Brighton & Hove City Council

COUNCIL ADDENDUM

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
42.	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	1 - 2
43.	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	3 - 8
44.	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.	9 - 16
52.	NOTICES OF MOTION.	17 - 42

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen 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 five written questions have been received from members of the public.

(a) Mr Christopher Hawtree

"Would Councillor Smith please tell us when work will begin on preparing the next Library Plan?"

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism, will reply.

(b) Mr Ian Elkin

"To Gill Mitchell as the Leader of the Labour Opposition on Brighton & Hove Council.

Given that you and your Party were not voted in at the last council elections, why is the Labour Group now stopping the council from operating in the way that the last council and its Administration did, is it because there is a Parliamentary Election this year, if so might I suggest that you and your council colleagues are not interested in Brighton & Hove?"

Councillor Mitchell, Leader of the Opposition, will reply.

(c) Ms Ninka Willcock

"Can Cllr Smith confirm that various groups, and other interested people, will be able to take part in continuing discussions about the Brighton History Centre?"

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism will reply.

(d) Ms Trish Murray

"Several activities within the Local Government Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1982, come under the 2003 Licensing Act, which states; *'The fee is to recover the administration, inspection and enforcement costs of licensing authorities which arise from carrying out their licensing functions under the Act'.* Licensed under the Act, Off Licenses pay approx £180 per annum, have specific licence criteria, and commonly consume more council resources than Licensed Sex Establishments. As councils are able to accomplish this for a mere £180 fee, why do Sex Establishment renewal fees carry a far higher cost, for universally utilising far less council resources?"

Councillor Cobb, Chairman of the Licensing Committee will reply.

(e) Mr Tim Carder

"Users retain concerns about removing Brighton History Centre resources to The Keep, finding no mention in council minutes until last month. Will the Cabinet member for Culture:

a) explain the decision process and reasons, pointing to documentation;
b) state how and when inclusion of the Centre's resources was allowed for in The Keep's design;
c) state if and when microform resources and books are to be removed from the Centre to the Jubilee Library;
d) state whether library users will enjoy the present instant access to microforms; and
e) state if there will be an overall loss of microform readers?

Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism will reply.

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meting 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 deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of two Deputations have been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

(a) Deputation concerning Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads – Mr John Towers (Spokesperson).

(b) Deputation concerning Dangers of Crossing Old Shoreham Road at the Junctions of The Upper Drive and The Drive - Ms Paula Slinn (Spokesperson).

43(a) Deputation concerning Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads - Mr John Towers (Spokesperson)

"As residents of Painters Corner, we are deeply concerned about the nearby Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road crossroads. There are no pedestrian crossings on the north or southbound carriageways at the junctions on Neville and Sackville Roads. We have written to the Council many times about the dangers and the need for safe and effective pedestrian crossings, but no action has been taken.

Our petition
We petitioned **212 residents** living in five roads in Painters Corner, and all but two signed. This shows **99% support** for pedestrian crossings as described above. **We attach their signatures as part of this document.**

Comments from residents included:

- Three children involved in accidents
- Eye-witness accounts of vehicle crashes
- Multiple examples of near misses of pedestrians by vehicles
- A blind person unable to cross at this junction
- Older children unable to cross unsupervised
- Elderly residents and their relatives frightened of crossing
- Traffic speeding and jumping red lights
- Confusing traffic light sequences making crossing hazardous
- Inadequate space on the central islands, especially for parents with buggies and small children
- No safety barriers on the central islands with speeding traffic dangerously close to pedestrians
- Pedestrians stranded in the central islands due to traffic light sequence giving priority to vehicles
- Concerns about increased traffic and pedestrian safety with Sackville Place development
- Written complaints to the Council by residents have to date achieved nothing."

Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment, will respond.

Brighton and Hove City Council

Supporting Information

Deputation concerning road safety improvements for Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads, Hove

The local community are deeply concerned about the Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road crossroads. This is because there are no safe pedestrian crossings at this junction. We want the Council to introduce measures to improve pedestrian safety. This deputation is being made as, to date, written complaints to the Council by residents have achieved no improvements.

A door to door petition of 212 residents in five roads in Painters Corner showed that 99% felt strongly that action must be done to improve pedestrian safety at these crossings.

The dangers

There are many reasons why this crossroads is dangerous for pedestrians. There are no pedestrian crossings on the north or southbound carriageways at the junctions on Neville and Sackville roads.

It is a complicated junction. The traffic light sequence and filter lanes are confusing to drivers, and vehicles often speed and jump red lights. Pedestrians of all ages and abilities put themselves at risk by having to negotiate these hazards.

There is inadequate space on the central islands for pedestrians, including parents with buggies and small children. Pedestrians are often stranded in the central islands due to traffic light sequences giving priority to vehicles. There are no safety barriers on the central islands, with speeding traffic passing perilously close to pedestrians.

Data from Mark Prior, Assistant Director Sustainable Transport, confirms that '*during the three year period to 30 November 2009 there were 10 reported injury collisions at these crossroads. Two were classed as 'serious injury collisions' and eight were classed as 'slight injury collisions'. From these collisions, there were four pedestrian casualties, two of which were serious.*' These figures undoubtedly mask a larger number of unreported and near accidents.

The impact on the community

Many people cross here every day. This includes hundreds of children going to schools in Hove Park, Blatchington Mill, Aldrington, Cottesmore St Marys, and Cardinal Newman, as well as many employees who work in the immediate vicinity, and those using Hove Park.

Because of the present dangers many people are fearful of crossing or do not cross here at all. Elderly people and their relatives reported that they are frightened to cross, many older children are not permitted to cross unsupervised, and for anyone with a disability this junction presents a major obstacle.

Action needed
Whilst we understand that the Council is waiting for the developers of the Sackville Place Retail Park to fund road safety improvements at this junction, we cannot wait indefinitely for a private finance solution. We have seen no guaranteed time frame for this development nor a prioritised schedule of work as regards road safety improvements included in it. We therefore ask the Council to consider immediate and urgent action.

We need an immediate safety audit to be undertaken on week days at peak times (e.g. school times) to identify the problems. Protective railings need to be installed on the central islands and traffic calming measures introduced. Above all we need a green man crossing system to be introduced.

John Towers (spokesperson)

28 January 2010

43(b) Deputation concerning Dangers of Crossing Old Shoreham Road at the Junctions of The Upper Drive and The Drive - Ms Paula Slinn (Spokesperson).

"We wish to raise the issue of the dangers of crossing the Old Shoreham Rd at the junctions with The Upper Drive and The Drive. Some 3000 school children are at school around these junctions and there is no provision to enable them to safely cross the road at these junctions. We ask that the Cabinet Member for Environment agrees to review the situation and consider taking action to safeguard the welfare of the children and others who wish to cross the road."

