, can remain on the housing register. This is supporting choice and longer-term security. And between April and November this year, I'm very proud of our team - it wasn't my work, it was our team's work and we have to thank them - we successfully prevented homelessness for 365 households. We remain committed to increasing housing supply and prioritising those most in need, and we're working with partners to provide homelessness wherever possible.

**10. Ian Needham asked:**

When the government supports more affordable rents on new build the rents the rents are either "affordable" or the new definition of "social" both these rent levels are a lot higher than the old "social target rents" paid by current tenants. So in demolishing rather than refurbishing 560 homes at low council rents will eventually be replaced at some distant time by homes that are less affordable higher rent homes. However tenants of the LPS blocks that the council has decided to demolish were promised a "like for like" right to return when the homes are eventually replaced. Is the council guaranteeing "like for like" council target social rents for all existing tenants?

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

Yes, absolutely right, in July, Cabinet agreed in principle decisions about the future development plans of the three sites of the eight large panel system (LPS) blocks. We have no choice but to demolish. We didn't do it because we want to do it, we're doing it because we have to do it. And these people deserve a safe home, and that's why we're doing it. Unfortunately, much of our housing stock has been neglected for many, many years and this administration is taking responsibility for that and we're doing everything we can.

Now, there will be different rates in different places, and I can guarantee you on our new housing developments such

as in Coldean and in Portslade they are social rents. Lots of our developments are social rents and we're doing our absolute best to keep them at social rents because it's really important.

Now the council is currently, in the existing rehousing policy, we're consulting with tenants that it effects at the moment and these are going to be LPS Local Lettings Plan specific to these particular residents from the LPS blocks, with current residents of all tenures providing feedback, of course. The summary of this consultation will be provided at Cabinet in March 2026, and the like-for-like offer will apply to the secure tenancy offered at the point of rehousing. So, all of these people in these homes, 560 homes, will be offered the opportunity for a like-for-like rent because they have to move out, it's not their fault. So that is absolutely correct.

The right to return policy, as currently drafted, states that the priority for the new-build council homes across the named regeneration sites will be given to those secure tenants who've had to move because of the LPS redevelopment programme. This will form part of the LLP when the new homes are let, and tenants who express an interest in moving back to one of these homes within that redevelopment area will be offered secure tenancies elsewhere until these properties are ready. This is going to take three to five - and even longer - years so many of the tenants will be happily settled, we hope, in new homes and they will be offered like-for-like in that situation.

**Ian Needham asked a supplementary question:**

I'm slightly confused because there's reference to differential rents in the answer and then a reference to like-for-like and I'm not quite sure how the two fit together?

**Councillor Williams replied:**

So any person moving out to a new secure tenancy, to a new council home, will have the opportunity for a like-for-like rent.

**11. Adrian Hill asked:**

The latest data shows that vehicle emissions standard adherence is low on main roads in poorer areas such as Lewes Road. This means that many of the vehicles are of the highly polluting diesel type. However, Labour's manifesto promised to end polluting diesel vehicles in the city. With some of the worst pollution in the country it is clear not enough has been done to tackle toxic air pollution on Lewes Road. Waiting and doing nothing has caused and worsened illness for thousands in the city. Will you please finally agree that a clean air zone is urgently required?

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

It was good to cycle with you along this part of the Lewes Road during the Kidical Mass cycle ride in Brighton in September where you and I had a positive discussion around these very matters.

Our manifesto did set out to work to bring an end to noisy and polluting diesel vehicles. We are working towards this, with significant work done and ongoing towards this objective of improving vehicle related air quality.

Our adopted Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) 2022–2027 commits us to ambitious local targets beyond the legal minimum; sets an NO<sub>2</sub> annual mean target of 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> by 2026 (25% below the UK legal limit of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) and a PM2.5 target of 7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> by 2027, working towards WHO guidance levels.

The AQAP acknowledges that poor air quality disproportionately affects less affluent areas and vulnerable groups, strengthening the case for robust interventions on corridors such as Lewes Road. Unlike recent Tory Group comms, we do not consider this a “woke” endeavour. Cleaner air saves lives, and we are committed to improving air quality for our city.

We are data-led and continue to expand public information and monitoring, including the Brighton & Hove & Sussex Real Time Air Quality Portal launched in October 2024 (with approximately fifty sensors across Sussex, forty in the city). As the first administration to do this, data-led is vital to inform our targeted approach and aims to reduce exposure near schools, bus stops, and crossings on Lewes Road, while supporting behavioural change.

We comply with national air quality standards and have done since 2023. Given the monitoring evidence and our local targets, we recognise additional measures may be necessary to ensure sustained compliance and to meet the more ambitious AQAP targets for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM2.5.

**Adrian Hill asked a supplementary question:**

According to a 2025 report from the Royal College of Physicians, it says air pollution costs the UK £50 billion every year. Air pollution causes sickness in children, adults, the elderly and those with existing health issues.

Last meeting, the committee spoke of compassion, fairness and equality, and I did like that. To let one part of the city suffer more than another just because of the toxic air is not fair, it's not compassionate, and it's not equal. Targets are being missed on 80% of

days. So can you help explain to the committee why a Clean Air Zone has been successful in other cities?

**Councillor Muten replied:**

I concur with those points. I'm very much aware of the epidemiological and public health evidence which supports that view. There is a clear relationship between poor air quality and health and I think drives our endeavour to improve. So future initiatives on pilot schemes will be informed by the latest empirical studies to ensure effectiveness and public health benefits. We will look carefully at the experience from other cities with targeted clean-air zones, such as Bradford. Any pilot scheme must be evidence-driven using our publicly available, real-time air quality monitoring. We are doing other targeted measures which I think you are generally aware of, ranging from the engine idling ban, red routes on Lewes Road, and which have shown some improvement in air quality, and also our School Streets programme, and we continue to accelerate our Euro 6 compliance of our bus operator's fleet across the scheduled routes in the city.

We do accept there's more to do and we are working to seek funding for some of those improvements, such as what we have taken forward with the Conway Street bus depot via a ZEBRA 2 bid, successfully funded to bring fully EV zero submission buses to that part of the city, and with potential for future ZEBRA funding we may be able to look at the Lewes Road bus depot, for instance.

**12. Nigel Furness asked:**

In the run-up to Christmas, which should be the traders' busiest period, this city is currently at a virtual standstill as a result of an epidemic of roadworks from East to West and North to South without any visible sign of a co-ordinated approach in place.

Have you, as Cabinet Lead for Transport, Councillor Muten, made any attempts to mitigate this crisis or are you deaf to our pleas?

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

I fully recognise concerns raised by traders and residents about the scale of roadworks across our city during this critical pre-Christmas period. There are too often overdue major planned and reactive works by utility companies and their contractors in our city. Utilities have rights to access their services under our streets and pavements. The council is listening closely and we are actively working to mitigate and reduce disruption.

Privatised utilities have too often neglected their assets under our streets. Making them fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century is important, and under our watch we are getting our city services fixed.

Several steps have already been taken: coordination of streetworks and permits - we're strengthening utility and highway projects scheduling to reduce overlap and ensure works are completed as efficiently as possible. Traffic management - measures such as adjusted signal timings, temporary diversions, and extended working hours are being deployed to keep traffic moving. This is particularly important within our longer running schemes that cannot simply be stopped in the run up to Christmas. Business engagement - we are heavily lobbying utilities companies to ensure direct contact with traders' representatives to understand the specific impacts on footfall and deliveries, and to adapt wherever possible.

It is their responsibility to communicate, and time and time again we explain they need to improve and recognise the importance of better engagement specific to each community in our city. Undoubtedly, several utility companies and their contractors working in Brighton & Hove need to improve communication and services. I will continue to call this out where it is lacking.

**Nigel Furness asked a supplementary question:**

In the dying days of Gordon Brown's administration, Labour administration, you should all be aware, I hope you are, that he gave enacted legislation that gave far more sweeping powers to local authorities, county, borough, whatever, to control the utility companies. I do appreciate what you say about 'we've got to renew infrastructure', but they have to give a time limit for how long they are going to have our roads up.

Are you prepared to reinstate a Clerk of Works who will keep an eye, or several Clerks of Works, on those utility companies, Councillor Muten, and get them doing what you have the power to do and no shoddy workmanship either?

**Councillor Muten replied:**

I want to be really clear, we are absolutely aware of those permit requirements, street work notices and others. We have in the region of 4000 street works permits issued by this authority every year. There's a lot there. Utility companies - they are to give 12 weeks notice where they have planned works. They have a significant number, I have to say well over 1000, of emergency applications where they don't have to give the same notice, and I think we need to work with them. As I intimated, too many of the utility assets underneath our streets and pavements are aging, they're poorly maintained - I think over three or four decades of privatisation, they haven't invested properly in them,

and now they're having to repair in an emergency format, which means they don't actually have to give the same level of notice that they might do, say for 12 weeks notice if it's planned works. If it's an emergency, they can come in to fix a gas main that's leaking, a water main or power supply that have to be fixed very urgently.

But we need to change that culture and to your point about the Clerk of Works, or the NEC4 contract, I think it's got a different term now, I've been pushing very hard and I think this council is now resolving this to get a business case to fund such a person that will be on site available to check the quality of finish by the utility companies' contractors in our in our city. It is an absolute priority, I'm passionate about this, and I want to see the cultural change from every single contractor working for every single utility in this city so that they do finish well.

**13. Diane Montgomery asked:**

At the full council meeting on the 10th July in response to a supplementary question following changes to how affordable shared ownership is and to what extent it benefits local people, Councillor Williams said she would provide:

- 1) Information on the number of shared ownership homes provided in the last 10 years and the percentage of these homes that were provided for households living in the Brighton and Hove area
- 2) Evidence on the extent to which shared ownership has reduced housing waiting lists
- 3) The latest NPPF that gives councils more flexibility to reduce the shared ownership as a percentage of the affordable quota, referred to as policy

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

887 homes have been delivered for shared ownership in the past 10 years I am told. Whilst we don't currently hold all of the details of this home ownership, this information can be sought from registered providers who administer that because the council doesn't; but we've tried to find out some information for you. A couple of recent examples I can give you with the Homes for Brighton & Hove developments have shown a high proportion of local residents benefiting. So 98% of residents at the Quay View in Portslade had a local connection with shared ownership, and 92% of residents who so far have bought at Bluebell Heights in Coldean have a local connection. So that's really good news and I hope that helps with your enquiry. Shared ownership properties are not ring-fenced solely to local residents but our partner registered providers are committed to promoting this very much to local residents and so do we.

Shared ownership doesn't directly reduce overall housing waiting lists. Generally, if you can afford to buy a home, you wouldn't qualify to be on the housing waiting list so it doesn't affect it in that way. But it does shift the demand and it makes home ownership accessible to more people who might otherwise not afford the full market rate. So it does offer a stepping stone which I think is very useful and helpful.

