Brighton & Hove City Council

COUNCIL
ADDENDUM 1

2.00PM, THURSDAY, 23 JULY 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
16	TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS	5 - 10
17	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	11 - 16
18	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	17 - 22
19	PETITION(S) FOR DEBATE	23 - 26

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council Agenda Item 16

Subject: **Petitions**

Date of meeting: **23 July 2026**

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

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

Ward(s) affected: **All**

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

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

2. Recommendations

2.1 That Council notes the petition(s).

3. Context and background information

3.1 To receive the following petition:

Complimentary Visitor Parking Permits for Residents in Controlled Parking Zones

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to call on Brighton & Hove City Council to introduce a small allocation of complimentary visitor parking permits for households living within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).

Brighton & Hove is a vibrant and densely populated city, but it is also a place where many people experience isolation and loneliness. A growing body of research shows that social connection plays a vital role in maintaining good mental health. For many residents—particularly those living alone, older residents, people with disabilities, and individuals experiencing mental health challenges—visits from friends and family provide essential emotional support and help prevent isolation.

Over the years, the expansion of Controlled Parking Zones across the city has made it increasingly difficult for visitors to park near the homes of residents. While the intention behind CPZs is understandable, the practical impact is that friends, carers, and family members often face limited parking availability and high parking charges simply to spend time with loved ones. This can unintentionally discourage visits, particularly for those on low incomes or travelling longer distances.

For residents who are already feeling isolated, this creates an additional barrier to maintaining meaningful social connections. The cost and difficulty of parking should not stand in the way of people receiving support, companionship, or care from those closest to them.

We therefore respectfully ask Brighton & Hove City Council to consider the following:
Provide each household within Controlled Parking Zones with a small annual allocation of complimentary visitor parking permits or digital guest passes.

Ensure these permits can be used for short visits by friends, family members, carers, or support networks.

Introduce the scheme in a way that is simple, fair, and limited in quantity so that it does not negatively impact parking availability.

Even a modest number of complimentary guest permits per year would make a meaningful difference. It would help residents maintain social connections, support mental wellbeing, and ensure that people living in Brighton & Hove are not unintentionally isolated by parking policy.

Our city should be one that supports community, connection, and wellbeing. Allowing residents a small number of free visitor permits is a practical and compassionate step toward achieving this.

We ask Brighton & Hove City Council to review this issue and work with residents to implement a fair solution.

3.2 To receive the following petition:

North Hollingdean Residents' Parking Scheme – urgent consultation required

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to reopen consultation on parking arrangements in North Hollingdean, to allow residents the option of introducing a residents' parking permit scheme in line with that in South Hollingdean.

Residents in North Hollingdean are facing extreme difficulty in parking near homes due to commuter and non-resident parking. This has been exacerbated by the introduction of the parking scheme in South Hollingdean. This is problematic during the day and late at night, forcing families to park far away from their properties. This situation is creating safety concerns with inconsiderate parking and increased traffic from drivers searching for spaces, making streets less safe, particularly for children. We would like the opportunity to have a consultation on this new situation.

3.3 To receive the following petition:

Madeira Drive Parking Charges

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to review and mitigate the 2026 seafront parking charge increases on Madeira drive and around Sealanes to protect local workers, sea swimming programmes, and community access to healthy activities.

Sealanes and Pool to Pier staff, customers, coaches and community members including members of Brighton Swimming Club are concerned about the impact of the hike in parking charges in the area. Specific concerns include:

Low paid workers such as lifeguards and bar staff being priced out of work; Hourly paid swim teachers and sports coaches delivering short sessions facing parking costs that make their shift unviable;

Impact on recruitment and retention;

Negative impact on access to healthy activities and 'blue nature' particularly for individuals using swimming for rehabilitation and recovery who are not eligible for blue badges and may not be able to walk or cycle;

Impact on the Pool to Pier programme which teaches safe sea swimming and promotes beach safety;

Parking prices doubling the cost of a single swim for Sealanes swimmers;

Contravening the recommendation in the 'Coast for All' report from the University of Brighton to 'strengthen transport connections, accessible parking provision and the affordability of travel';

No joined up policy for sustainable travel which includes addressing the endemic cycle theft problem on the seafront;

Undermining accessibility campaigns to improve access for all, including those with disabilities, caring responsibilities and other barriers to the seafront.