Deputation to Council

In support of Petition being presented by Cllr Melanie Davis to improve safety at Upper Drive/Old Shoreham Road Junction and The Drive/Old Shoreham Road junction

My name is Paula Slinn. I am a resident in Hove, having lived in two streets leading off the Old Shoreham Road (Bigwood Avenue and Chanctonbury Road) which are at opposite ends of the stretch of the Old Shoreham Road between BHASVIC – Dyke Road and the Upper Drive for over 11 years. I have two children – a 13 year old who attends Cardinal Newman and a 10 year old who attends Somerhill Junior School. I have concerns about the safety of the crossing at the Upper Drive/Old Shoreham Road and the lack of crossing at the Drive/Old Shoreham Road.

I am also a Planning and Highways Solicitor and have often thought that there should be greater road safety measures implemented along this road.

It is clear that both junctions are very busy, and the Upper Drive junction is used predominantly by school children.

At the junction with the Drive, there are no pedestrian traffic signals. There is no time delay between the change of lights to allow school children or other pedestrians to cross safely.

At the junction with the Upper Drive, there is a crossing, however, there have been many incidents recently of cars speeding through this crossing to avoid the lights changing and actually driving through red lights, crashing into railings or narrowly avoiding pedestrians. My neighbour and her daughter were nearly killed at this crossing before Christmas, and my window cleaner was nearly run over by a speeding car last week. I myself was involved in a car collision in December caused by a speeding car that was overtaking a stationary line of traffic just before the crossing. She unfortunately lost control of her car and careered on to the pavement on the other side of the road just before the crossing, hitting a tree and just missing the bus shelter. This was at 8.45 am. Had it happened 5 minutes earlier, it may have affected school children.

The design of the Old Shoreham Road is, I consider, partly to blame. The carriageways are wide and they encourage overtaking. There are also bus

stops immediately before the crossing on either side of the road and when buses stop, cars overtake at the crossing. In fact, the whole stretch of the Old Shoreham Road just before the Upper Drive and up to The Drive is wide and motorists appear to treat it like a dual carriageway with the accompanying speeds.

There are no signs indicating that there are schools along this part of the Old Shoreham Road (the only signs being halfway up the Upper Drive). I find this quite shocking bearing in mind that there are 3 schools located at this junction (Cardinal Newman, Brighton & Hove High Junior School, and Cottesmore Primary School) with approximately 3000 children attending. There is also no speed camera, no traffic signal camera and no device which advises motorists to slow down. All of these are present on other roads in the City.

It is alarming that school children have to cross a busy road that is effectively being used as a dual carriageway.

I have spoken to many parents in the area, including parents at Somerhill Junior School for which I am a parent governor, and they too raise their concerns about this stretch of the Old Shoreham Road and the safety of their children attending the secondary schools. Many reported incidents of their children being very upset having been stuck in the middle of the roads whilst cars speed by, or having to throw themselves out of the way whilst crossing.

There are measures that can be taken. I have taken advice from a highways engineer who advises that the simplest measure would be to erect school signs just before the junction of the Upper Drive approaching south, east and west. Secondly, to prevent overtaking, and to slow the traffic down and prevent the Old Shoreham Road being treated like a dual carriageway, the carriageways could be physically narrowed, or if that is too expensive, hatching could be placed in the middle between the carriageways to prevent overtaking. Thirdly, a slow down device could be erected. Lastly, if this stretch of the Old Shoreham Road was reduced to a 20 mph zone, the traffic would slow down. As this road has a school crossing, that would be a good reason to make this part of the road 20 mph. If signs are too expensive, road markings could indicate this.

As parents, we like our children to attend their local schools and to be able to walk to school rather than be driven. However, we want them to be able to walk to school safely.

We need the crossing and the junction to be made safer by slowing down the traffic and making motorists aware that the crossing is a school crossing.

Therefore, I would ask the Council to support this Petition.

Signed: Paula Slinn
Date: 21 January 2010

Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment, will respond.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 37 – 40 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answer detailed below. The Councillor asking the question may then ask one relevant supplementary question which shall be put and answered without discussion. A second supplementary question may be asked by any other Member of the Council which shall also be put and answered without discussion:

(a) Councillor Fryer

"What measures did the council take to ensure that school closures were kept to a minimum during the cold weather and to address the impact this has on children and young people's education and their families?"

Reply from Councillor Brown, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People.

"Our first priority during any period of severe weather conditions is the safety and well being of the children in the City. The CYPT updates and issues emergency closure advice, including guidance on how to deal with severe weather conditions, to all schools annually in the autumn term.

The CYPT worked closely with Environment to enable the schools to open as soon as possible during the spell of extreme weather conditions but ultimately the final decision rests with individual head teachers. The Schools Futures Director was identified as the contact point for schools and he prioritised schools to ensure the most effective use of limited resources in difficult circumstances. The Head of Highways Operations liaised with the CYPT so that roads and pavements serving schools were cleared as soon as possible and the CYPT through its contractors cleared school paths and car parks.

Secondary schools were identified as the top priority and supported to enable all AS and GCSE students to take their exams at their school and at the nationally allocated time. This was closely followed by Special Schools then Primary schools.

Head teachers stayed in contact with students and their families throughout the difficult weather period informing them of arrangements made for examinations and helping families overcome any logistical problems.

Schools in general kept parents informed of their arrangements through school websites, text messaging and local media. Many schools put work for pupils on their websites to ensure that the disruption to learning was minimised.

This support was highlighted in a letter to the Argus when Hove Park was commended for staying in direct contact with 6th form students and ensuring that students received the support they needed during the exam period."

(b) Councillor Kitcat

"Will Cllr G Theobald make clear to this meeting and colleagues in East Sussex County Council that this city has no wish to ship its waste to landraise sites in the East Sussex countryside?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"As a waste planning authority we are obliged to make provision in our plans for viable and deliverable facilities for dealing with all waste streams. To this end we will aim to make provision within the city for facilities to handle and treat waste generated in the city but it is unlikely that these would be sufficient to handle and treat all the waste the city generates. However, I would like to make it clear that our priorities are to promote recycling and other sustainable methods of waste management – landraise would be very much a last resort."

(c) Councillor Kitcat

"Does Councillor Theobald agree that recycling municipal waste is the cheapest way of handling waste for this council and that greater rates of recycling can play an important part in improving this council's financial situation in the face of the extremely low central government grant?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"Yes."