In the latest December 2024 iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework, reference to a 25% requirement for first homes, which is a type of affordable home ownership, was removed. This change gives local planning authorities more flexibility to determine which tenure of affordable housing is appropriate for their area - so that helps us. In response we're bringing forward changes to our planning guidance through a new Affordable Housing Planning Advice Note which is expected to be adopted in early 2026 and we can provide you with more details when that's finalised.

**Diane Montgomery asked a supplementary question:**

We've emailed Peter Kyle to urge his colleagues at the Ministry of Housing to redefine what is regarded as affordable when used in the context of housing, or better still, stop using the word completely. It is meaningless unless brought back to its original dictionary definition, which is: inexpensive, reasonably priced. Can you assure me that you will also push the Labour Government to do this? This will allow councils more power to refuse developments that are not in the best interest of the local community and developers who will use shared ownership as part of that so-called affordable quota.

**Councillor Williams replied:**

I can assure you that I will, most annoyingly, push for genuinely affordable homes for the people of our city to the best of my ability. I can reassure you of that.

**55 DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- 55.1 The mayor reported that three deputations had been received from members of the public and invited the lead spokespersons to come forward and address the council.
- 55.2 Jo Whitehead presented the deputation concerning Filming in the City.
- 55.3 Councillor Miller, Cabinet Member for Culture, Heritage & Tourism, replied:

For question one - for more disruptive shoots, typically with over five crew or complex setups, production companies must consult residents in person,



usually by door knocking and logging concerns. We and Sussex Film Office stay in close contact with production companies to ensure issues are addressed. Multiple letter drops are also required to keep residents informed.

Although we can't specifically evidence that all properties were contacted in this instance, we rarely have problems with companies not doing so and we do have confirmation that at least some properties were contacted prior to the shoot. Officers are taking note of the company involved on this occasion and are looking into this matter further.

Question two - at the beginning of August 2025, the permanent Outdoor Events portal on the Brighton & Hove City Council Your Voice page went live, which allows the Outdoor Events team to deal with resident issues for events and filming in real time and we are also reviewing our monitoring systems in conjunction with Sussex Film Office to make reporting and consultation with residents easier. In response to your deputation, we will also make it clear in the portal header that outdoor filming nuisance issues should be reported via this portal.

Question three - it is stated in the terms and conditions on the resident parking permit page that: 'the use of parking bays may be suspended by police officers, civil enforcement officers or duly authorised council officers at any time without notice. A permit is not valid in a bay where parking has been suspended'.

Finally, question four - in the filming charter provided to all filming companies it states that: 'noise should be kept to a minimum, especially during unsocial hours - normally 22:00 to 08:00'. If noise nuisance is experienced by residents in relation to filming activity, this should be reported via the Outdoor Events portal, which enables investigation by Events officers and Environmental Protection, and enforcement if necessary.

While the council recognises that film shoots can cause short term inconvenience and nuisance to affected residents, filming does bring many benefits to the city, whether it is through the work placements on most major film shoots arranged by the Sussex Film Office for Brighton MET students, the £100k of licensing income for the general revenue fund, which helps the council to protect non-statutory services, or the boost to our tourism economy, through the appeal of location tourism for fans of popular films and series. So filming is very important to the city, but I regret that it has caused you such difficulty over the summer.

55.4. Kevin Thomas presented the deputation concerning Brighton & Hove Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles

55.5 Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure, replied:

Brighton & Hove City Council upholds high standards for licensed drivers, vehicles, and operators through its Blue Book, covering safeguarding, safety,

sustainability, and accessibility. Our licenced taxis are an asset to our city and as a council, we are proud of these standards, as I know many drivers are. These standards are regularly reviewed and set the city apart, though neighbouring authorities may not always apply equivalent requirements. So, thank you for your hard work and service to the city.

The council values the professionalism of its licensed drivers and encourages two-way collaboration to address concerns such as bus lane obstruction and adherence to the engine idling ban, which supports ambitions for a cleaner, more accessible city, including cleaner air as you referenced. We will work with you, and please work with us on that.

The council already is exploring restricting bus lane access to Brighton & Hove licensed taxis and private hire vehicles, with potential priority for electric and wheelchair accessible vehicles – EVs and WAVs. Enforcement against illegal ranking, plying for hire by out-of-town vehicles and engine idling remains a priority, with officers monitoring compliance – such as outside Brighton station where taxis, including Brighton & Hove licenced cabs, can sometimes inhibit the flow of buses - and welcome intelligence from the trade.

The council also supports fare transparency, particularly for pre-paid journeys, and would encourage operators to communicate well with their drivers for fare transparency. We will raise this with operators and at the Taxi Forum and are willing to set up meetings through the Taxi Forum with Councillor McGregor in January.

All home-to-school transport contracts must meet our Blue Book standards, and duty of care principles are embedded throughout, especially for nighttime safety. The employer has clear duties towards their employees in relation to workplace safety. We can also look at the enforcement of Brighton & Hove licensed Hackney cabs at our taxi ranks.

I genuinely ask that we work together on our priorities too – a cleaner city with improved air quality, lower emissions, drive towards net zero, more accessible city with less congestion with parking restrictions and bus priority respected. The Council is committed to increasing EVs and WAVs, for instance – we can look at preferential options in support of this aim; clarifying red route regulations, and working nationally to address cross-border hiring, while maintaining strong collaboration with the trade for improvements for all. We're more than happy to work with you to solve this, particularly for the Taxi Forum with my colleague Councillor McGregor.

55.6 Catherine Eden and Barney Miller presented the deputation concerning Lack of Maintenance Budget for Major/Planned Works on Sylvan Hall Estate

55.7 Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing, replied:

First of all, the council are undertaking significant Housing Revenue Account major works investments to improve the exterior of 11 blocks on the Sylvan

Hall Estate. The council have a budget of £27 million for major works and this addresses investment requirements as part of stock condition and other surveys. Our planned works budget includes provision for investment in areas such as gutter clearance and service risers as part of our approach to undertake more planned preventative work. This is really important, I completely agree with you and I'm pleased to say that we are doing this now. I'm sorry that administrations in the past haven't, but we are endeavouring to do just as you asked and quite right too. So hopefully we can have a better future for you guys, and I'd be happy to help with that.

Number two, the short answer is: the minimum energy efficiency standards. Ensuring residents live in well-insulated, efficiently heated, healthy homes, addressing fuel poverty issues – and these are long term objectives for this council, which are supported through the HRA capital programme investing in the sustainability of our homes which probably has been lacking in the past, I agree. The five-year capital programme sets out resources of over £30 million - an average investment of £6.11 million per annum - including some provision for cavity wall insulation. This investment will support the council to meet our net zero target and to bring our homes up an Energy Performance Certificate standards by 2030, in line with the government's Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards framework. Major & planned works address this, and any need for cavity wall insulation, in our specifications and schedules.

Number three - when preparing specifications for planned and major works we engage consultants who will make recommendations for the work and would address any maintenance issues prior to the installation of an element to ensure we obtain the required warranty offered. So that is the standard there. We would not specifically discuss this with an installer as at the time of the new cavity wall installation, that would be repaired with the necessary standards.

Number four – the same answer would apply as above. Number five – our cavity wall insulation installers would be Cavity Insulation Guarantee Agency approved contractors and terms, conditions and warranty would be followed to meet the CIGA criteria, including in relation to any ongoing maintenance requirements.

Number six - yes, our Housing Repairs and Maintenance service have committed to an annual gutter clearing programme, and quite right too I may say.

Seven – our five-year stock condition surveys, agreed at cabinet last week, will include a review of windows which will include information about the anticipated lifespan of windows, with any repair and maintenance requirements identified being referred to our Housing Repairs & Maintenance serviced to action.

55.8 **RESOLVED:**

That Council noted the following deputations:

- 1) concerning Filming in the City.
- 2) concerning Brighton & Hove Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles.
- 3) concerning Lack of Maintenance Budget for Major/Planned Works on Sylvan Hall Estate.

## **A PETITION(S) FOR DEBATE**

55.a1 The Mayor stated that the Council's Petition Scheme provide that where a petition secures 1,250 or more signatures it can be debated at a meeting of the Full Council. There were two petitions which had reached that threshold.

55.a2 The Mayor invited Edie Oakman, Robert Sales, Megan Stubbs and Naomi Hudson from the Youth Council to join the meeting and present the first petition.

55.a3 Edie Oakman, Robert Sales, Megan Stubbs and Naomi Hudson presented a petition for debate titled 'Investigate the possibility of free public transport for young people in Brighton and Hove' which had received more than 2500 signatures at the time the agenda was published.

55.a4 The Mayor invited Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure to reply.

55.a5 Councillor Muten replied:

Thank you for bringing this important petition to this meeting today. I genuinely thank you and support your aims here and I also value every one of your invitations to Youth Council meetings over the past two years to discuss public transport including safety, affordability, reliability and the opportunity for after school activities and connection with friends and communities. Each of those meetings I've attended, I've learned a huge amount, I've listened and understand much from this and I really do value those invites and I'm very happy to come and talk further with the Youth Council on this particular matter.

For every young person, an affordable, safe, reliable and well-connected bus service enables more freedom, is better for the planet and helps tackle deep seated inequality. It may mean fewer car journeys and mean those without access to a lift are not excluded. I am completely on board with the expressed aims of this petition. I know low bus fares make a huge difference. In 2023, we set out in our manifesto that we would look at ways of providing free bus travel for under 19s still in education. As an administration, this is exactly what we have done, we have been looking at this carefully and continue to seek ways to do so within our means.

The Council supports the principle of free public transport for young people and agrees that it would promote youth engagement and boost accessibility in different areas of the city. We also agree that free public transport for city's

young people would enable higher bus usage, taking more cars off the road, reduce congestion and the city's carbon emissions, improving health and opportunities.

We have looked carefully at ways of providing free bus travel for under 19s still in education. Our council budgets do not presently stretch to enable this ambition. We presently cannot afford this. We have used the Bus Service Improvement Plan, or BSIP - now called the Local Authority Bus Grant - to subsidise youth fares with other offers, such as the 50p unaccompanied off-peak fare, and the 'four under 19s travel free' with a paying adult in peak time fare. The council is currently considering fare options for 2026/27 as part of our draft BSIP delivery plan, but we are acutely aware the limits of funding will impact on our capacity to continue to expand youth fare offers.