3.4 **Keep East Brighton Seafront Accessible for All**

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to reinstate the lower parking tariff at the east end of Madeira Drive - 30 spaces from the east of the Concorde to the base of Dukes Mound and 20 spaces immediately west of Concorde.

Parking charges on the section of Madeira Drive serving Yellowave, Sea Lanes and other east seafront community leisure and wellbeing facilities have increased from £1.70 to £5.80 per hour – a rise of over 240%.

This area is not in the city centre and has limited accessibility. There is no public transport directly serving the site, no lift access from Marine Parade,

and access is only via a steep slope, a long walk from the Pier, or more than 100 steps.

This section of Madeira Drive has historically been treated as a lower-tariff zone due to its location and accessibility challenges. We understand previous assurances were given that affordable parking would be maintained for those accessing the area. There has been no consultation.

The increase is already affecting local residents, families, older people, people with mobility challenges, and those attending community activities. Several organisations report that participants are reducing or cancelling attendance because parking costs have become unaffordable.

These facilities provide year-round access to sports, swimming, wellbeing programmes, children's activities, cancer support groups, toddler classes and other community services. These facilities and organisations based on the east seafront are a vital part of the local community, generating substantial social value and helping to prevent health inequalities through accessible sport, exercise, wellbeing activities and social interaction.

We call on Brighton & Hove City Council to urgently review parking charges on this section of Madeira Drive and reinstate an affordable tariff that allows residents and visitors to continue accessing these important community, health and wellbeing facilities.

3.5 **Green Area Adjacent to Woodingdean Lawn Memorial**

In Woodingdean, Brighton, the green space adjacent to the lawn memorial is more than just a patch of grass. It's a treasured spot for relaxation, reflection, and recreation. For many, including myself, it is an essential outdoor area where I can read, enjoy the tranquillity, and spend time with my grandchildren; they believe their grandparents are watching over them as they play on this green. This green space isn’t merely a patch of natural beauty; it's part of our community fabric. Many locals cherish it as a serene retreat from the hustle and bustle, a place where we can enjoy life and watch the world pass by.

However, there is a proposal to transform this beloved green space into a wildflower meadow, a vision that has led to untamed mess in years past. This shift disregards the area's natural beauty and the needs and sentiments of local residents who have family ties to the lawn memorial. Initial attempts to convert similar areas led to significant upkeep challenges, undesirable aesthetics, and less accessible spaces for public enjoyment.

The transformation of well-maintained grassland into a wildflower meadow does not suit the heritage and aesthetic values of this sacred area. Woodingdean has numerous alternative locations that could successfully host a wildflower meadow, blending seamlessly with local scenery and

receiving community support.

Action is required to maintain the charm and utility of our cherished well kept green space. We urge the local council to reconsider the current plans and preserve the green area at the Lawn Memorial. Making this space a place for ongoing serenity and community gathering is of utmost importance to those who visit and use it regularly.

Join us in preserving this valued space by signing this petition. Let's show that the interests and voices of Woodingdean's residents matter in maintaining our community's cherished green landscapes.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council **Agenda Item 17**

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

Date of meeting: **23 July 2026**

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

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

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

1. Mark Cull asked:

The Government says it exists to make the country fairer, reduce poverty and help improve lives, and that it is committed to cutting the cost of living to people and families. We all know that sport promotes positive mental and physical health, reduces isolation and improves social health. Brighton & Hove City Council has contracted Game4Padel to operate padel in our city. Game4Padel is a private company with many wealthy shareholders, who, by the way, do not reside in our city. To play padel at Hove Park a court can cost up to £32, and at Withdean, up to £48. Compare this to hiring a tennis court for £9. These prices are unaffordable for a great many people in our city, so how does this contract align to the Administrations commitments to making the country fairer, improving lives and reducing the cost of living?