(d) Councillor Kitcat

"Can Councillor Smith explain why he responded to a public question on the Brighton 'O' at our last council meeting by saying that this Council was 'dealing directly' with Brighton Sailing Club yet the club report no such talks are happening?"

Reply from Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism.

"Thank you Councillor Kitcat for your question on the Brighton 'O'. The Sailing Club have been advised in writing that the planning application for the Brighton 'O' has been deferred for further consideration. The concerns of the Sailing Club will be taken into account in the determination of the planning application insofar as they are relevant to planning matters. Additionally, the council will also take these concerns into account when considering its position as landowner in discussions with the promoters of the Brighton 'O'."

(e) Councillor Hamilton

"On 18th January 2010 the Leader of the Council's current Forward Plan listed a key decision relating to Hangleton Bottom as being Key Decision CAB 5498:

> "to seek agreement to the marketing approach and the future use of the site."

This decision was marked "deferred" and had been marked as such on successive Forward Plans since it first appeared on the Forward Plan in October 2008. In the interest of openness and transparency will the Leader of the Council explain why a report went to the Central Services CMM on January 18th seeking agreement to the marketing approach and future use of the site without having been listed in advance on her publicly available Forward Plan?"

Reply from Councillor Mears, Leader of the City Council.

"The decision in the Hangleton Bottom report taken to Central Services Cabinet Member Meeting (CS CMM) on the 18th January is not a key decision and not required to be on the forward plan. This is an exploratory report giving an early warning and seeking permission to test the property market to explore what interest is out in the open market for the redevelopment of this strategic council owned site. It does not have a significant impact on 2 or more wards or involve a significant expenditure or saving of £500k. The decision could have proceeded under officers' delegated powers.

Once we have the results of this marketing exercise we will review and analyse the options, consult with the necessary parties as set out under our property protocol and prepare a detailed report for Cabinet to consider the options on the strategic potential future uses on the site. This will be a key decision affecting more than 2 wards with financial implications over £500k.

In the interests of being open and transparent we took an early report to CS CMM giving notice of our intention to explore and test the market regarding on this site and prepare a further substantial report for Cabinet consideration. The key decision regarding the future use of the site is to be taken by Cabinet and as such the Forward Plan wording will be adhered to."

(f) Councillor McCaffery

"At a training event for school governors on Safeguarding Children in November, I asked who the Brighton and Hove Local Children's Safeguarding Board reports to. The officer did not know and has since informed me that despite asking she has not yet received an answer. We as Councillors are legally responsible for the children in our care, Would the Cabinet member for Children Families and Schools please inform this Council who the LCSB reports to?"

Reply from Councillor Brown, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People.

"**Local Safeguarding Children Board:**

The Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) is the most important among a number of checks and balances across public services to assure the quality and effectiveness of local safeguarding and child protection arrangements. External inspection by Ofsted has consistently found that the LSCB in Brighton and Hove is effective and works to a high standard.

Although the local authority is responsible for ensuring an effective LSCB is in place the Board is a distinct and separate body with duties set out in statutory guidance.

In Brighton and Hove the LSCB has provided reports to the Children and Young People's Board, but is not accountable to it. Our LSCB now has an Independent Chair who has attended the Trust Board and will provide regular reports on the quality and effectiveness of local safeguarding and child protection services.

The Director of Children's Services is responsible for ensuring the Independent Chair fulfils the terms of their job description and contract.

The relationship between a Local Safeguarding Children Board and a Children's Trust Board is complex:

Chapter 3 of the 2006 Statutory Guidance: Working Together to Safeguard Children states:
3.52 The LSCB should not be subordinate to, or subsumed within, the children's trust arrangements in a way that might compromise its separate identity and independent voice. The LSCB should expect to be consulted by the partnership on issues that affect how children are safeguarded and how their welfare is promoted. The LSCB is a formal consultee during the development of the Children and Young People's Plan.

Lord Laming's Report 'The Protection of Children in England (2009)' recommended the revision of this guidance and draft proposals are currently out for consultation for implementation in April 2010.

The future relationship between LSCBs and Children's Trust Boards has also been addressed in the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009. Statutory Guidance to inform the implementation of the Act is also out for consultation. In summary:

- The Children's Trust Board must link to the LSCB and ensure ongoing direct and regular communication with it. The LSCB is a distinct and separate body with a separate identity and independent voice that has a role to challenge the CTB. It is not subsumed by or subordinate to the CTB.

- The Children's Trust Board will receive an annual report from the LSCB on the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements locally."

(g) Councillor Mitchell

"In his departmental budget report for 2010/11, the Cabinet Member for Environment is proposing a £200,000 cut to the council's Supported Transport budget with effect from April 2010. Given that this would have entailed the formal three month prior notification of contract termination, could the Cabinet Member inform the council as to whether this notification has been served and which bus service contracts and routes will be affected?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"The city council is mindful of the statutory obligation on the bus operator to give the Traffic Commissioner 56 days notice of any service cancellations.

Budget figures are constantly being updated as fresh information becomes available.

If indeed the administration proposes any changes to subsidised bus routes then the appropriate documentation will be issued in due course."

(h) Councillor Caulfield

"In the light of 1) her Scrutiny Committee's examination of the Administration's housing budget proposals last week and 2) comments in Gscene from the Leader of the Labour Group and her housing spokesperson that the LDV is not worth pursuing, could Cllr. Meadows, in her capacity as Chair of the Adult Social Care & Housing Overview & Scrutiny Committee, reassure council members that she, and the rest of the Labour Group, are fully committed to supporting tenants in ensuring that the LDV is successfully set up this spring?"

Reply from Councillor Meadows, Chair of the Adult Social Care & Housing Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

"Neither quotation contained within the Gscene article stated that the LDV is not worth pursuing. I can readily give assurances that the Labour Group remains committed to the principals of a Local Delivery Vehicle and recognise its potential, not only in terms of benefits to tenant's homes but other uses in the long term.

However, in common with other interested parties, including the other political parties on the council, we reserve the right to question and scrutinise the process as the LDV is set up, in terms of its cost and the achievement of its original objectives."

(i) Councillor Davey

"Brighton & Hove Buses are justifiably an award winning service provider and the partnership with the city council is often cited as an example of best practice yet, concerns remain over aspects of the bus service in the city. These concerns include: high prices as recently highlighted by the Office of Fair Trading, a limited service to the outer areas of the city, congestion in the city centre and poor air quality. Could the Cabinet Member for Environment please tell us what he is doing to address these issues?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"The Council has no direct control over fare levels as it is a commercial decision for the bus company. Officers and I meet regularly with the bus company to discuss matters of mutual concern."