We are financially responsible and constrained, we will investigate what can be done towards our shared ambition of free, or very cheap, bus transport for under 19s and work with a Strategic Mayoral Authority and our highly profitable bus operators, and look at governance options to help achieve this. We know cheap public transport transforms lives, tackles inequalities, improves air quality emissions, net zero and quality of lives. We agree this is a necessary next step, we agree with you on that, and will do everything within our power and means to move towards this, working with the soon to be Mayoral Strategic Authority and addressing governance barriers to ensure profitable services help support our moves towards this aim.

55.a6 Councillors Shanks and McNair spoke on the matter.

55.a7 Councillor Muten responded to the debate.

55.a8 The Mayor put the recommendations to the vote.

55.a9 The Mayor invited Sara Leddy to join the meeting and present the second petition.

55.a10 Sara Leddy presented a petition for debate titled 'Reduce Traffic & Air Pollution on Lewes Road' which had received 1906 signatures.

55.a11 The Mayor invited Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure to reply.

55.a12 Councillor Muten replied:

Thank you for bringing this petition and bringing your direct professional experience of the devastating conditions affecting many in our nation, including in our city, and bringing your experience as a concerned parent and concerns of other parents and other residents, representing many who have signed this petition.

At a recent air quality meeting in Sussex University, which I and council officers attended, clinical professionals presented research on health

impacts of air quality. There is no question that there are relationships between air quality and respiratory and other health conditions as you rightly inform us here. Unlike the Tory Group's media crossing stations, clean air is not a 'woke agenda', rather we have a statutory duty to improve air quality as established in 1995. We comply with the national air quality standards and have done since 2023. Set within this epidemiological and public health guidance our stated voluntary drive to tighter WHO standards is more ambitious than near alignment with EU legislation with most member states' 2030 target.

Regarding Lewes Road as a potential Clean Air Pilot scheme, monitoring shows that nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) hotspots in AQMA1-A270 are concentrated around Elm Grove, Vogue Gyratory, Hollingdean Road, and Coombe Terrace, while surrounding schools and suburbs generally experience cleaner air. Air quality between Trinity Street and Inverness Road has improved. In this area we have instigated target measures such as: the Lewes Road Red Route; dedicated cycle lanes; school street schemes; more public EV charging infrastructure; old bendy buses retired after 16 years in 2023; new express services including the 3X and 25X this autumn encouraging fewer car journeys; working with bus operators for a clean fleet – including fully EV buses in the city for 2026, with more to do.

We will show leadership in improving air quality. At the next Enhanced Partnership meeting, I will propose to all of our bus operators that we set a timeline for all buses to meet Euro 6 emissions standards or more citywide, and expand our bus-based ultra-low emission zone (ULEZ) along Lewes Road, up to at least the bus depot, London Road to St Peters and St James' Street. With more ZEBRA funding we could even look at electrifying Lewes Road bus depot and opening up a much cleaner bus fleet in that part of the city.

The Council must stress that improving air quality is not solely our responsibility; residents, local community, businesses, health and educational establishments play a crucial role through behaviour change and consumer choices. Continued reductions in traffic-related NO<sub>2</sub> will deliver significant health benefits. Future initiatives or pilot schemes will be informed by the latest empirical studies to ensure effectiveness and public health benefits. We will look carefully at the experience from other cities with targeted clean air zones, such as Bradford. Any pilot scheme must be evidence-driven, using our publicly available real-time air quality monitoring data. ANPR cameras would provide data on vehicle failure to meet ULEZ standards and help assess zero-emission uptake. Targeted measures will see further improvements called for today. Thank you and we are listening to your call.

55.a13 Councillor Pickett moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Shanks.

55a14 The Mayor moved to put the amendment to the vote.

55.a15 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost and put the recommendation to note the petition as listed in the original report to the vote.

55.a16 **RESOLVED:**

That Council noted the following petitions for debate:

- 1) Investigate the possibility of free public transport for young people in Brighton and Hove'
- 2) 'Reduce Traffic & Air Pollution on Lewes Road'

**56 CALL OVER FOR REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**(a) Callover**

The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

Item 60 – Appointment to Outside Bodies and Partnerships

**(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports**

The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that Items 60 had been reserved for discussion; and confirmed that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

Item 59 – Review of Statement of Licensing Policy 2026

**57 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

57.1 The Mayor noted that written questions from Members and the replies from the appropriate Councillor were taken as read by reference to the list included in the addendum which had been circulated prior to the meeting as detailed below:

**1. Councillor Fishleigh asked:**

Once the current phase of CIL distribution has been finalised, what is the process and timescales for distributing the CIL accrued during 2025? We are ready to spend it in Ovingdean and West Saltdean.

**Response provided by Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration:**

The Better Brighton & Hove Fund is currently consulting on spending circa £750k of CIL receipts accrued since October 2020, with a £230k injection from Citywide CIL to ensure all wards see benefit from development granted across our city.

Due to the level of new development starting, the fund currently has only £40k in total of new receipts across the city, with only just over £468.84 collected in 2025 in Ovingdean and West Saltdean, which will be

distributed to Rottingdean Parish Council. There is therefore insufficient new unallocated neighbourhood CIL receipts to merit a further citywide allocation exercise in the immediate future.

The future plans for the use of CIL receipts over the next 3 years will be considered as part of the medium term financial plan for the council as part of the budget setting for 2026/27. This will include a forward forecast of CIL receipts and a proposal for when to undertake a further round of bids for the Better Brighton & Hove Fund.

**2. Councillor Bagaeen asked:**

TROs 19a-2025 and 19b-2025 – Dyke Close: Residents have been in touch with ourselves and with officers about these TROs and it would be helpful to understand how and why officers created and advertised both TROs without reverting to ward councillors given the furore at the last time the council tried to intervene in this location in November/December 2024 when there was substantial opposition to the proposal for a Light Touch Parking Scheme on Dyke Close which officers would have been aware of.

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you for your question, Cllr Bagaeen, regarding Dyke Close. I appreciate the concerns you have outlined. Changes to road marking, signage, curblines and other aspect of the road are made via a TRO process. These are often in response to local residents, businesses, interest groups and/or highways inspectors safety assessment concerns, including those raised by ward councillors. In general, TRO Minor proposals are not normally notified to Ward Councillors prior to the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Where there are more substantive changes, engagement with respective stakeholders including ward councillors, residents and business, does inform the design. However, all Ward Councillors in affected wards are informed once a TRO is advertised. A weekly email is sent from TRO Support [TRO.Support@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:TRO.Support@brighton-hove.gov.uk) to respective ward councillors and others. This is the opportunity for ward councillors to respond and engage with their constituents as part of the consultation process.

The proposal was included in our most recent traffic regulation order TRO-19b-2025, with a notice period from 31<sup>st</sup> October to 21<sup>st</sup> November 2025.

The request for no waiting restrictions around the island came from a resident in the close who provided information and photographs detailing the issue of motorists obstructing access. This is in the context of the petition presented by residents and received at Full Council on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2023 [Dyke Road Drive is an unsafe road](#) with at least one ward councillor indicating support for this petition at the time. The TRO amendments in response to a safety and access review of Dyke Close following this petition. There has been further correspondence with



local residents and ward councillors since October 2023 and we recognise that this proposal has generated comments from residents, which officers are currently reviewing.

On review of the residents' petition, response at Full Council, and subsequent correspondence, I agree with you that there should have been better prior engagement on the design ahead of going to public consultation in this case. I will ensure that the outcome reflects fairly the public consultation feedback and proceed on that basis.

**3. Councillor Bagaeen asked:**

Parking scheme consultation in Goldstone Crescent, the Nevills, the Orchards and Cranmer Avenue: Could you please share an update on what is the current status and details of plans to consult on a parking scheme in these locations.

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you for your question, Cllr Bagaeen, regarding the parking scheme consultation. It is anticipated that the preliminary round of consultation will take place in spring 2026. Officers will analyse the responses and propose a further detailed design consultation which will indicate the parking arrangements and street layout should a scheme be introduced to the area. The timescale for introducing controlled parking to an area is approximately 18 months, therefore any scheme for the area would likely be implemented during summer/autumn of 2027.

**4. Councillor Theobald asked:**

When is the sports pavilion at Patcham Place going to be reopened so that all the sports clubs can use the changing room and toilet facilities? This sports ground is used all year by cricket and football clubs. They are in great need of these facilities.

**Response provided by Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries:**

The Pavilion programme has been paused due to staff being off on Maternity leave. Unfortunately, we cannot give a timeline on the programme re-starting at this time.

**5. Councillor Theobald asked:**

Vale Avenue Park playground is a target for vandalism and has become a real eyesore. It has had to be retarmacked recently due to the vandalism. Is there new funding available for the playground to be renovated?

**Response provided by Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries:**

Vandalism in Parks is always very sad to see, and something that our community safety colleagues and the police liaise over, through our joint working. Specifically in regard to Vale Park, a decision was taken in 2023 that there were insufficient funds to fully refurbish both Mackie Park play area and Vale park, and therefore it was decided to focus on Mackie Park to ensure that we were able to have a better facility, and one that is only a few minutes walk from Vale Park. We would love to have more facilities across the city, but have had to make decisions to focus our resource in the best and most efficient way possible to maximise play facilities. The refurbishment of Mackie Park was completed in 2024, and is a lovely park, but sadly this does mean that we will no longer be able to maintain a play park in Vale park on a long term basis. There are 2 pieces of equipment left in the park, and these will be removed when they are end of life. We will continue to maintain and focus on the park in Mackie Park. I have passed onto the team your feedback that the area is an eyesore, and will ask our various teams to check the area for any work that needs to be done to address this.

**6. Councillor Meadows asked:**

A speed hump/pedestrian crossing was installed in Winfield Avenue in February 2025. However, it neither slows cars down nor acts as a pedestrian crossing as it doesn't have the line markings of one. This has cost thousands of pounds to install yet is a failure. It has not made it easier for pedestrians – in particular children going to school - to cross the road or reduced the speed of cars. When will this speed hump's effectiveness be investigated and improved? We do not want the same mistake to happen again.

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you, Cllr Meadows, for raising your concerns regarding the raised table installed in February 2025. We appreciate your feedback on its effectiveness for speed reduction and pedestrian safety.

The raised table was designed as a traffic-calming measure rather than a formal pedestrian crossing. A crossing was not installed because surveys indicated a relatively low volume of pedestrians at this location, and experience shows that drivers can become accustomed to not stopping where crossings are provided without sufficient demand.

Monitoring indicates that average vehicle speeds have been reduced since installation from 27 MPH down to 23MPH, which was the primary objective and below the posted speed limit of 30MPH. However, we acknowledge your concerns and will continue to review its performance to ensure it meets safety expectations.