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

2. Mike Sexton asked:

The grit bin is near the bottom of the Bazehill. This is not ideal as the main hazard is 100m further up the hill where the road bends. This area always get slippery when icy, vehicles brake and pedestrians cross here. The department responsible states "current location offers the most balanced distribution of properties along BazeHill," which is untrue as if the bin was sited at the bend there would be approx 25 household level and above the bin and 18 below it. Please move the bin near the bend so we do not have to carry the grit uphill.

Response from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure.

3. John Parsons asked:

I live in Ovingdean next to a plot of BHCC-owned landed which has recently been identified for disposal. The boundary between this plot and my property is the wall of our home. We need maintenance access here for roof and double height windows requiring scaffolding. Current drawings indicate a planned child play area looking into our bedrooms! I am generally pro-development but these plans will surely create problems for everybody. Would BHCC consider an offer to buy approximately 270 sqm prior to the entire plot going on the open market? I can offer £38,000.

Response from Councillor Taylor, Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration.

4. Daniel Rue asked:

This council set out its Accessible city strategy back in 2023. A specific focus of the strategy was to work closely with the disabled community in Brighton, specifically through the Disability Panel. Does the council believe the current approach is living up to standards and commitments set out in the original strategy and does it believe all relevant voices in the city are being heard as we enter the final few years of the plan?

Response from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care.

5. Laura King asked:

Under BHCC Interim Chief Financial Officer, John Hooton, the cost for the King Alfred redevelopment project rose sharply from £47m to £65m in September 2025.
Now a new permanent CFO 151 Officer - Elizabeth Griffiths - has been appointed, is Ms Griffiths instigating an urgent and independent review of budget and costs for this project?

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

6. Chris Davis asked:

The Council recently published its Circular Economy Action Plan for 2026-2035. This Plan lists 'Brighton AI', a network encouraging the adoption of AI technologies across the City, as a 'delivery partner' within the Plan.
Given what is widely known about the range of environmental impacts from the development and use of AI - including with regards to energy and water demands, and reliance on extractive industries throughout supply chains - this proposed partnership would severely compromise the credibility of the Council's circular economy ambitions, and broader Net Zero strategy.
Can the council please explain the decision to include Brighton AI within this Plan - including supplying any evidence as to how Brighton AI will 'advance circular economy practices' - and clarify whether any consideration was given to environmental impacts when including the group within the Plan.

Response from Councillor Taylor, Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration.

7. Tony Greenstein asked:

Parent carers are unanimously opposed to closing Wellington House. However it is spun there is a lack of evidence for safe alternatives and a failure to model future demand. It is also abundantly clear that the alternatives on offer do not have the capacity to admit more clients.'

This proposal is driven by financial considerations.

The Council's alternative providers are more of a hope and a prayer. Voluntary/private sector organisations are notorious for folding. It is essential that the Council has at least one drop-in-centre.

When the Belgrave Centre was closed a decade ago we were promised that Wellington House would be a permanent alternative. That promise is in danger of being broken.

In the event of a failure of the alternative providers the Council will be left with no fall-back position.

Will the Cabinet agree to abide by the views of parent carers in the consultation?

Response from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care.

8. Kate Sawyer asked:

The Council's Local SEND Reform Plan places strong emphasis on earlier identification, expert support and improving outcomes for children with SEND. Given the widely recognised lessons arising from the failures of the Tavistock Gender Identity Development Service, particularly regarding the vulnerability of autistic children experiencing gender-related distress, can the Council explain how those lessons have informed the development of its SEND Reform Plan, including workforce training and the 'Experts at Hand' model?

Response from Councillor Daniel, Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Youth Services.

9. Sarah Fitzgerald asked:

Hollingdean currently has a single bus route, the number 20 which recently replaced the 50, a decision many residents were not happy about. Comparable areas nearby, such as Preston Park and Hollingbury, have multiple routes serving them, giving residents a fallback when a service is disrupted. This is not true in Hollingdean, an area which includes

neighbourhoods with some of the highest levels of deprivation in the city, where residents are less likely to own a car. The council's own data shows Hollingdean and Fiveways has one of the highest concentrations of young children in the city, and many families rely heavily on public transport to get around. When the council next reviews its Bus Service Improvement Plan, will it commit to reassessing the needs of single bus service communities like Hollingdean to ensure that no community in Brighton and Hove is disadvantaged by a lack of suitable public transport?