(j) Councillor Simson

"As the Council's representative on the Sussex Police Authority, could Cllr. Duncan please tell me how much it has cost to police the last two 'Smash EDO' demonstrations (in May 2009 and January 2010)?"

Reply from Councillor Duncan, Council Representative on the Sussex Police Authority.

"Thanks for your question. Final figures for the policing costs incurred during the events you describe are yet to be published: I'm happy to report back, via the Community Safety Forum, when they are. That's likely to be in March this year, when the financial report for the force's budgetary year 2009/10 is completed.

In the meantime, I can report that Sussex Police has incurred costs of approximately £5.1 million in relation to policing politically motivated events in Brighton and Hove during the current financial year, including the Labour Party conference, several multi-denominational 'peace' walks, weekly peace vigils in the city, and the protests, to which your question directly refers, against the role of the Brighton-based EDO-ITT factory in manufacturing weapons components that have reportedly been used by the Israeli military during the unlawful bombing raids in Gaza that killed more than 1400 people in January 2009, many of them civilians.

The protest last May directly cost £370,080; no information is available yet for the cost of policing the January 2010 protest.

In any event, I expect – and have strongly argued at SPA meetings – that the Home Office will meet these costs from general exchequer funds so, in the final analysis, there will be no budgetary implications for Sussex Police. It has already been agreed that, should the Home Office decide not to meet the costs of policing any or all of these events, such costs will be met centrally – and not from the budget for policing Brighton and Hove."

(k) Councillor Bennett

"Residents are asking me…Dyke Road is a gateway into Brighton and Hove and sets visitors first impressions of the City. Cars are being parked on the grass verges on the western side causing damage, even though the road is wide enough for cars to be parked correctly; these appear to be overspill cars from nearby parking schemes. How will the council rectify the situation?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"Cars have been parking along these verges for several years now and the Council cannot prevent this where there are no yellow lines. Only the Police can take action for obstruction.

In order to prevent vehicles from blocking bus stops, thus causing danger to bus passengers, 24 hour bus stop clearways will shortly be installed.
The yellow lines could be extended along Dyke Road, which would protect the verges, but this would lead to more cars parking in the side roads."

(l) Councillor Bennett

"The school parking sign outside Lancing Pre Prep has the wrong times for no parking. The school operates at different hours to those displayed; could I please have a date for when the council will amend the sign to the correct hours?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"The times displayed on School Keep Clear signs across the city are all the same because they are all subject to the same city-wide Traffic Regulation Order. It was considered important that the signs are consistent across the city so that Parking Enforcement can be carried out effectively.

Officers have already been in discussion over the matter with Lancing Pre Prep School, and are carrying out an informal consultation to gauge how many other schools would benefit if the No Stopping times were extended or changed. I will be discussing the results of the informal consultation with my colleague the Cabinet Member for Children's Services."

(m) Councillor Bennett

"Will the council commit to work with City Park to ensure maximum use of the car parks to help reduce the problems on local roads by overspill parking?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

“The council is already working closely with the occupiers of City Park (Legal & General and Lloyds/TSB) to reduce the number of employees travelling to work on their own by car.

Last year, for instance, Legal & General and Lloyds/TSB agreed to work together to promote sustainable travel choices to their employees and produced a joint Travel Plan, a first for Brighton & Hove.”

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(a)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

SUPPORT FAIRTRADE IN THE CITY

To delete the wording in paragraph 8 after "This Council calls upon the Cabinet…" and delete the final bullet point as struck out, and insert new text in bullet points 2 and 3 as shown in bold:

The motion to read as follows:

"In 2009 the Fairtrade Foundation celebrates its 15th Anniversary as Brighton celebrates being the UK's first Fairtrade town over 13 years ago.

Seven in 10 households purchase Fairtrade goods, including an extra 1.3 million more households in 2008, helping Fairtrade sales reach an estimated £700m in 2008, a 43% increase on the previous year. There are over 460 producer organisations selling to the UK and 746 to the global Fairtrade system, representing more than 1.5 million farmers and workers.

Over 4,500 products have been licensed to carry the Fairtrade Mark including;

> *coffee, tea, herbal teas, chocolate, cocoa, sugar, bananas, grapes, pineapples, mangoes, avocados, apples, pears, plums, grapefruit, lemons, oranges, satsumas, clementines, mandarins, lychees, coconuts, dried fruit, juices, smoothies, biscuits, cakes & snacks, honey, jams & preserves, chutney & sauces, rice, quinoa, herbs & spices, seeds, nuts & nut oil, wines, beers, rum, confectionary, muesli, cereal bars, yoghurt, ice-cream, flowers, sports balls and cotton products including clothing, homeware, cloth toys, cotton wool, olive oil and beauty products.*

In June this year, the Fairtrade Foundation announced the first cosmetic products to carry the Fairtrade Mark in the UK.

Businesses in Brighton and Hove will be stocking these products . 57 new Fairtrade products will contain one or more Fairtrade certified ingredient such as cocoa butter, shea nut butter, sugar or brazil nut oil, benefiting disadvantaged producers from countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

This Council recognises that introducing Fairtrade labelling to cosmetic products will increase the overall number of Fairtrade products in UK shops and the volumes of ingredients which producers are able to sell under Fairtrade terms, which in turn increases the benefits back to farmers.

Furthermore, this Council welcomes the recent decision of the Sustainability Cabinet Committee to establish a steering group to examine and maximise the benefits of continued 'Fairtrade City' status.

(1) This Council calls upon the Cabinet ~~to consider the Council's responsibility as a guiding force in local businesses to encourage the use of Fairtrade products in business and also to the City's residents through the following~~;

- **To r**eaffirm~~ing~~ its commitment to Fairtrade and ensuring that the City will continue to be classified as a 'Fairtrade City.'

- **To commit to b**eing a leading example to the City and where appropriate, ensuring that only Fairtrade products are served and sold on Council premises, such as fruit, fruit juices, soaps, jams, teas and coffees.

- **To commit to p**ublicising its Fairtrade policy and practice via City News and the Council's website.

~~(2) That the Chief Executive write to the Managers of Boots (North Road) and Neil's Yard as local businesses that have chosen to stock the new Fairtrade products, welcoming their decision to stock more Fairtrade products locally; and~~

~~(3) That the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for International Development, renewing this City's commitment to Fairtrade and welcoming the almost £2 million dedicated to Fairtrade Foundation since 1997 out of £12 million to fair and ethical trade initiatives and the £400 million for Aid for Trade which helps developing countries build their trade capacity..~~"

Proposed by: Cllr. Denise Cobb Seconded by: Cllr. Ted Kemble

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(b)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

SUPPORT CONSIDERATION OF A NEW CO-OPERATIVE TRUST PRIMARY SCHOOL FOR HOVE.