**7. Councillor Meadows asked:**

Patcham & Hollingbury councillors were recently told that, despite applying for a court order, the council is reluctant to move caravans parked at the bottom of Carden Hill because the council would have to pay for their storage or be liable to owners making a claim on the land if their caravan is left there, despite it being close to centres used by children. We were told that “ultimately, although these activities are coordinated through Community Safety, as it’s the landowners/stewards, Parks or Highways who cover the costs of this they make the ultimate decision on the removal of these vehicles.” Clearly this policy, if true, will only make illegal parking more prevalent. Why can’t the council simply enforce the removal of caravans, and tents, from illegal sites following a court order? This lack of enforcement may be leading to tents being pitched illegally across the city.

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you, Cllr Meadows, for your concerns regarding caravans on Carden Hill. The council faces issues with occupied vehicles across the city across Highways, City Parks, Estates and the Seafront.

Officers have been proactively working with community safety teams to come up with a full strategy to address unauthorised encampments which will address both van dwelling and tent encampments. This strategy will be brought to a future cabinet meeting, and will include how we work together across the council to address unauthorised encampment, balancing our support to vulnerable people with our enforcement duties.

To address your specific question: Before officers can remove these vehicles, they require the necessary court authorisation/documentation to move. Often the requisite authorisation is sufficient to instigate removal. However, where this is not forthcoming, officers are limited in the next steps.

The cost to remove these vehicles is significant and even more problematic is the required storage costs if they are simply moved to another part of the city this affects any legal rights to move the vehicles a second time.

**8. Councillor McNair asked:**

When will the central white lines be repainted on Carden Hill? The road was resurfaced in August, and residents have been enquiring for some time without response. And when will the white lines be completed at the entrance to Warmdene Way to avoid it being blocked by parked cars?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

The road surface contractors have been significantly delayed in returning to apply lining to the newly surfaced roads and we apologise for this. Officers are investigating this via our Highways Framework contractual procedures. The central lining was scheduled to be complete on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> December but due to bad weather this has been delayed although the lining required has been marked on site for preparation. The contractors are on standby and lines will be applied as soon as weather allows which officers will be chasing up on.

**9. Councillor McNair asked:**

Much of the crazy paving in the Peace Gardens is a serious trip hazard. It would be very easy to trip and fall a couple of feet from the raised walkway into the sunken garden where the paving is completely missing. In order to avoid residents getting injured, when will the worst areas be repaired?

**Response provided by Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries:**

The repair request has been raised as a H&S concern and sent to our Premises team for quotation and immediate repair.

**10. Councillor Lyons asked:**

Trees are being removed in residential streets within Hove Park vicinity for a variety of reasons, causing distress to residents as lost trees are not being replaced. If funding is an issue, can't the council approach local garden centres to provide saplings that could have a small advertising board attached "supplied by xyz garden centres"? When will residents be allowed to donate a tree outside their home?

**Response provided by Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries:**

Thank you for the question and the ideas that you have suggested to replace some of our trees that are sadly being removed due to tree disease. We have a fantastic and skilled Arboriculture team who work tirelessly and proactively to protect our wonderful trees across the city. I will pass the ideas you have regarding garden centres and other local businesses to our arboriculture team, and also to our events team who will be exploring how we work closely with local businesses to improve the look and feel of our city however there are biosecurity issues with using plants from garden centres and also suitability in terms of species, form, age and quality of the trees sold. We strongly discourage residents from planting their own trees upon the street scene due in part for these reasons but also the very real safety concerns around residents digging in ground containing underground services such as electricity, gas and water. In the meantime, the council has a scheme available through the Tree Trust, where residents can request to have a tree planted in a park. Replacing

street trees is more complex due to the tree pits that often require expensive work to repair both the pit and surrounding pavement. There are a number of examples where residents have raised money to replace street trees, and this can be discussed with our parks service, or our partners from the CPRE via their 'Plant Your Postcode' initiative, if there are specific examples. Also, we currently have the consultation open for the Better Brighton & Hove Fund, and many wards are suggesting using those funds for street tree planting. The consultation is open until the end of the year, and it would be a good idea to make suggestions through that route, so we can consider additional tree planting to replace street trees alongside other suggestions.

**11. Councillor Lyons asked:**

Residents within the Nevill Rd, Nevill Ave & the closes have been asking for a Parking Consultation for some time now. In addition, residents in Woodland Drive are calling for additional parking measures. Noting the Parking Scheme Priority timetable was agreed earlier this year & that Officers are working on the detail of the consultation – householders are asking when ward councillors in Westdene & Hove Park will be consulted for the promised meeting to discuss the boundary of the scheme.

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you for your question, Cllr Lyons, regarding the parking scheme consultation. It's anticipated that the preliminary round of consultation will take place in spring 2026. Officers will analyse the responses and propose a further detailed design consultation which will indicate the parking arrangements and street layout should a scheme be introduced to the area. The timescale for introducing controlled parking to an area is approximately 18 months, therefore any scheme for the area would likely be implemented during summer/autumn of 2027. Officers will arrange to meet with Ward Councillors early in the new year to discuss the boundary and details of the scheme.

**12. Councillor Lyons asked:**

I have received a steady number of complaints as to the number of dogs being walked by any one person in Waterhall. Only this week, a resident contacted me who came across a group of three walkers that had 22 dogs with them. Trying to get past them was not pleasant for the resident who felt intimidated. Further on, another two walkers had 20 dogs between them. Once again, the resident had to stand still until the walkers got control of them. Can BHC consider implementing a Public Space Protection Order? I understand many councils impose a maximum of 4 dogs for the general public & potentially more for professional dog walkers, which can also be capped by their insurance.

**Response provided by Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries:**

Thank you for raising concerns about the number of dogs being walked at Waterhall. We are aware of recent reports of very large groups and understand how this can feel intimidating for residents.

Brighton & Hove currently has a number of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) and these are scheduled for review during 2026. In light of the situation at Waterhall and ongoing discussions about responsible ownership and dogfree areas (including at Blakers Park), we will keep this under active review and consider whether there is a case to consult on introducing limits as part of that programme.

In the meantime, we will write to ward councillors to ask whether they have received similar complaints and gather evidence to inform options. Thank you again for highlighting this; we will update you following that initial engagement.

**13. Councillor Lyons asked:**

A resident contacted me recently disappointed & distressed to discover that graffiti had been scrawled on their private property that is not offensive but not covered by the council. To keep Brighton and Hove clean, this sort of thing should be dealt with quickly to prevent reoccurrence.

The going market rate for private cleaning is circa £100+, which falls neatly under most household insurance excess.

Surely the Council could use a certain amount of discretion when deeming what should be cleaned or not on private property?

**Response provided by Councillor Rowkins, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Net Zero & Environmental Services:**

The Council recognises the impact graffiti has on the city's appearance and residents' concerns. A Graffiti Action Plan has recently been agreed at Cabinet, which sets out how we will improve the city's look and feel. This includes working in partnership with community groups and businesses to prevent graffiti and exploring commercial contracts to remove graffiti from commercial properties.

However, the Council does not currently have a dedicated budget to remove graffiti from all private residential properties. Our priority is to focus resources on public spaces and high-visibility areas. We encourage residents to report graffiti so we can monitor trends and target prevention efforts. In the meantime, we are committed to working collaboratively to reduce graffiti across Brighton & Hove.

**14. Councillor Hill asked:**

Does the administration support the pressure group Compass's campaign to elect the Sussex & Brighton Mayor through the Supplementary Vote system rather than First Past the Post which is currently proposed for Mayoral elections in May 2026? Compass have also suggested delaying the election until May 2027 to align with local elections.

**Response provided by Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council & Cabinet Chair:**

The government has announced their intention to postpone the mayoral elections in 4 of the Devolution Priority Programme areas, including Sussex and Brighton, until 2028. We are working with West Sussex County Council and East Sussex County Council to engage government Ministers and officials to work through the detail of what this means for Sussex and Brighton. We will update members when we have more information to share, including about election timing.

The English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill that is currently going through Parliament seeks to move Mayoral elections to the Supplementary Vote system. Subject to parliamentary approval, this would be in place for elections that take place in 2027 and beyond.

The administration is supportive of the Supplementary Vote system for the Mayoral elections to provide greater legitimacy for the mayor, promote consensus building and strengthen public trust.

**15. Councillor Hill asked:**

On the surface, the new budget announcement to absorb council SEND debts is welcome. However, concerns remain about how this is to be paid for, with fears it will result in either less funding for schools or by making it harder to get an EHCP. Is there any information the administration has regarding this? Can it also lobby the government to support local schools with this?

**Response provided by Councillor Daniel, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Youth Services:**

At present, we only have the headline announcement. Detailed funding mechanisms are expected in future Treasury or Department for Education guidance. The announcement is positive in principle but accept that uncertainties remain about funding and implementation. Through the implementation of any new funding mechanism, we would want to ensure that our city schools are not financially disadvantaged and that our children with SEND continue to receive the support they need to access their education.

**16. Councillor Hill asked:**

It is good to see the administration's support for a tourist tax in the city. Therefore, can I encourage the administration and all members to lobby Mayoral candidates to allow our city to implement a tourist tax in their manifestos since the government has given the strategic authority powers to implement this?

**Response provided by Councillor Miller, Cabinet Member for Culture, Heritage & Tourism:**

Thank you for emphasising the significance of Government's recent announcement regarding tourism levies. As you are aware, the Government has initiated a consultation on the design and implementation of a modest overnight visitor levy for Mayoral Strategic Authorities, with the potential to expand these powers further. Brighton & Hove City Council will participate in this consultation to ensure our city's interests are well-represented.

We hope for bipartisan support for our position from the candidates for Mayor of Sussex and Brighton. Tourism is crucial to our economy, and a well-structured levy, like those in Europe, would support sustainable investment in our city.

**17. Councillor Shanks asked:**

Would the cabinet agree that one of the major issues for people taking up employment is the poverty trap of the benefits system. A previous council passed a motion to support a pilot of Universal Basic Income for Creative Workers. Will you agree to revisit this idea as part of the Get Sussex Working Plan?

**Response provided by Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration:**

The Get Sussex Working Plan addresses key issues set out in the Government's Get Britain Working White Paper which included young people not in employment, education and training, unfilled vacancies due to labour and skills shortages, and labour market exclusion. The Get Sussex Working Plan is designed to reduce economic inactivity and increase long-term employment by taking a whole-system approach across employment, health, post-16 education, and skills. Whilst the Creative Worker Income Guarantee (CWIG) pilot is not within the action plan recently published, it is a living document, which will be reviewed and updated to ensure we can respond and benefit from national funding and policy initiatives as they continue to evolve.

**18. Councillor West asked:**

The Administration heralded their summer Park & Ride scheme with much fanfare, but I would like to understand whether it was value for money or made a significant difference to the number of vehicles heading into the



city. Please can you provide an analysis of the costs and the usage of the scheme, in particular including the number of days it was operating, how many journeys were made and the number of users and the data regarding the number of car journeys estimated to have been avoided into the City?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you for your question, Cllr West, regarding our Summer Park & Ride.