Response from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure.

10. Robert Pickup asked:

On behalf of Hanover Action, Brighton & Hove has declared a climate and biodiversity emergency, and the Government's January 2026 national security assessment concludes that nature loss is now a systemic threat to the UK's food, water, health and economic security. The council's own Climate and Nature Action Plan does not yet reflect this urgency and lacks the measurable biodiversity targets and performance indicators such a threat demands. Given the council's duty to protect residents, will the administration commit to supporting and promoting viewings of the People’s Emergency Briefing film across Brighton & Hove, especially for council officers and in Brighton & Hove schools, so that those helping deliver the plan and the generation who will be most affected by it, fully understand the risks it is meant to address?

Response from Councillor Rowkins, Cabinet Member for Net Zero and Environment Services.1

11. Mariangela Vitolo asked:

The new 3X service is a welcome addition to Brighton & Hove’s public transport network, improving connectivity and encouraging more people to travel by bus.
However, residents have raised concerns about routing the service through Trafalgar Street, given its importance within the North Laine Conservation Area and the constraints of this historic street. The recent collision involving a bus and a shopfront has heightened concerns about pedestrian safety, businesses and property.
How will the Council work with residents, Brighton & Hove Buses, heritage organisations and other stakeholders to monitor the route, address any safety concerns and protect the character of this important area, while ensuring the continued success of this valuable new service?

Response from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure.

12. Lambros Fatsis asked:

Brighton & Hove City Council

What will the Council do to honour its Council of Sanctuary status by placing restrictions of banning the march of anti-immigration groups through the city?

Response from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council Agenda Item 18

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

Date of meeting: **23 July 2026**

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

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

1. **Brighton 53 Tram Project**

Supported by:

Guy Hall (lead spokesperson)
Mark Harrison
Keith Carter
Harry Winter
Peter Field
Blay Whitby
Phil Hamerton

Summary of Deputation:

Good afternoon, councillors, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Guy Hall and I am the chairman of the Brighton tram 53 society, which for the last 16 years has been restoring the last Brighton passenger tram, number 53. We have also started work on a second heritage tram, the former Brighton works car, number 1. Both trams are being restored to running order. We are a registered charity and have raised over a £130,000 by ourselves, without any outside grants.

Last year we published a detailed, clearly staged, self-funding prospectus for moving the trams to Stanmer park as a visitor attraction, laying some track within the yard we wish to use for a shed and museum and to eventually run the vehicles in the park as a tourist attraction. We raised a petition to support this, which currently has over 1,800 signatures. The society has constantly publicised the project in the press, as well as the radio. We have also appeared on the BBC, both last year and more recently in June this year and this has generated enormous interest in the project. We had a meeting last November with the council and more recently attempted to make a formal offer for the project by re-sending the prospectus in April this year to

Bella Sankey and Jess Gibbons of the Brighton and Hove council. We had been asked to create a business plan from the November meeting and which is now close to completion. The whole farm area was suddenly put on the market in June and we have expressed an interest in the small area that we require for a tram shed to display and store the trams and to also create a small museum/shop. There is plenty of room for other projects or units in that area and we would be adding value to a long-neglected area within the farm. This closed in 2005 with its buildings being left to the elements to deteriorate. They will all get to a point of being uneconomical to repair. We believe that by being the first to take over two of the buildings, which we will pay for, we will give the council a much better chance to find other users for the remaining buildings. The public backing that we are getting for the trams to go to the park is considerable, thus the trams will increase visitor numbers to the park and will add to the ability for profitable businesses to be established. We want to use and modify a post war, open sided cow shed as our main depot, whilst next to it is a smaller extension of the same age, which would be a shop and museum.

Supporting Information

Registered charity no 1157813.

The society has accounts, a constitution, records of its meetings, with a proven record of planning, specialist sourcing and financial competence.

53 was the last open top tram built for a standard system in this country, whilst tram 1 is an even rarer survivor, a works car from 1912.

The nearest operating heritage tramways are in Devon and Derbyshire, with Heaton Park in Manchester and Seaton in Devon being successful examples of ths type of heritage tramway.