To delete the wording in point 2 as struck out, and insert new text as shown in bold:

The motion to read as follows:

"Co-operative Trust Schools are becoming an increasingly popular way of raising school standards through developing partnerships, helping to engage the local community and strengthening the curriculum through the shared co-operative values of self help, self responsibility, democracy, equity and community solidarity. They can help raise aspirations and standards, ensure that parents have more choice of good local schools and have a greater say in the running of their schools through better democratic participation.

There are now 240 Co-op Trust schools operating in the UK with five Primary Schools in Doncaster being included within the Trust Schools Programme in October 2009, supported by Government funding to become established. The Trust School model is flexible, allowing schools and their governing bodies to build a Trust that meets their specific needs.

This council therefore calls on the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to:

(1) Recognise that the Co-operative Trust School model incorporates values and principles that would benefit children, parents and communities in the city;

(2) Commits to giving serious consideration to **a range of potential providers, including the Co-operative Trust** ~~the establishment of a Co-operative Primary School~~, when seeking to provide a new Primary School in Hove; and

(3) Considers how the Co-operative Trust School Programme could generally enhance cross-sector educational provision in Brighton and Hove, particularly in respect of poorly performing schools.

Proposed by: Cllr. Vanessa Brown Seconded by: Cllr Trevor Alford

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(c)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

HIGH PAY COMMISSION

To delete the wording as struck out in paragraphs 2 and 4 and the insertion of the wording in paragraphs 1 and 2 and the insertion new paragraphs 4 and 5 as shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"This council recognises that the pay gap between high earners and ***the rest of society, particularly*** those on low incomes, is unfair, unsustainable and damaging to social cohesion.

It also recognises that inflated bonus payments and other rewards in the ~~City of London and elsewhere in the private sector~~ ***banking and financial sector*** fuelled the risk-taking that ***nearly*** brought down the world economy and triggered the recession.

Furthermore, it believes the unfair and unjustifiable gap between high and low earners is not restricted to the private sector and that pay differentials in local government and other public services are unacceptable and should also be addressed.

~~It therefore:~~

~~(1) Calls on the Cabinet to sign up to the national High Pay Commission campaign*~~

~~(2) Requests the Chief Executive to write to Alistair Darling, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Mandelson, Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, urging them to:~~

- ~~Take decisive action on excessive pay by establishing a High Pay Commission, set up on the lines of the Low Pay Commission, to deliver a fairer, more stable and sustainable economy for the future.~~

- ~~Instruct the High Pay Commission to launch a wide-ranging review of pay and consider proposals to restrict excessive remuneration, such as maximum wage ratios and bonus taxation, to provide a fair society and a sustainable economy.~~

- ~~Take the moral lead by setting reasonable pay structures in our public bodies and for public procurement contracts.~~

~~(3) Calls on the city's three MPs to urge the Government to establish a High Pay Commission~~

This council notes the campaign launched by the pressure group Compass for the establishment of a High Pay Commission.

At the same time this council acknowledges the action taken by the government to tackle the excess bonus culture, welcoming in particular the announcement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Pre-Budget statement that there will be a 50% levy on bank bonuses above £25,000 and that over half of additional revenue will be raised from the wealthiest 2% of the population."

Proposed by: Cllr Kevin Allen Seconded by: Cllr Les Hamilton

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(d)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

PROTECTING NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING SERVICES IN BRIGHTON AND HOVE

To delete the wording in point 2 as struck out, and insert new text in point 2 and an additional resolution 4 as shown in bold:

The motion to read as follows:

"Both crime and, crucially, fear of crime, are falling in Brighton and Hove.

This is, in large part, due to the model of neighbourhood policing that has been adopted by Sussex Police, and, in particular, the engagement of both PCSOs and police officers with community groups and LATs across the city. Since 2007 the number of PCSOs and police officers patrolling the city has risen, despite Sussex Police receiving one of the lowest levels of Government financial support of any force in the UK.

But Sussex's Chief Constable – and members of Sussex Police Authority – have warned that the force faces a dramatic cash shortfall: perhaps as much as £35 million over the next five years.

<u>This Council believes:</u>

1. That residents of the city want to see more, not less, community-led policing in their neighbourhoods;

2. That the Government should ~~find a small proportion of the sums identified for bailing out the banks to~~ fund an increase in the budget allocated to Sussex Police in 2010/11 and coming years;

3. That any cuts Sussex Police are forced to make should not lead to any reduction in the numbers of staff and officers employed to serve the city of Brighton and Hove – or the partnership work with this council, LATs or any other community groups.

<u>This Council therefore resolves:</u>

1. To ask the Chief Executive to write to the city's three MPs urging them to put pressure on Government to ensure additional funds are available to Sussex Police to ring-fence neighbourhood policing in Brighton and Hove;

2. To ask the Chief Executive to write to the Chief Constable of Sussex, Martin Richards QPM, and the Chairman of Sussex Police Authority, Laurie Bush, asking them to ensure there are no cuts to the numbers of police staff or officers delivering neighbourhood policing in Brighton and Hove; and

3. To place on record its thanks to Sussex Police for all the force's efforts to improve community safety in the city, especially the force's decision to open a new public-facing police station in Hollingdean last year, and the way police staff and officers have engaged with partnership work, both with this Council and the network of LATS representing neighbourhoods across the city.

4. **To ask the Council's sole representative on the Sussex Police Authority to relay to his fellow members the Council's view that the proactive use of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and a tough stance against benefit fraud has had a significant positive effect on reducing both "crime and, crucially, the fear of crime" in Brighton & Hove.**

Proposed by: Cllr Dee Simson Seconded by: Cllr Geoffrey Theobald

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(d)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

PROTECTING NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING SERVICES IN BRIGHTON AND HOVE

To delete the wording as struck out in paragraphs 2 and 3 and under "This Council believes delete the wording in point 2 and replace with the wording in bold italics":

The motion to read as follows:

"Both crime and, crucially, fear of crime, are falling in Brighton and Hove.

This is, in large part, due to the model of neighbourhood policing that has been adopted by Sussex Police, and, in particular, the engagement of both PCSOs and police officers with community groups and LATs across the city. Since 2007 the number of PCSOs and police officers patrolling the city has risen~~, despite Sussex Police receiving one of the lowest levels of Government financial support of any force in the UK~~.

