BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

SPECIAL COUNCIL

4.00pm 28 JANUARY 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Mrs Norman (Chairman), Peltzer Dunn (Deputy Chairman), Alford, Allen, Barnett, Bennett, Brown, Carden, Caulfield, Cobb, Davey, Davis, Drake, Duncan, Elgood, Fallon-Khan, Fryer, Hamilton, Harmer-Strange, Hawkes, Hyde, Janio, Kemble, Kennedy, Kitcat, Lepper, Marsh, McCaffery, Meadows, Mears, Mitchell, Morgan, K Norman, Older, Oxley, Phillips, Pidgeon, Randall, Rufus, Simpson, Simson, Smart, Smith, Steedman, Taylor, C Theobald, G Theobald, Turton, Wakefield-Jarrett, Watkins, Wells, West, Wrighton and Young

PART ONE

1. STATUTORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE BY COUNCILLORS OF INTERESTS IN MATTERS APPEARING ON THE AGENDA.

1.1 There were no declarations of interest.

2. PATCHAM WARD AND STANFORD WARD - CHANGE OF NAME

2.1 The Mayor noted that the main item on the agenda related to the proposed ward name change of Stanford Ward to Hove Park Ward and for Patcham Ward to remain as Patcham Ward. She stated that she had been made aware of an amendment from the Labour Group to resolution 3 of the Governance Committee's recommendations which sought to change Patcham Ward to Patcham and Hollingbury Ward. In view of the amendment she intended to take each of the recommendations contained in the extract from the proceedings of the Governance Committee individually when putting them to the vote.

2.2 The Mayor then called on Councillor Oxley as Chairman of the Governance Committee, to introduce the report."

2.3 Councillor Oxley introduced the report and noted that the outcome of the public consultation process for both wards in question had resulted in a majority wishing to change the name of Stanford to Hove Park Ward and for Patcham to remain as Patcham Ward.

2.4 Councillor Lepper formerly moved the Labour amendment which sought to change the name of Patcham to Patcham and Hollingbury Ward. She noted the low level of

response to the public consultation and suggested that there may have been some misunderstanding to the proposal. Prior to the change of Hollingbury & Stanmer to Stanmer & Hollingdean, Hollingbury was recognised as a community with a separate identity and she believed this needed to be recognised. It was therefore appropriate to include the name with Patcham, as most of the residents of Hollingbury fell under the boundary of Patcham Ward.

2.5 Councillor Allen formerly seconded the proposed amendment.

2.6 Councillor G. Theobald stated that he could recall the previous debate and accepted that the majority of Hollingbury residents lived within the Patcham Ward. However, he noted that the majority of responses had indicated a desire to retain the name of Patcham Ward, and therefore felt that this should be adhered to and could not support the proposed amendment.

2.7 Councillor Bennett stated that she believed the proposed change of name to Hove Park Ward would provide residents with a clearer understanding of where they lived and was more representative for the ward as a whole than the name of Stanford.

2.8 Councillor Brown stated that as a ward councillor for Stanford Ward she could not support the proposed change of name to Hove Park. She believed that the name of Stanford had been one that had been in existence since the 1800's and had a historical significance which should not be lost. She also noted that Hove Park was only on one edge of the ward and questioned the level of responses that appeared to be able to warrant a change of name. She suggested that consideration should be given to having a set percentage of the number of residents in a ward requesting a change of name before any action was taken to reviewing it and subsequently implementing a change.

2.9 Councillor Elgood stated that he felt it would be helpful to have a protocol that covered the possibility of changes to ward names, but in the absence of any such protocol he could only support the recommendations as listed in the extract of the Governance Committee meeting.

2.10 Councillor Peltzer Dunn expressed his concern over the manner in which the consultation exercise had taken place and suggested that it had been open to misinterpretation. He referred to the article in City News and queried how the responses received had been verified given that the article suggested anyone could respond on the proposed name changes. He also felt that the proposed amendment went against the majority verdict of the consultation process and therefore could not support it.

2.11 Councillor Oxley noted the comments and stated that he felt the Labour Group amendment had come forward at a very late stage and did not reflect the outcome of the consultation process. In this regard he believed that there was a need for the council to respect the outcome of the consultation exercises for both wards. He understood Councillor Brown's feelings and agreed that the current situation did raise the question of the need to have an approved mechanism for instigating a change of name and he would ask officers to investigate the options open to the council for the future. With regard to the consultation process, he was aware that all responses had been verified by the electoral staff and only those from residents within the respective wards had been

accepted. He therefore moved that the recommendations before the council be accepted.

2.12 The Mayor noted that the amendment had been moved and seconded and put it to the vote which was lost.

2.13 The Mayor then put the recommendations listed in the extract of the minutes from the Governance Committee to the vote on an individual basis and each recommendation was carried.

2.14 **RESOLVED:**

(1) That the results of the consultation exercise be noted;

(2) That the change of name of Stanford Ward to Hove Park Ward be approved; and

(3) That Patcham Ward should retain its current name.

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

Signed Chair

Dated this day of