The project is self- funding.

The trams are electric, so zero pollution.

We have a lot of documents and historical articles from the Brighton tramways to display, including a 1/12th running scale Brighton tram model, with working lights and 40 feet of track.

The trams will add to Stanmer park, they will not detract from it. Residents were contacted, there were no complaints and the Stanmer society endorse the idea. This a chance to put Brighton back on the tourist map.

The trams can be a basis for revenue earning activity in the park.

An on-line petition with 1,800-signatures has proved the project is popular with the public.

The society has a facebook page with followers around the world and is currently revamping its website.

2. Wellington House Day Centre

Supported by:

Lou Vaughan (lead spokesperson)
Tracey Hammond
Sue Holder
Teresa Ralph
Cathy Cooper

Summary of Deputation:

Wellington House (Welly) is a Day Centre for adults with special needs that is utilised by 21 vulnerable adults. On February 26th 2026, the Council voted to close this Day Centre in order to make a saving of £400,000. We oppose this closure primarily because we do not agree that the service provided there can be replicated in the private sector. We have voiced our concerns on this aspect previously.

Today we would like to draw your attention to the figures and to show you how closing Welly will not save the projected £400,000, and instead will ultimately result in higher cost to the Council, thus eliminating any potential savings. We would like to point out that there have been multiple different costs quoted throughout the consultation period- the Consultation documents state that it costs £220 per person, per day. Kim Foster states £244 per person per day, and social workers are quoting differently again based on individuals, so what is the actual daily cost? We estimate that it is around £200, based on the information we have been given from the Council, however this data is high level and doesn't take into consideration cost of individual needs.

Our calculations of potential savings are different to those of the Council. Based on the figures in the Consultation document from 24th February, we estimate a total saving of £277,134. This includes eight people quoted as having "complex needs", and 13 as "moderate needs". The Consultation document also contradicts itself, as on page 4 it refers to "half the attendees have complex needs", but on page 5 refers to 8 people as having complex needs. This would make the saving less at £204,306.

Staff numbers are 12fte with one agency staff member, not the 21 quoted by the Council, therefore contributing to less than £803,000.

We have previously reported our concerns regarding family breakdown without the respite of Day Care. We have calculated, based on a national average, that one week in a residential respite would cost £1500, exceeding the weekly cost of a maximum £1100 for five days at Welly. Additionally, a permanent residential placement costs £130,000 per year, based on a

national average. If just two of the 21 people needed this, it would eliminate any potential savings the Council hoped to make.

In 2018, ITV News discovered that the number of day centres for adults with special needs has decreased by 41% since 2010, yet the number of people who could benefit from such places is ever increasing. In 2012, the learning disability charity Mencap found that since 2009, one in three Councils had closed day services, and that one in four learning disabled people spend less than one hour outside their home every day.

Andy Burnham has spoken of an urgent need to fix social care, with a report expected from Louise Casey later this year about the care and support for disabled people.

We believe that complete closure is not necessary to save money. We feel that if Welly has the right management, recruitment of service users and attendance can be increased. Families of younger adults with special needs have already expressed an interest in Welly, but have been actively discouraged from applying there due to the potential closure.

There are other options including reducing the days Welly is open, or promoting evening use for social clubs and groups that would save money, and indeed make money! There will always be a demand for this type of service, and so by keeping Welly open, expanded, and promoted, the Council would stand to make more money than they hope to save.

Supporting Information

The following numbers are taken from the engagement document.

Wellington House has 21 people attending.
Of these 8 are complex needs while the rest,13, have moderate needs

Attending 5 days a week. 5 people with complex needs. 3 with moderate needs. Others attend 3 days or less. Following calculations use 3 days for part timers.

Running cost of service is £803,050

Daily costs for day care at third party placement are £60 daily for low needs, up to £199 for complex needs, No cost for moderate needs are given and £80 per day has been assumed.

Wellington house is open 51 weeks a year.

Total number of days attended weekly is:
Complex needs full time 5 x 5 = 25
complex part-time 3 x 3 = 9
moderate need full time 3 x 5 =15
moderate needs part time 10 x 3 = 30

total days weekly 79, 34 complex need and 45 moderate needs
total days annually 79 x 51 = 4,029

So the average cost per day at Wellington is, £803,050 divided by 4,029, £199.38.