~~But Sussex's Chief Constable – and members of Sussex Police Authority – have warned that the force faces a dramatic cash shortfall: perhaps as much as £35 million over the next five years.~~

This Council believes:

1. That residents of the city want to see more, not less, community-led policing in their neighbourhoods;

2. That the Government should find ~~a small proportion of the sums identified for bailing out the banks~~ ***the necessary funding from appropriate sources to increase*** ~~to fund an increase in~~ the budget allocated to Sussex Police in 2010/11 and coming years;

3. That any cuts Sussex Police are forced to make should not lead to any reduction in the numbers of staff and officers employed to serve the city of Brighton and Hove – or the partnership work with this council, LATs or any other community groups.

This Council therefore resolves:

1. To ask the Chief Executive to write to the city's three MPs urging them to put pressure on Government to ensure additional funds are available to Sussex Police to ring-fence neighbourhood policing in Brighton and Hove;

2. To ask the Chief Executive to write to the Chief Constable of Sussex, Martin Richards QPM, and the Chairman of Sussex Police Authority, Laurie Bush, asking them to ensure there are no cuts to the numbers of police staff or officers delivering neighbourhood policing in Brighton and Hove; and

3. To place on record its thanks to Sussex Police for all the force's efforts to improve community safety in the city, especially the force's decision to open a new public-facing police station in Hollingdean last year, and the way police staff and officers have engaged with partnership work, both with this Council and the network of LATS representing neighbourhoods across the city.

Proposed by: Cllr Warren Morgan Seconded by: Cllr Anne Meadows

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(e)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

RESPONSIBLE LICENSING

To delete the wording as struck out throughout, and the insertion of all new wording shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"This council notes that:

Nationally there are over 200,000 hospital admissions related to alcohol each year, of which 20,000 are under the age of 18.

Brighton & Hove has a serious problem with excessive alcohol consumption in people of all ages, with over 2,000 hospital admissions per year related to alcohol.

According to Sussex Police, five children a week, on average, are hospitalised in Brighton and Hove owing to alcohol abuse - a staggering ten times higher than the national average.

Brighton & Hove PCT has recognised and is targeting the need to reduce hospital related admissions due to alcohol consumption.

In the published 2008 report of Brighton and Hove's Director of public Health Dr Tom Scanlon reported that the negative health impacts of alcohol use by children and young people are worsening in the city.

Furthermore, organisations such as Alcohol Concern have found that the average amount of pocket money young people receive would enable them to buy 57 units of alcohol per week.

The recent scrutiny 'Reducing Alcohol related harm to children and young people' recognised the correlation between a lower price of alcohol and off-sales purchasing with higher rates of alcohol consumption.

70 per cent of all alcohol supplied in the UK is sold by supermarkets where most alcohol is the cheapest.

A great deal of anti-social behaviour is associated with people drinking on the street, i.e. drinking alcohol purchased from off-licenses rather than pubs and clubs where the alcohol is consumed on-site.

Deliberately selling alcohol at a loss, known as 'loss leaders' encourages people to purchase alcohol in off-licenses where it is virtually impossible for the licensee to have any control over its consumption.

Earlier this year a Sussex Police and Sussex Police Authority issued a joint statement calling for a ban on volume-related alcohol discounts in pubs and called for '2 for 1' deals to be scrapped in favour of lowering drinks prices across the board. The statement, a response to the Government's consultation of revisions to its Code of Conduct for Alcohol Retailers, also called for a ban on 'loss leaders' - the practise of alcohol being sold for less that it costs retailers - especially in supermarkets.

Therefore this Council requests the Chief Executive to write to Gerry Sutcliffe, the Minister for Alcohol Licensing, calling for ~~a ban of the practice of~~

a) ***A ban on the practice of*** selling alcohol at a cost which is lower than the cost price for the licensee; and

b) ***A ban on the practice of*** drinks promotions such as '2 for 1' and 'Happy Hour' which encourage people to consume more alcohol and at a faster rate than they would otherwise have done

c) A thorough overhaul of the Licensing Act 2003 including giving councils the power to (i) make it easier to remove licences from any premises which are continually causing problems, in particular, those found selling alcohol to children; and (ii) charge more for late night licences to pay for additional policing.

Furthermore it calls on:

a) the Licensing Committee to draw up a list of 'best practice' which takes into account the recommendations of the 'Reducing Alcohol related harm to children and young people' scrutiny and looks into ways of publicly recognising and rewarding responsible licensees who follow best practice, in a similar way to its successful 'Scores-on-the-Doors' scheme;

b) The Cabinet to consider how planning policy and enforcement could be more effectively used to supplement the existing licensing powers to control the availability of alcohol through licensed premises in the City and to bring forward a report as a matter of priority."

Proposed by: Cllr. Denise Cobb Seconded by: Cllr. Dee Simson

NOTICE OF MOTION

LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

RESPONSIBLE LICENSING

To delete the wording as struck out throughout, and the insertion of all new wording shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"This council notes that:

Nationally there are over 200,000 hospital admissions related to alcohol each year, of which 20,000 are under the age of 18.

Brighton & Hove has a serious problem with excessive alcohol consumption in people of all ages, with over 2,000 hospital admissions per year related to alcohol.

According to Sussex Police, five children a week, on average, are hospitalised in Brighton and Hove owing to alcohol abuse - a staggering ten times higher than the national average.

Brighton & Hove PCT has recognised and is targeting the need to reduce hospital related admissions due to alcohol consumption.

In the published 2008 report of Brighton and Hove's Director of public Health Dr Tom Scanlon reported that the negative health impacts of alcohol use by children and young people are worsening in the city.

Furthermore, organisations such as Alcohol Concern have found that the average amount of pocket money young people receive would enable them to buy 57 units of alcohol per week.

The recent scrutiny 'Reducing Alcohol related harm to children and young people' recognised the correlation between a lower price of alcohol and off-sales purchasing with higher rates of alcohol consumption.

70 per cent of all alcohol supplied in the UK is sold by supermarkets where most alcohol is the cheapest.

A great deal of anti-social behaviour is associated with people drinking on the street, i.e. drinking alcohol purchased from off-licenses rather than pubs and clubs where the alcohol is consumed on-site.

Deliberately selling alcohol at a loss, known as ‘loss leaders’ encourages people to purchase alcohol in off-licenses where it is virtually impossible for the licensee to have any control over its consumption.

Earlier this year a Sussex Police and Sussex Police Authority issued a joint statement calling for a ban on volume-related alcohol discounts in pubs and called for '2 for 1' deals to be scrapped in favour of lowering drinks prices across the board.

The statement, a response to the Government's consultation of revisions to its Code of Conduct for Alcohol Retailers, also called for a ban on 'loss leaders' - the practise of alcohol being sold for less that it costs retailers - especially in supermarkets.