Your question seems to be based on the expectation that our initial summer Park & Ride scheme must demonstrate value for money and have a substantial impact from the off to be a success. It is worth bearing in mind that Oxford's Park & Ride scheme began life as a temporary scheme from a motel car park. From these beginnings it is now a multi-site operation with over 2,000 parking spaces. Oxford's Park & Ride scheme is undoubtedly having a substantial impact on congestion when the initial scheme did not.

To be clear, the summer Park & Ride scheme was implemented as a trial so we can learn lessons, understand potential demand, and use these to build the business case for a permanent facility. Even successful and well-established Park & Ride facilities do not tend to make profit, rather they benefit the city by making it an easy and attractive place to visit and through reducing congestion. For many cities Park & Ride is subsidised and is a key element of the mix of transport interventions.

The criteria for implementing environmental improvements should not be solely about making money or expect all visitors who drive to choose it from the off. Rather, a scheme that can benefit the wider city environment including air quality, reduced traffic congestion as well as benefiting the visitor experience needs to consider more holistic costs and benefits and take time to bed in. If the criteria for success of an environmental improvement is whether it is profitable or not by itself, then this limits the wider benefits of innovation which was tested as part of this Park & Ride trial.

The summer 2025 Park & Ride operated for 7 days in August. The first three Sundays, the Saturday, Sunday and Monday of the bank holiday weekend and the last Saturday. The dates had to work around existing commitments the University of Sussex had, such as parking for football matches.

A dedicated bus service was provided at a frequency of 4 buses per hour between 9am and 9pm. This meant that on a typical day there were 88 bus journeys (43 to the city centre and 45 from the city centre). On average there were 226 people using the service each day. The number of people using the scheme steadily grew as awareness of the summer scheme grew. On the bank holiday weekend there were over 300 people using the scheme each day with a peak of 347 people on 25 Aug. From my site visit with BHCC officers to Portsmouth as part of the research for our scheme, any permanent facility would take 3-4 years to become established in terms of patronage and it would see significant growth over this period as

awareness of it grew. The summer Park & Ride was priced competitively, with a car full of people being able to park all day and travel to and from the city for £7. Parking for Blue Badge holders was free, in line with existing arrangements at University of Sussex. The overall cost of the scheme was around £52,000. This cost includes signage, marketing, stewarding the site, the bus service itself and market research on the buses. The scheme took £3,829 income.

We do not have information on what percentage of visitors this represents to the city on any given day. We know that Park & Ride schemes start small before growing into their full potential as awareness grows.

We know from our market research, which had a high response rate covering around a third of users, that 81% would have driven by car/van to the city anyway, and 4% would have used bus, 7% train and 3% other modes. Five percent of Park & Ride users surveyed stated that they would not have come to the city at all without the Park & Ride.

The summer Park & Ride has provided key learnings for taking forward Park & Ride in the city, ensuring value for money is offered in terms of learning more about demand, journey origins of users and operational considerations, prior to implementing a permanent site.

This trial has value beyond the financial and given the city environment is precious, determining whether to proceed with a scheme solely on profit seems not to value the city's residents or its environment. After some 2 decades without a dedicated official Park & Ride and the lack of political will or leadership to enable this, it is about time we got started. The innovative approach adopted this summer is to benefit the whole and drive forward environmental change that many residents, businesses and visitors long to see.

**19. Councillor Sykes asked:**

The proposed Western red route as published for consultation shows no loading bays between Little Western Street and Brunswick Street East. There are at least 10 hospitality businesses on the south side of this stretch of Western Road including two grassroots music venues. The council has historically recognised the importance of grassroots arts venues to the city's character. Without any provision for loading and unloading, and for receiving stock deliveries, these venues may no longer be viable. Can this be revisited?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you, Cllr Sykes, for your question. Officers have visited the area several times along with colleagues in Road Safety to assess which parts of the carriageway are suitable for loading / disabled provision. On the northern side on this stretch is a long bus stop, and road safety's initial

view is that provision on the south side would not be appropriate. However, we will look at this area again to see if a solution can be found.

**20. Councillor Sykes asked:**

Can the Administration inform on its progress with the two actions agreed under item 46b (amended Notice of Motion on Gaza and council financial exposure) of the meeting of Council on 13th Oct 2025?

**Response provided by Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration:**

We have been compiling information in respect of any exposure to companies on the OHCHR list, and a report will come to Cabinet early in the New Year.

**21. Councillor Sykes asked:**

Western Road red route: How will the Transport Lead use consultation response figures to inform a decision on the proposed red route and will a simple majority of 'votes in favour' or 'votes against' effectively make the decision? How will petition figures be taken into consideration?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you, Cllr Sykes, for your question. Comments in the consultation will be considered via the relevant member process when discussing and agreeing the way forward. Consultation feedback is an important part of gauging public opinion and help us to assess which areas may need attention. Whilst the consultation is important other factors will be taken into consideration such as petitions. We can identify any double counting via the Your Voice consultation as respondents are asked for their name and address. Petitions are treated separately. Much of the feedback via the public consultation will be in response to the detail of the co-designed scheme and whether key features, such as position of loading bays and the number of disability parking bays are acceptable rather than a binary view of the scheme as a whole. A fair outcome reflective of how it can best serve the community will be derived from the consultation process.

**22. Councillor Pickett asked:**

A number of residents that have gardens have said that they do not want food waste bins as they already have their own compost areas. Why wasn't there an option to opt out of food waste bins that would have saved the council money on materials and unnecessary collections where bins are not being used?

**Response provided by Councillor Rowkins, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Net Zero & Environmental Services:**

In the same way as other bins, food waste caddies are issued to the property rather than the resident, and future residents may require the service. There are seasons when home composting is not effective. Food composting requires a mix of brown and green material. In summer green predominates and in winter brown predominates. Food waste caddies allow the option of providing materials not suited to the season rather than run home composters sub optimally, the cost of collecting, sterilising and reissuing the bins would be more than the value of the bin itself. Unwanted collections are avoided simply by residents not putting their caddy out.

**23. Councillor Pickett asked:**

With flooding in built up urban areas becoming more of an issue as our climate changes, when will the council initiate a policy that sets out rules for paving over gardens that include keeping a percentage porous?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

In 2008, Government introduced Permitted Development (PD) rights that allowed single householders to pave their front garden with a hardstanding. Planning permission would not be required if a new or replacement driveway used permeable material. If the surface to be covered is more than 5 square metres planning permission will be needed for laying traditional, impermeable driveways that do not provide for the water to run to a permeable area.

Policy DM43 of Brighton & Hove City Plan Part Two requires the design and layout of all new buildings, and the development of car parking and hard standing to incorporate appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems. Where applicable, we will review applications for drop kerb installation in relation to paving over garden space for car parking and will provide guidance to ensure adherence with this policy.

When assessing applications for a driveway or landscaping of an area as part of a new development conditions are attached to require hard landscaping to be permeable.

A new connection to a sewer for drainage of a paved area would require a permit or consent from Southern Water and/or Brighton & Hove City Council. If there is an unauthorised connection to sewer, this could be subject to prosecution and fines.

**24. Councillor Goldsmith asked:**

Last October I asked about additional cycle hangars in the city and was told that the installation of further hangars would be kept under review. Most hangars in the city are full, and I know that many people are still on wait lists to be able to use them. Despite having many flats that make safely storing bikes safely either difficult or impossible, Regency has a very

low number of cycle hangers, especially in the city centre, and I regularly get asked by residents if more can be installed. Would you commit to at least producing a report, assessing the cost implications of introducing enough hangers to match the current needs of residents, so a decision can be made by cabinet?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

Thank you, Cllr Goldsmith, for your question. It is fantastic to see the cycle hangars being well used. I am aware there are requests to expand these and would like more people to benefit from a cycle hangar. However, as well as the one-off cost of supplying the hangar, we do need to consider the ongoing costs of maintenance and officer time in administering the service.

In April 2025, the cycle hangar service was brought in-house. Officers plan to report to Cabinet in 2026 with a review of this service including costs and future operational plans to ensure it is sustainable moving forward. As part of this review, we will look at the distribution of demand and viability of expanding the service where it is most called for.

**25. Councillor McLeay asked:**

The recent e-scooter consultation highlighted that many older people faced barriers to participating online and did not manage to find an alternative way to have their views recorded. In Age UK's April 2025 response to the Digital Inclusion Action Plan, they called for a legal right to offline access to public services. What steps will Brighton & Hove City Council take to ensure older residents, who may be digitally excluded, can fully engage in future consultations, through accessible formats such as telephone, postal surveys, and in-person opportunities?

**Response provided by Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Customer Services & Public Realm:**

The council's Engagement Framework follows the Gunning Principles which includes principles on accessibility and ability to respond. We actively encourage services to design inclusive consultation and engagement activities, particularly considering service users and all those that could be involved or affected because of a consultation outcome and that includes providing alternative formats including translations.

Consultations and engagement activities are promoted widely to raise awareness of opportunities, including with specific equalities groups.

Digital engagement remains one of the most accessible options and our Your Voice platform follows UK accessibility regulations and offers translations. The spread of digital literacy is the most democratising innovations to civil society, and we should not pretend otherwise.

Telephone, postal surveys and in-person opportunities present their own accessibility challenges – therefore a sensible array of opportunities is the best approach to ensuring everyone and anyone can engage with public consultations.

**26. Councillor Wilkinson asked:**

St James's Street remains one of our city's most vibrant and diverse areas, but ongoing issues with anti-social behaviour, visible drug use, and related criminal activity continue to affect residents, businesses, and visitors. These challenges put pressure on local services and undermine confidence in the safety and wellbeing of the neighbourhood.

Residents and stakeholders have repeatedly raised concerns and are asking the council to take a proactive role in improving public safety. One commonly suggested measure is fixed CCTV, both as a deterrent and to support enforcement and investigations.

Will the administration commit to working closely with residents, local businesses, Sussex Police, and ward councillors to explore what a council-led public safety plan for the St James's Street area could look like, including the possible role of CCTV?

This would show the community that their concerns are taken seriously and that the council is committed to practical, effective solutions.

**Response provided by Councillor Czolak:**

The council fully recognises that the issues affecting St James's street are long-standing, complex and deeply frustrating for residents and businesses. Antisocial behaviour, street crime, public safety concerns and the wider impacts linked to substance misuse require more than isolated or short-term interventions, and the council agrees that visible leadership and a coordinated response are essential.

Like other similarly busy areas, St James's Street is known to be a hotspot for antisocial behaviour and street crime. When this occurs, the area is reviewed by the Joint Area Action Group for targeted multi-agency activity. Experience shows that increased and focused police and enforcement activity leads to a reduction in both antisocial behaviour and street crime.