Alternative placements.
The cost given in the engagement document is £60 for low need and up to £199 for complex needs. No cost has been given for moderate need so £80 is assumed.

Moderate need cost 45 days per week x 51 weeks,	at £80	=	£183,600
Complex needs cost 34 days per week x 51 weeks,	at £199	=	£345,066
	total	=	£528,666

The saving is therefore £803,050 - £528,666 = £274,384

Although assumptions have been made in these calculations we believe it shows how fragile the proposed saving of £400,000 is.

Assumptions have also been made about the level of care needed in the engagement document. At the time these savings were proposed none of the people attending Wellington had had a review for several years. It will now be necessary for the alternative providers to become familiar with the individuals involved, and decide a care plan and cost it. Given that the the people with complex needs who attend Wellington were recognised as being the hardest to place elsewhere at the last round of day centre closures, it will not be a surprise if alternative placements cost more than is claimed in the engagement document.

The above calculations estimate a daily cost £200 at Wellington. We have seen daily costs in documents from the council ranging from £220 to £240 and no attempt has been made to assign costs according to level of need. We don't know why this is as one would expect cost to relate directly to care needed; most of the cost being staff.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council Agenda Item 19

Subject: **Petition for Debate**

Date of meeting: **23 July 2026**

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

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

Ward(s) affected: **All**

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

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

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the petition is noted.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION / CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 To receive the following petition:

Protect our Local Independent Businesses

Say NO to the Red Route, on the Western Road, Brighton & Hove, from Holland road to Montpelier.

Why the Red Route is Harmful, to your local area.

- This red route could disproportionately affect those who rely on assistance to access our businesses. Customers with disabilities, elderly patrons, and those with limited mobility often depend on close and convenient parking or drop-off points. By eliminating these essential access points, we risk alienating a significant portion of our customer base and compromising the principle of equality for all members of our community.

This creates a serious breach of the Equality Act 2010, which protects disabled individuals from indirect discrimination by public authorities.

- Reduced Foot Traffic: The implementation of a red route will significantly reduce the number of people passing by our local shops, leading to fewer customers and lower sales, loss of jobs.
- Parking Restrictions: Red routes often come with strict parking regulations, making it difficult for customers to stop and shop at our beloved independent businesses.
- Increased Delivery Challenges: Local businesses rely on timely deliveries. A red route could disrupt delivery schedules, leading to delays and increased costs. Additionally, we would have to use residential side roads and as this is the main delivery route for suppliers, complicating logistics. Loading and Delivering around the city from our own shops.
- Loss of Community Character: Our independent businesses are part of what makes our community unique. Losing them would mean losing a piece of our local identity and charm.

Stand with Us!

We urge you to join us in opposing the red route. Together, we can protect our local retail and ensure that they continue to thrive and serve our community. Your support matters!

- Shop Local: Make a conscious effort to support local businesses during this challenging time.
- Raise Awareness: Share this message with your friends and family. Let them know how crucial it is to support our local economy.
- The cost of this Red route is £250,000 on a road that was not even named in the busiest roads in Brighton & Hove.

4. PROCEDURE:

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

(i) The Lead petitioner will be invited by the Mayor to present the petition and will have up to 3 minutes in which to outline the petition and confirm the number of signatures;

(ii) The Mayor will then open the matter up for debate by councillors for period of 15 minutes and will first call on the relevant Cabinet Member to respond to the petition and move a proposed response. The Mayor will then call on those councillors who have indicated a desire to speak in the matter, before calling on the relevant Cabinet Member to respond to the debate;

(iii) An amendment to the recommendation in paragraph 2.1 of the report or to add additional recommendations should be submitted by 10.00am on the day before the meeting; otherwise it will be subject to the Mayor's discretion as to being appropriate. Any such amendment will need to be formally moved and seconded at the meeting;

(iv) After the 15 minutes set aside for the debate, the Mayor will then formally put:

(v) (a) Any amendments in the order in which they are moved, and

(b) The substantive recommendation(s) as amended (if amended).