Therefore this Council requests the Chief Executive to write to ***The Home Secretary welcoming the new powers that will be put in place to tackle irresponsible licensing.*** ~~Gerry Sutcliffe, the Minister for Alcohol Licensing, calling for a ban of the practice of~~

~~a) selling alcohol at a cost which is lower than the cost price for the licensee; and~~

The conditions will be applied to all alcohol retailers to ensure consistent good practice and to crack down on problem premises, where irresponsible drinking could put individuals at risk and lead to crime and antisocial behaviour.

The proposed conditions that will be enforced in 2010 are:

~~b) drinks promotions such as ‘2 for 1’ and ‘Happy Hour’ which encourage people to consume more alcohol and at a faster rate than they would otherwise have done~~

- ***banning irresponsible promotions, such as ‘all you can drink for £10’ or ‘women drink free’ deals, that encourage people to drink quickly or irresponsibly***
- ***banning ‘dentist’s chairs’ where drink is poured directly into the mouths of customers, making it impossible for them to control the amount they are drinking***
- ***ensuring free tap water is available for customers, allowing people to space out their drinks***
- ***ensuring all those who sell alcohol have an age-verification policy in place, requiring them to check the ID of anyone who looks under-18***
- ***ensuring small measures of beers, wine and spirits are made available to customers***

Any premises that breach the code or any secondary conditions will risk a range of possible sanctions, including losing their licence, having additional tough conditions imposed on their licence, or facing a maximum £20,000 fine and/or six months imprisonment. The code will be put in to practice in two stages on 6 April 2010 and 1 October 2010.

Additionally, from 29 January local councils gained tough new powers to make it quicker and easier for them to tackle problem premises by calling for a

review to restrict or remove licences, without having to wait for the police or local residents to complain

Furthermore it calls on the Licensing Committee to draw up a list of 'best practice' which takes into account the recommendations of the 'Reducing Alcohol related harm to children and young people' scrutiny and looks into ways of publicly recognising and rewarding responsible licensees who follow best practice, in a similar way to its successful 'Scores-on-the-Doors' ***and previous 'Best Bar None'*** scheme ***which stopped in Brighton and Hove in 2007, but continues to be successful across the Country."***

Proposed by: Cllr Jeane Lepper Seconded by: Cllr Craig Turton

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(f)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT

VAN DWELLERS IN BRIGHTON & HOVE

To delete the wording as struck out throughout, and the insertion of all new wording shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"This Council ~~notes with concern~~ ***recognises*** the ~~growing problem~~ ***community*** of "van dwellers" ~~on~~ in the City~~'s roads.~~ ***of Brighton & Hove.*** ~~The only~~ ***There are*** other cities in the U.K. with similar levels of lived in vehicles ~~are~~ ***including*** Bristol and Blackpool.

This Council ~~does not support "van dwelling" (which is different from Gypsies or Travellers) as an appropriate or acceptable lifestyle choice~~ ***acknowledges that the issues surrounding the van dwelling population in Brighton & Hove are extremely complex and sensitive*** for the following reasons:

- ~~It is unlawful to live in a vehicle on a public highway (which is intended for the purposes of passing and re-passing) and on either occupied or unoccupied land without the owners' consent;~~

- ~~There are serious health and safety concerns for adjacent residents;~~

- ~~There are serious health and safety concerns for the van dwellers themselves, particularly where children are involved.~~

- ***There is a lack of decent affordable housing in the City; in particular the private rented sector is typified by inflexible fixed tenancies, high fees and high rents, with few rental agencies accepting people on benefits or low incomes without substantial deposits or guarantors;***

- ***Van dwellers are not a single homogeneous group. People adopt the way of life for very different reasons – some for a few years, some for a lifetime – some because they can't afford to rent, and some are very vulnerable and choose to live with a group;***

- ***Many van dwellers come to Brighton and Hove looking for work;***

- ***Many van dwellers are employed in seasonal occupations, often working at festivals or trade fairs, and thus need an affordable and flexible way to live;***

- ***Many van dwellers do indeed take part in the economic and cultural life of Brighton & Hove;***

- ***Many of the vans on the City's streets are not lived in. Many are registered to local people and are simply parked like other vans, until needed;***

- ***Unlike Gypsies and Travellers, the current legislation does not require the Council to provide designated sites for van dwellers, with toilet and waste collection facilities, on which rent and council tax would be payable. However, the Council can provide parking facilities if it chooses.***

Furthermore, this Council notes ***with regret*** that van dwellers do not generally meet the legal definition of Gypsies and Travellers and ~~in the main, have expressed a desire to remain in Brighton & Hove~~ ***that therefore,*** unlike Gypsies and Travellers, local authorities have no specific duties towards van dwellers.

This Council considers that the legal measures available ~~to deal with the problem of~~ ***with respect to*** van dwellers are both cumbersome and inadequate:

- Section 77 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 enables the Council to move vehicles on from a particular piece of highway but there is nothing to stop those vehicles moving onto the adjacent road immediately afterwards;

- ***That in any case, such displacement does not provide a long-term solution to addressing the needs of the City's van dwellers;***

- Obtaining an injunction against specified van dwellers is both time consuming and expensive and is possible only when the identity of the occupier is known;

- There are no ~~enforcement~~ powers under current planning legislation that enable the Council ~~to take action~~ ***to work towards designating sites for van dwellers***.

~~This Council further notes with regret that the Government still considers that current powers are adequate for local authorities to deal with this problem and that van dwelling will not be amongst the subjects considered suitable for new local flexibility around making local byelaws under Part 6 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.~~

Therefore, this Council resolves:

1. To ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government asking him to recognise the unique nature of the van dwelling ~~problem~~ ***community*** in Brighton & Hove and requesting that ~~Councils be given the power to introduce specific local byelaws to properly address it~~ ***legislation be introduced requiring Local Authorities to provide sites for van dwellers***; and

2. To ask the Council's representative on the Sussex Police Authority to ~~examine~~ ***consider***, with his fellow members, ~~ways in which van dwelling could be more effectively policed~~ ***whether policing van dwelling*** in Brighton & Hove ***is an efficient use of police resources under the current circumstances where no site provision for van dwellers is made,*** and to report back to the Cabinet as a matter of urgency."

Proposed by: Cllr Vicky Wakefield-Jarrett Seconded by: Cllr Rachel Fryer

Supported by: Cllrs Ian Davey, Ben Duncan, Amy Kennedy, Jason Kitcat, Alex Phillips, Bill Randall, Sven Rufus, Paul Steedman, Keith Taylor, Pete West and Georgia Wrighton

NOTICE OF MOTION

LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

VAN DWELLERS IN BRIGHTON & HOVE

To delete the wording as struck out throughout, and the insertion of all new wording shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"This Council notes ***the growing number*** ~~with concern the growing problem~~ of "van dwellers" on the City's roads. The only other cities in the U.K. with similar levels of lived in vehicles are Bristol and Blackpool.