There are four council-operated public space CCTV cameras covering St James's Street, with footage accessible to both the Council and Sussex Police. While the council primarily monitors these cameras for traffic management, Sussex Police also have access, as well as access to footage from a substantial number of CCTV systems operated by licensed premises along the street, which are routinely used to support crime and antisocial behaviour investigations. There are no plan for additional council public space CCTV cameras as this would not significantly enhance the police's ability to investigate crime or manage antisocial behaviour.

However, any joined-up plan may wish to keep this under consideration should this change.

The council remains committed to working collaboratively with ward councillors, Sussex Police, commissioned drug and alcohol safety partners and local stakeholders to address the underlying causes of the issues in the area. To support this, we will look to organise a meeting early in the new year to develop a joined-up plan that improves public safety, supports vulnerable individuals, and delivers practical, visible improvements for local residents and businesses.

**27. Councillor Wilkinson asked:**

Ultra Low Emission Zone for Buses: St James's Street is a vital part of our city centre, home to a busy shopping area, a diverse residential community, and a major bus corridor used by people every day.

Despite this, the street is not currently included in Brighton & Hove's existing Ultra Low Emission Zone for buses. The continued exposure to harmful pollutants affects some of our most vulnerable residents - including older people, young children, and those with long-term health conditions, and could be strengthened to align with the Council's wider commitments to improving public health and air quality.

Will the Cabinet Member commit to reviewing the feasibility of extending the city's current ULEZ zone to include St James's Street, and to bring forward options that would deliver measurable improvements to air quality in this part of the city centre?

**Response provided by Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

I am pleased to report that St James's Street already benefits from the existing bus based Ultra Low Emission Zone, which goes from Palmeira Square, along Western Road and North Street to Castle Square. All scheduled buses which run through this route, and then along St James's Street are required to be Euro VI standard or higher, such as fully electric. There is an additional requirement within the ULEZ for buses to switch off their engines if they expect to be stationary at bus stops for more than 1 minute. However, the vast majority of buses are not stationary at bus stops for longer than 1 minute here.

Because of the success of our ULEZ in place since 2015, driving the change that residents wish to see, we are prepared to review the extent of the Bus ULEZ and consider whether this should extend further east and north.

We are focused on improving air quality and are committed to a data led approach. We have a network of air quality monitors in place with public online access to their data. This data informs our targeted approach to

improve air quality and reduce impacts on public health. We are developing targeted policy to drive improvements in traffic related air quality through incentivising cleaner vehicles with low or zero tailpipe emissions and improving infrastructure to enable this, including in the St James' Street area of the city.

## 58 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

58.1 The mayor noted that oral questions had been submitted and that 30 minutes was set aside for the duration of the item. She asked that both the questioner and responder endeavour to keep their questions and answers brief, to enable the questions listed to be taken. The mayor moved on to question 2 in the absence of the presenter for Question 1.

### 2. Councillor McNair asked:

Residents have been contacting us about the poor food waste collections. Residents have been told to put food waste out by 5am, but it's not collected until 9:15pm. Food waste collections have also been missed quite often.

What is the council doing to improve reliability of this service?

### Reply from Councillor Rowkins, Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Net Zero & Environmental Services:

The launch of our food waste collections has been very successful, actually. It's surpassed even our most optimistic assumptions in terms of uptake. Obviously, being a new service, the reliability of the collections has been a major focus and, of course out of 73,000 properties now that have weekly food waste collections, of course there's going to be a handful that missed and some issues getting the service up and running.

But as far as reliability goes, I would say it's been pretty successful and and you know, zooming out, not just with food waste, but reminding ourselves of where we are now on the collection service more generally; now that we've got the 73,000 households covered by food waste collections every week we collect about 190,000 collections of various waste streams around the city and just the last few weeks of data just to illustrate that out of out of those 190,000: the first week of November we collected 99.9% on time, the second week of November 98.8%, the third week 99.4%, the 4th week 98%, and the first week of December 98.7%.

We're not finished yet, we want to get to zero missed collections, but we're routinely collecting 98 or 99% of waste now. And crucially, we know what we've missed straight away without residents having to report it because of the technology that we've put in to replace the scraps of paper that the service was running on when we took over in May 2023.

### Councillor McNair asked a supplementary question:



Residents have contacted us as the number of boxes being put out by residents is going down. Some streets only have 13 boxes put out of 100 houses.

What is the council doing to increase uptake of food collections?

**Councillor Rowkins replied:**

Like I said, uptake was well above what we modelled. Typically when you introduce a new service like food waste like this, you tend to get something like 50% uptake to begin with. In the in the first week or two of phase one, we were looking at more like 60 to 70%. So there might be individual streets where uptake hasn't been great but on the whole all the data I've seen has been very good. Obviously this is on the back of expanding recycling earlier this year. Next year, once we've got all of the additional waste streams that we're adding to recycling, we're going to be really sort of going hard on the behaviour change and the messaging on you know, this is now what recycling and waste looks like in Brighton & Hove and really going hard to maximise that uptake.

**3. Councillor Fishleigh asked:**

This question is about the covenant on the land in West Saltdean, which was subject of a Notice of Motion and a deputation at the October Full Council.

Please would you tell us how officers are getting on with investigating what action the council can take with regard to enforcing the covenant, and when should we expect to see the first draft of their report?

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

We've spent a fair bit of time on this since it was last discussed in this chamber following the Notice of Motion, and that includes seeking legal advice in relation to the 1938 covenant, which I think is fair to say probably doesn't have the rigorous wording that one would expect of a modern legal document. Officers are currently working on the report to Cabinet, but it's my intention to keep residents and ward councillors updated along the way so you don't have to wait for that report, so that you're in the loop on that.

I just want to shout out and say thanks to Mr. Roughsedge for helping us to identify the new owner because I think, we were exchanging a few miles earlier, the Land Registry has not yet updated with the new owner. So that's been very helpful to get not just the name of that owner, but indeed the contact details. So thank you very much to him for that and we'll be reaching out to that new owner to start a dialogue shortly.

I also just want to say thanks to you, to ward councillors, as well as residents in the area for taking the time to actually show me around and talk through the issues and everything. I think with all of these things, it comes alive much more when you can actually see it with your own two eyes. It was very clear to me after that visit that the patch is very highly valued and used by the community that surrounds it and I'll certainly continue to support residents and ward councillors in protecting the space.

**4. Councillor Helliwell asked:**

Earlier this year, the council carried out a public consultation on improving School Streets through the use of ANPR cameras. Could you update us on the outcome of that consultation and on the progress of the associated application to the Department of Transport for additional powers to make our streets and school gates safer.

I'm particularly interested in this in relation to helping to solve the parking issues around Peter Gladwin School and Hill Park School in Portslade.

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

School Streets schemes are proven to establish safer environments at school gates, removing hazards of moving vehicles, creating a much safer environment for children, parents and carers to gather, and with it encourage more active travel and public transport to and from the school gate, notably with improvement to air quality. So vital for children, adults and public health. Moreover the school gate is where there are a number of pupils with additional access needs. Cars at the school gates block access for those who most need them.

Thanks to the Labour government, new guidance was issued last year for new School Streets to have ANPR cameras to enforce, rather than being solely reliant on volunteers and school staff. However, gaining moving traffic powers was not seen as a priority to previous administrations, so at the time we couldn't respond agile to that.

So earlier this year we consulted residents, asking should we apply for such powers. The consultation indicated a high level of resident support for introducing safer school streets using ANPR monitoring rather than sole reliance on volunteers and staff. To implement this, the council had to apply for moving traffic powers from the government, which we did in July. I'm happy to inform everybody here that we received notification from the Department of Transport that the application has been successful and those powers have been granted by central government to this authority which came into effect from last Tuesday 9th of December 2025. That means we can move forward with this scheme.

We're now looking to begin with a pilot scheme in one school street before rolling it out to more schools next year. When we're ready to announce more details about this pilot, we'll update further.

**5. Councillor Shanks asked:**

Despite the unanimous vote of the Scrutiny Committee, perhaps the council could tell me why the library cuts were proceeded with in the last Cabinet meeting?

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

The Scrutiny recommendations were referenced in the Cabinet report, in spite of Councillor Shanks not being able to find them to start with. This was part of the decision making process, but this was alongside other considerations such as the needs and usage analysis in the EIA.

**Councillor Shanks asked a supplementary question:**

The supplementary might really be to the Chairs of Scrutiny, but in view of the disregard of scrutiny in this case, I'm asking really what is the point of spending a long time scrutinising something which the cabinet members have already decided to put through? I don't know if the Chair of Scrutiny would like to answer that, but Councillor Robins has already answered that they decided not to do it. He hasn't explained to me why they ignored it despite a lot of people being against it.

**Councillor Robins replied:**

Councillor Shanks is quite right. I did say that it was considered along with other considerations. It was considered. It came, it was put forward, it was considered and a decision was made by Cabinet. That's the way it should be working, surely that proves that scrutiny is working rather than it's not working.

**6. Councillor Meadows asked:**

Last year the 46 bus did not get round to large parts of Hollingbury for five days because of a lack of gritting. This meant that many people were prisoners in their own homes.

Can we be reassured that this year and early 2026, if there is snowfall, this bus route will be kept clear and well gritted?

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport and City Infrastructure:**

We absolutely are prepared for the winter gritting. We've actually done a huge amount in improving our services this year. So we've actually gone to a dedicated team from a highways contractor, RJ Dance, to carry out all weather gritting operations. This moves from reliance on pulling from our Environmental Services refuse operations which we had last year, and previously affected the collection of refuse. So we're definitely improving that.

We're also aware that last year we had some problems with that particular bus service and we've made those improvements, working with a new operator and we've seen significant improvements with the reliability data already. We've seen improvements there.

So we are expecting a much better service from the bus service and from our gritting teams.

**Councillor Meadows asked a supplementary question:**

Will the council ensure that all the yellow grit bins are full across Hollingbury and Patcham in the high areas, as residents can then help grit the roads where necessary?

**Councillor Muten replied:**

You'll be very pleased to know we've actually done an audit of the 400 grit bins which the public are welcome to use, and we have checked all of these bins in preparation for winter and have filled any that were empty.

In severe weather, we do grit outside destinations such as hospitals, and the public are welcome to use the salt on the highway near their own properties and those of their neighbours. We audit grit bins, for instance we inspected 50 bins in Withdean in October this year, including the condition of the bin and the salt levels and we do that across the city. So yes, I'll give some level of assurance that we're in a good place ready for winter.

