#### **BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

#### COUNCIL

## 6.30pm 24 SEPTEMBER 2025

# **COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

#### **MINUTES**

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

## **PART ONE**

- 1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
- 1.1 No declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.
- 2 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.
- 2.1 There were none.
- 3 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS
- 3.1 There were none.
- 4 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION
- 4.1 Councillor Hewitt introduced and formally moved the report concerning Local Government Reorganisation.
- 4.2 Councillors McLeay, McNair, Taylor, Earthey, Atkinson, Sykes, Meadows, Alexander, Bagaeen, Shanks, Theobald, Asaduzzaman, De Oliveira, Pickett, Lyons, Sankey, Hill, and Hogan spoke in the general debate on the matter.
- 4.3 The following points were raised during the debate. Reservations were expressed about the process, describing it as rushed and imposed from the top down. They questioned what they felt was an absence of meaningful consultation with residents and neighbouring councils, warning that such an approach risked centralising power and undermining local democracy. Concerns were also raised about the potential erosion of

- public trust and the imposition of significant upfront costs without clear evidence of long-term financial benefits.
- 4.4 There were questions as to whether the proposed changes would effectively tackle core challenges such as adult social care, housing, and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). They cautioned that the reorganisation could divert resources and attention away from essential services, without resolving the underlying issues facing local government.
- 4.5 Supporters of the local government reorganisation proposal emphasised that the changes would create more coherent and connected communities, reflecting existing social and economic ties, particularly between Brighton and Hove and the neighbouring areas proposed for inclusion. They argued that the new structure would unlock significant devolution funding, improve service delivery, and ensure balanced representation for urban, coastal, and rural communities. Also highlighting the potential for greater local empowerment, streamlined governance, and the ability to address local needs more effectively through a model designed around real-life patterns and journeys.
- 4.6 Councillor Hewitt responded to the debate.
- 4.7 Councillors called for a recorded vote on the recommendations which was put to the vote and carried.
- 4.8 The Mayor put the recommendations as detailed in the report to the vote:

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Alexander	Х			28	Lyons			Х
2	Allen	Х			29	Mackey	Χ		
3	Asaduzzaman	Х			30	McGregor	Х		
4	Atkinson			Х	31	McLeay		Х	
5	Bagaeen		Х		32	McNair			Х
6	Baghoth	Χ			33	Meadows			Х
7	Cattell	Χ			34	Miller	Χ		
8	Czolak	Χ			35	Muten	Χ		
9	Daniel	Х			36	Nann	Χ		
10	Davis		Х		37	O'Quinn		Not Pres	ent
11	De Oliveira		Х		38	Parrott	Х		
12	Earthey	Χ			39	Pickett		Х	
13	Evans		Not Pres	ent	40	Robins	Χ		
14	Fishleigh	Χ			41	Robinson	Χ		
15	Fowler	Х			42	Rowkins	Х		
16	Galvin	Χ			43	Sankey	Χ		
17	Gauge	Х			44	Shanks		Х	
18	Goddard	Х			45	Sheard	Χ		
19	Goldsmith		Not Pres	ent	46	Simon	Χ		
20	Grimshaw	Х			47	Sykes		Х	
21	Guilmant	Х			48	Taylor	Х		
22	Helliwell	Х			49	Theobald			Х
23	Hewitt	Х			50	Thomson	Х		_

24	Hill		Х		51	West		Not Pres	ent
25	Hogan			Х	52	Wilkinson	Х		
26	Lademacher		Х		53	Williams	Х		
27	Loughran	Χ			54	Winder	Χ		
						Total	35	9	6

4.9 The Mayor confirmed that the recommendations had been carried by a vote of 35 in favour, 9 against, with 6 abstentions

### **RESOLVED:**

That Council endorse the recommendations set out in the Cabinet report attached.

That Cabinet

- 1) Agrees the Final Proposal: 'Representative Councils for a Devolved Sussex: A Five Unitary Proposal' as set out at Appendix 1 and approves its submission to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government by 26 September 2025.
- 2) Delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make any final adjustments to the Final Proposal before the deadline for submission.

### 5 CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting concluded at	7.35pm	
Signed	Chair	
Dated this	day of	2025