~~This Council does not support "van dwelling" (which is different from gypsies or travellers) as an appropriate or acceptable lifestyle choice for the following reasons:~~

- ~~It is unlawful to live in a vehicle on a public highway (which is intended for the purposes of passing and re-passing) and on either occupied or unoccupied land without the owners' consent;~~
- ~~There are serious health and safety concerns for adjacent residents;~~
- ~~There are serious health and safety concerns for the van dwellers themselves, particularly where children are involved.~~

~~Furthermore,~~ ***T***his Council notes that van dwellers do not generally meet the legal definition of gypsies and travellers and in the main, have expressed a desire to remain in Brighton & Hove. ~~Unlike gypsies and travellers, local authorities have no specific duties towards van dwellers.~~

This Council considers that the legal measures available to deal with the problem of van dwellers are both cumbersome and inadequate:

- ~~Section 77 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 enables the Council to move vehicles on from a particular piece of highway but there is nothing to stop those vehicles moving onto the adjacent road immediately afterwards;~~
- ~~Obtaining an injunction against specified van dwellers is both time consuming and expensive and is possible only when the identity of the occupier is known;~~
- ~~There are no enforcement powers under current planning legislation that enable the Council to take action.~~

~~This Council further notes with regret that the Government still considers that current powers are adequate for local authorities to deal with this problem and that van dwelling will not be amongst the subjects considered suitable for new local flexibility around making local byelaws under Part 6 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.~~

Therefore, this Council resolves:

1. ~~1.~~ To ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government asking him to recognise the unique nature of the van dwelling ***and to request that councils be required to undertake a survey of the accommodation needs of "van dwellers" and report to the government accordingly, in order for policies to be established to enable councils to address their particular accommodation needs."*** ~~problem in Brighton & Hove and requesting that Councils be given the power to introduce specific local byelaws to properly address it; and~~

2. ~~To ask the Council's representative on the Sussex Police Authority to examine, with his fellow members, ways in which van dwelling could be more effectively policed in Brighton & Hove and to report back to the Cabinet as a matter of urgency."~~

Proposed by: Cllr Gill Mitchell Seconded by: Cllr Juliet McCaffery

NOTICE OF MOTION

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

SUSSEX UNIVERSITY: CUTS TO JOBS AND SERVICES

To delete the wording as struck out throughout, and the insertion of all new wording shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"Nearly 50 years after it was established, the University of Sussex is a leading teaching and research institution. In the 2009 Times Higher Education University World Rankings, Sussex was ranked in the top five per cent of all universities worldwide.

University of Sussex staff and students play an integral role in Brighton and Hove, contributing to the city's economy, culture and vibrant atmosphere. The entire student community makes up roughly ten per cent of the population and brings in around £250 million to the regional economy annually.

This council notes:

The University of Sussex has revealed plans to cut spending by £5 million during the next academic year, achieved through job losses, course closures and department restructuring.

Proposed changes include:

- a reduction of 24 posts in Life sciences, 13 posts in Informatics, 5 posts in English, 3 in History, Art History and Philosophy and 62 posts in Professional support services including 5.5 Student Advice posts

- closing Unisex, a tripartite project involving the Universities of Sussex and Brighton and the local NHS Primary Care Trust, that provides support and advice for students concerning sexual health, HIV & Aids, Drugs and Alcohol.

- potentially closing the campus crèche and nursery, which is used by more than 80 staff and 20 students

This council believes:

- The proposed plans will have a negative impact on staff and students alike.

- In the longer term the cuts could reduce the critical role the university plays in supporting and helping to develop the city's economy and prosperity

- Reducing student support services is a particularly damaging option.

Therefore, this council

~~Instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Vice Chancellor of the University of Sussex informing him of our concern and asking him and his colleagues to reconsider the proposals.~~"

- ***Requests that the Children and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers undertaking an investigation into the potential effects of the University's plans.***

- ***Requests that the Chief Executive writes to the Chair of the Brighton & Hove Economic Partnership (who is also Chair of the University of Sussex Governing Council) suggesting that he (and the Partnership) examine in more detail the potential negative effects on the City's economic prosperity of the University's proposals."***

Proposed by: Cllr. Ted Kemble Seconded by: Cllr. Lynda Hyde

COUNCIL	Agenda Item 52(g)
28 January 2010	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP AMENDMENT

SUSSEX UNIVERSITY: CUTS TO JOBS AND SERVICES

To add a final paragraph as shown in bold italics:

The motion to read as follows:

"Nearly 50 years after it was established, the University of Sussex is a leading teaching and research institution. In the 2009 Times Higher Education University World Rankings, Sussex was ranked in the top five per cent of all universities worldwide.

University of Sussex staff and students play an integral role in Brighton and Hove, contributing to the city's economy, culture and vibrant atmosphere. The entire student community makes up roughly ten per cent of the population and brings in around £250 million to the regional economy annually.

This council notes:

The University of Sussex has revealed plans to cut spending by £5 million during the next academic year, achieved through job losses, course closures and department restructuring.

Proposed changes include:

- a reduction of 24 posts in Life sciences, 13 posts in Informatics, 5 posts in English, 3 in History, Art History and Philosophy and 62 posts in Professional support services including 5.5 Student Advice posts

- closing Unisex, a tripartite project involving the Universities of Sussex and Brighton and the local NHS Primary Care Trust, that provides support and advice for students concerning sexual health, HIV & Aids, Drugs and Alcohol.

- potentially closing the campus crèche and nursery, which is used by more than 80 staff and 20 students

This council believes:

- The proposed plans will have a negative impact on staff and students alike.

- In the longer term the cuts could reduce the critical role the university plays in supporting and helping to develop the city's economy and prosperity

- Reducing student support services is a particularly damaging option.

Therefore, this council

(1) Instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Vice Chancellor of the University of Sussex informing him of our concern and asking him and his colleagues to reconsider the proposals;

(2) In communicating these views, this council also calls on the University of Sussex to consider accepting the proposal made by the trade union UCU who adopted a resolution to present an alternative solution (with equivalent savings) to the University management. This proposes additional offers of part time working instead of redundancy, albeit to a greater number of people. It would have the distinct advantage of retaining the skills within the University, avoiding large numbers of redundancy payments, and putting the University in a position where it can grow faster in better economic times. It could also avoid industrial action which will impact negatively on teaching and research as well as the University's reputation."

Proposed by: Cllr Paul Elgood Seconded by: Cllr David Watkins