**7. Councillor Earthey asked:**

Given the resource constraints on the NHS and exponential rise in healthcare costs, it is essential that frontline diagnostic services, especially GP surgeries, are made as efficient as possible and do not fail to diagnose conditions which, if developed unchecked, become very costly or impossible to treat.

What practical steps are the Labour administration taking to encourage the effective, widespread adoption of Jess's Rule across the city's NHS GP surgeries?

**Reply from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care:**

So just to explain what Jess's Rule is: it's a new UK patient safety initiative for GPs in England, introduced recently, requiring them to pause and critically reevaluate a patient's care if they present with the same symptoms or concerns three times without a clear diagnosis or improvement. Named after Jesscia Brady, it encourages a reflect, review, rethink approach to catch serious illnesses like cancer sooner, aiming to prevent tragic, preventable, deaths by ensuring persistent symptoms are not missed.

Although this is something for GPs, rather than the council, it would be a very good subject for our council's Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as then we will get the opportunity to properly understand how our local GPs are putting Jess's Rule into practice, and I'll be putting this idea forward to the committee Chair, my colleague Councillor Wilkinson.

**Councillor Earthey asked a supplementary question:**

My question is prompted by the observation that funding for the NHS may not always be going to the right places. Underfunding primary care only serves to place big, unnecessary, burdens on secondary and tertiary care. So, for the sake of a modest increase in resources of GPs, Jess may not have been turned away multiple times, and sadly she's not alone. So thus we cannot pay lip-service to Jess's Rule.

So my supplementary question that you may have already half answered is: please can you assure this Chamber that the Labour administration will not pay lip-service to Jess's Rule, that you will do whatever you can to enforce it across the city's GP surgeries, with HOSC or wherever, and you will lobby central government to improve the funding of frontline diagnostic services.

**Councillor Alexander replied:**

Yes. Just to repeat that we will be looking at it for Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and maybe it might be something that the Health and Wellbeing Board can look at as well, so I shall be putting that to Councillor Faiza as well to see if that's something that will fit in. You can take my insurance, we will make sure that Jess's Rule takes place and is understood and worked on properly.

**8. Councillor De Oliveira asked:**

Have you closed anymore libraries this week?

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

No.

**Councillor De Oliveira asked a supplementary question:**

With public services like libraries being cut, the cost of living still high and opposition councillor is not having much access to scrutinise the upcoming budget. Will residents' council tax still go up next year?

**Councillor Robins replied:**

We can't give you an insight into the budget until we know what's fully in it. I didn't quite understand what you were asking. Are you asking that I guarantee that no changes will happen again next year?

Maybe it's best if you email me your query and I can answer it fully and properly for you.

**9. Councillor Sheard asked:**

We all know that after 14 years of austerity and budget, squeezing officers are covering the tasks once done by three or four. To give them a fighting chance, can the administration stress that it's embracing the rapid development of AI technology to support our staff in new ways of delivering services for our city?

**Reply from Councillor Allen, Cabinet member for Customer Services & Public Realm:**

Our council is confronting financial pressures without precedent. Recognising both the severity of our circumstances, but also the massive strides that have happened recently in emerging technologies, recently we launched a bold set of pilot schemes titled Turbo

Charging Innovation. The radical and ambitious programme had the purpose to test innovative technologies, which we can find at high speed, to identify which ones could improve delivery of services whilst also mitigating the impact of increasing costs.

We're now reviewing the data of these pilots and I'm expecting to receive a full report in the early part of January. But preliminary findings look very promising and with projections showing the potential for millions of pounds worth of savings in the upcoming budget.

These will manifest in several ways, particularly through technology cutting the cost of service delivery; removing laborious, repetitive administrative tasks from officers; and allowing us to redeploy more staff to frontline of customer services, cutting waiting times and speeding up responsiveness to residents.

These technologies also help us spot and cut fraud; recover council debt more effectively; and pre-identify people with emerging needs to act to prevent more complex and costly problems at source; cutting the cost of external contracts; making more intelligent decisions; and making them quicker and cutting waiting times on calls, emails and other customer service interactions.

We are the party of Labour in administration here, and as part of that we want to equip our staff to have the tools they need to do the best work they can for the residents of our city. Hence why this will be a key pillar for us going forward. This is the kind of bold, creative and positive leadership that the people of Brighton & Hove expect and we plan to be a pioneering and exemplary local authority in this field.

**Councillor Sheard asked a supplementary question:**

Other local authorities are also embracing this technological revolution. To put it bluntly, we are not alone. To this end, can Councillor Allen elaborate on how the administration is learning from these other local authorities in their use of AI?

**Councillor Allen replied:**

Yes, my eminent friend, Councillor Sheard, is absolutely right - other local authorities have been looking at this area as well. In September I met with officers from Peterborough City Council to talk about some of their pioneering artificial intelligence work. We've also been doing in-depth learnings from Derby City Council and North Northamptonshire Council, who are also leading the way in this area.

In the pilots I mentioned earlier, we started from a pool of 700 ideas and about a third of those were ideas already being incorporated into the general day-to-day practice of other local authorities. So it's certainly something that we are not the first to catch on to.

**Question 10 was not asked and the mayor moved on to question 11.**

**11. Councillor Lyons asked:**

What lessons have been learned from last year to keep our city moving during the winter cold spells?

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport and City Infrastructure:**

My response to Councillor Meadows on her question about winter bus services in Hollingbury was mostly about winter gritting so excuse any overlap. We've changed the way we deliver our winter service this year. We've improved operations for both environmental services and with the gritting service. This year, we're using a dedicated team from our highways contractor, RJ Dance, to carry out all winter grittings operations. This moves from reliance on our environmental services refuse operations, which in the past have affected the collection of refuse. A win-win for residents.

We've redeveloped the Black Rock Depot to accommodate the service and a base for the service to store its gritting vehicles, salt and equipment needed. We have 300 tonnes of grit, with more available on stand-by. More than enough. Last year we used around 200 tonnes of grit the entire winter period. This year we have four main gritting routes and four vehicles which are to be used by contractors to grit the roads. That's more than last year. We saw our first snowfall on 19<sup>th</sup> November, and we've successfully gritted the roads multiple times already. The contractors are on standby 24/7 and we respond to changes to weather at short notice. The service runs from the beginning of November to end of March, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, when it's needed and we got great weather forecast to inform us about this. So yeah we're doing really well.

**Councillor Lyons asked a supplementary question:**

Can you assure residents in the north of the city, such as Westdene, that they won't be treated as second-class citizens for gritting services?

**Councillor Muten replied:**

So we'd like to treat them as first class citizens as we do all our residents. We have 400 grit bins that the public are welcome to use. We have done an audit of grit bins, for instance, we inspected 50 bins in Withdean in October this year, including condition of bin and salt levels. We identified eight of those bins in poor condition. We started replacements across the city in October and all will be completed by this month. So yes, I'm confident we will treat all our residents as first class citizens when it comes to making sure that the pavements and pathways are gritted as well as the roads.

**12. Councillor Czolak asked:**

I was recently contacted by a resident who wished to bring to my attention a campaign nationally around Motor Neurone Disease and the challenge that's faced across the UK in ensuring access to timely and affordable home adaptations under the Disabled Facilities Grant.

I wonder if you could let me know what the average time frame for both simple and complex adaptations currently are?

**Reply from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care:**

The Disabled Facilities Grant is designed to support a wide spectrum of needs for individuals with disabilities and as such we don't prioritise one long term condition over another. While we fully recognise this significant impact of conditions such as Motor Neurone Disease, it is important to note that progression and severity of such illnesses can vary greatly between individuals. For example, someone with Multiple Sclerosis or Parkinsons' Disease may present with needs that are more advanced and debilitating at the point of referral than an individual with an early-stage MND diagnosis. So to ensure fairness and consistency, our approach is to assess each case based on the evidence provided at the time of referral. Where there is a clear rationale to prioritise, due to presenting needs or associated risks, the team will act accordingly regardless of the specific condition.

So really, to answer your question, waiting times for works to commence for major adaptations are approximately three to five months and we appreciate that this can be challenging for applicants and their families, but we remain committed to managing referrals in a way that is fair and responsive to the most urgent needs.

**13. Councillor Pickett:**

As I noted before, the government's Environment Improvement Plan contains worrying statistics that evidence a clear correlation between air pollution and illness and death. The WHO have stated that there is no safe level of air pollution with regard to PM2.5.

With this information in mind, when will the administration change tack from advising people not to use wood burners and instead use alternative means, perhaps with the use of fines, as a way to enforce compliance as advising does not seem to be working?

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

I welcome the Environmental Improvement Plan from the government and I think she and I both agree that air quality is a major problem in this city, which is obviously why we've taken the 'woke steps' that Councillor Lyons described and I might just riff on that a little bit when I come to it in a minute. But yes, it is a problem, and I think, and Councillor Pickett will be aware as I think she's part of the Scrutiny Committee, that what we started last year is a sort of journey towards improving air quality, particularly from burning solid fuel. So not just making one change and then that's it, it's very much been a focus on sort of raising awareness. You're quite right, I think we really need to be strong in our rebuttals to people that say, well as long as you're using an eco-stove or whatever, then it's totally fine. There is no way of burning solid fuels that does not release harmful particulate matter, and I think the key thing here is that we are a densely populated city so if you're



burning those solid fuels in a densely populated area, clearly that pollution is going to affect many more people and it's obviously disappointing.

I sometimes think that if the right-wing press, like the Mail and the Telegraph are describing you as woke, it probably means you're doing something right. But seeing Councillor Lyons take that litany of errors to the Telegraph last week was, I mean, amusing more than anything else. He criticised the campaign as woke without sort of referencing the fact that he actually voted to continue it in the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He also voted to pursue the expansion of smoke control areas, so congratulations, Councillor Lyons, you are now woke. You mentioned that we were trying to ban wood burning. We're not and nobody's ever mentioned that, and even if we wanted to do that, we don't have the powers to do it.

**Councillor Pickett asked a supplementary question:**

It's really good that Councillor Rowkins is now in agreement, I'm really pleased to hear that. I just wonder then, is there a plan for this compliance?

**Councillor Rowkins replied:**

I'm assuming you're referring to existing smoke control areas. I mean, we have been using the phrase 'enforcing', I think, as you know, we've been leaning more into 'educating' and providing good information so that residents can make informed choices. We can place fines on residents where there's persistent contraventions of smoke-controlled areas, but I think really, the focus is on trying to educate. There'll be further measures coming down the line and I think that was probably set out and indeed agreed unanimously by the members of scrutiny.

**14. Councillor Theobald:**

Residents are worried that if a hire scheme for e-scooters is approved, this will only encourage the number of illegal e-scooters to increase. If most people are against the e-scooter hire scheme in the consultation, will the Council cancel the scheme?

**Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport and City Infrastructure:**

You raise a really good point about illegal use of e-scooters. It is a very concerning aspect of our city. I think many people want to try an e-scooter and I think forcing anybody who wants to try one straight into criminality, opening that door, is really not the answer. We'll just have a regulated scheme which allows people to do so safely, put a maximum speed limit – the legal limit is 15mph but that's a bit too fast – let's go for 12.5 miles an hour and, actually, after midnight drop down to six miles an hour because we can control this, and make sure it really is an offer. You get cheaper prices if you wear a helmet; have lights and number plates on them; and geofence it so we can decide where scooters can take place or not. It's so much safer than the suggestion that the only way to do it is to go criminal.

I don't agree with Councillor Theobald on this, I really think it's a flawed mentality to suggest if you want to try an e-scooter, open that door of criminality. Please take on

board this offer of a regulated scheme. It's a great opportunity for the city to try it. It's controlled by the government; they're going to try it and we're monitoring it very carefully. I encourage anybody who's yet to respond to the consultation: please take this, try it out and give us a good go of this because I think it's going to be a safe way to try this new way of micro-mobility around our city. With the checks and balances we're putting in, you'll need a provisional or full driving license, number plate, being traceable, any misappropriation of it, you won't be able to hire it again. It's really well thought through. If you haven't responded to the consultation and you'd like to try e-scooters, legally and not break the law and get into criminality, please respond to it because it's a fantastic opportunity if it's done well. I believe with our trusted partner in Beryl, we will do it well and we'll do it safely.

**Councillor Theobald asked a supplementary question:**

I'm not actually against it, but the residents actually are concerned. So if this scheme is approved, how will the council ensure the pedestrianised areas are kept free of e-scooters for pedestrians to keep them safe? I think that's the worry of it all.

**Councillor Muten replied:**

I want to reassure residents we are absolutely listening, and you've raised a very good point: how do we do this? The point about this trial, through our trusted partner in Beryl, each scooter will be geofenced so we won't be able to ride them along pavements, we can define where they can ride it – on the road or cycle path. We won't be able to put them on the promenade, or the undercliff, or other areas of the city. It'll be very defined. So, the technology that goes with this trial means exactly that – we will ensure that these e-scooters will not be in places where we don't want them to be.

So, we're listening to residents. This regulated approach with carefully monitored speeds and hire systems is exactly to address the concern that you and other residents have raised. It's so important that we do this and we don't have e-scooters where we don't want them, but we do this safely under regulated conditions. So again, please anybody wants to try, respond to the consultation and express your support.

**59 REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY 2026**

59.1 Councillor McGregor introduced and formally moved the report.

59.2 Councillor Sykes, Nann and Pickett spoke on the matter.

59.3 The mayor put the recommendations as detailed in the report to the vote which was carried.

**59.4 RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the revised Statement of Licensing Policy as detailed in appendix A and revised by the Licensing Committee be adopted and that officers be granted delegated authority to make any minor, formatting and numbering corrections that may be required.

**60 APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES AND PARTNERSHIPS****60.1 RESOLVED:**

- 1) That Council appointed Members/representatives to various bodies as listed in Appendix 1 to the report

**61 COUNCIL BUDGET AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

61.1 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Sykes on behalf of the Green Group and formally seconded by Councillor De Oliveira.

61.2 Councillor Taylor moved an amendment on behalf of the Labour Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Wilkinson.

61.3 Councillors Shanks, McNair and Earthey spoke on the matter

61.4 Councillor Sykes responded to the debate and did not accept the amendment by the Labour Group.

61.5 The mayor put the amendment to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.

61.6 The mayor put the motion as amended to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.

**61.7 RESOLVED:**

This council notes:

- 1) Our highly constrained council budget, described as one of the most challenging this council has seen, with in-year and multi-year pressures impacting on services.
- 2) Resident desire to have a well-run council, with good financial management, and services protected and improved.
- 3) The commitment by the council Administration to ensuring open and transparent local government under the Cabinet system.
- 4) The value that Participatory Budgeting (PB) and Participatory Advocacy (PA) can add, that Brighton & Hove City Council already uses participatory approaches, including for the recently launched Better Brighton & Hove Fund, and the availability of the new Your Voice channel on the council website to facilitate participatory approaches

Therefore, Council resolves to:

- 1) Acknowledge that a draft budget has been published in December this year, welcome this as good practice, and agree that publication of draft budget proposals in December should remain the aim in future years.
- 2) Request that all councillors seek to understand the budget-setting process and play their part in promoting public understanding of budget challenges.
- 3) Ask Cabinet to continue and, where appropriate, expand targeted and proportionate participatory approaches to budget-setting, including building on the Better Brighton & Hove Fund and use of the Your Voice platform, and invite Scrutiny Committee chairs to consider whether any refinements are needed within existing arrangements to strengthen budget scrutiny and engagement, while avoiding the creation of new resource-intensive structures during the current financial challenges.

## 62 AWAABS LAW

- 62.1 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Lademacher on behalf of the Green Group and formally seconded by Councillor McLeay.
- 62.2 Councillor Williams moved an amendment on behalf of the Labour Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Sheard.
- 62.3 Councillors Meadows and Earthey spoke on the matter
- 62.4 Councillor Lademacher responded to the debate and did not accept the amendment by the Labour Group.
- 62.5 The mayor put the amendment to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.
- 62.6 The mayor put the motion as amended to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.
- 62.7 **RESOLVED:**

This council notes:

- 1) The heartbreaking story of toddler Awaab Ishak's death as a result of damp and mould in his home, which shone a spotlight into poor living conditions across households in Britain.
- 2) The Government's Awaab's Law – which took effect on 27th October 2025 to prevent similar deaths – places strict timelines on some landlords to address emergency and significant hazards in their properties.
- 3) The Government's historic Renters Right Act 2025 which includes welcome proposals to extend Awaab's Law to privately rented homes
- 4) That all tenants across Brighton & Hove struggling with damp and mould-infested properties, including those currently excluded from Awaab's law, deserve to live

in healthy and well-maintained homes, free from conditions that could impact health and wellbeing.

- 5) The Administration has taken bold action on housing quality including introducing a landlord licensing scheme, radically reducing the council repair backlog, restoring HMO licensing, and directly purchasing council and temporary accommodation.

Therefore, Council resolves to:

- 1) Request that the next update to Cabinet about the Administration's Housing Strategy includes a review of what we have done so far in relation to Awaab's Law for our council tenants and what more we can do in relation to:
  - a. setting out clear targets and inspection schedules for external accommodation contracts, and robust management of, current contracts.
  - b. addressing poor property conditions in the private rented sector through implementing the next phase of the Administration's landlord licensing scheme.

### **63 WINTER ECONOMY**

- 63.1 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Lyons on behalf of the Conservative Group and formally seconded by Councillor Theobald
- 63.2 Councillor West moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Goldsmith.
- 63.3 Councillor Miller moved an amendment on behalf of the Labour Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Asaduzzaman.
- 63.4 Councillors Fishleigh spoke on the matter.
- 63.5 Councillor Lyons responded to the debate; he accepted the Green Group amendment however did not accept the Labour Group amendment.
- 63.6 The mayor put the Labour Group amendment to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.
- 63.7 The mayor put the Green Group amendment to the vote and confirmed that it had been lost.
- 63.8 The mayor put the motion as amended to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.
- 63.9 **RESOLVED:**

This council notes:

- 1) Brighton & Hove is a popular tourist destination but less successful as a winter and Christmas destination. The city received 12.2 million visitors in 2024, almost back to pre-pandemic levels.
- 2) The Brighton Festival, Brighton Pride, and the London to Brighton Bike Ride occur in late spring and summer, but weather prevents similar outdoor winter events.
- 3) Although the ice rink will need to move due to the Pavilion Gardens restoration, the council and operator are already exploring alternative sites for next year.
- 4) Burning the Clocks is paused but returns next year. The Administration is already receiving excellent local Christmas market proposals for 2026.
- 5) Businesses in the Brilliant Brighton BID work hard to provide wonderful Christmas lights for the city centre.
- 6) The Administration's Brighton & Hove Economic Plan requires that the council, "Develop an ambitious major events calendar to include a diverse range of festivals/events across the year"
- 7) The council's Shop Local scheme encourages residents to frequent our brilliant independent shops and the Administration froze parking charges and is keeping bus fares affordable.
- 8) The last Government's Brexit legacy casts a long shadow, inhibiting employment and contributing to food and drink inflation, which is 4.9%, damaging to our essential hospitality industry.

Therefore, Council resolves to:

- 1) Request the Chair of Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee considers setting up a Scrutiny Task & Finish Group focused on Brighton & Hove's winter Christmas and nighttime economy to ensure Brighton attracts tourists all year round.

## **64 BECOMING A DISABILITY CONFIDENT LEADER**

- 64.1 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Parrott on behalf of the Labour Group and formally seconded by Councillor Helliwell.
- 64.2 The mayor thanked Councillor Parrott on her maiden speech.
- 64.3 Councillors Goldsmith, Meadows and Earthey spoke on the matter
- 64.4 Councillor Parrott responded to the debate.
- 64.5 The mayor put the amendment to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.
- 64.6 The mayor put the motion to the vote and confirmed that it had been carried.

**64.7 RESOLVED:**

Accessibility, fairness and inclusion must be the foundation of how this Council delivers services, supports its workforce, and shows leadership across the city.

This council notes:

- 1) That Brighton & Hove City Council is a nationally recognised Level 2 Disability Confident Employer, with active staff networks, a growing focus on neurodiversity, and clear support in place for disabled employees, including appropriate adjustments and training.
- 2) That through its five-year Accessible City Strategy, the Council is committed to taking practical, citywide action to improve accessibility, not only across council services and workplaces but through active engagement with disabled residents via the Disability Panel and Other strategic partnerships.
- 3) The national Disability Confident framework, designed to improve recruitment, retention and progression for disabled people. Only a select number of employers in the UK have achieved Level 3 Disability Confident Leader, which requires robust external validation. Locally, the University of Sussex and University Hospitals Sussex already hold this status.
- 4) Achieving Level 3 accreditation would reinforce BHCC as an action led authority, placing us amongst the country's leading inclusive employers, strengthening the Council's approach to tackling inequality, incorporating <sup>OBJ</sup>Health Counts 2024 survey.

Therefore, Council resolves to:

- 1) To request a report to Cabinet which considers the process and implications of committing Brighton & Hove City Council to achieving Level 3 Disability Confident Leader accreditation, supported by:
  - Audits of workplace practices, policies and accessibility.
  - A strengthened co-production forum with disabled residents and partners.
  - A Disability Inclusion Charter outlining clear commitments for the Council and encouraging wider adoption across the city.

**65 CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting concluded at 10.23pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2025

