

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL

4.30pm 31 JANUARY 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Randall (Chair), Meadows (Deputy Chair), Barnett, Bennett, Bowden, Brown, Buckley, Carden, Cobb, Cox, Davey, Deane, Duncan, Farrow, Fitch, Gilbey, Hamilton, Hawtree, Hyde, Janio, Jarrett, Jones, Kennedy, A Kitcat, J Kitcat, Lepper, Littman, Mac Cafferty, Marsh, Mears, Mitchell, Morgan, A Norman, K Norman, Peltzer Dunn, Phillips, Pidgeon, Pissaridou, Powell, Robins, Rufus, Shanks, Simson, Smith, Summers, Sykes, C Theobald, G Theobald, Wakefield, Wealls, Wells, West and Wilson.

PART ONE

70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

70.1 There were no declarations of interest in matters appearing on the agenda.

71. SIGNING OF THE ARMED FORCES COMMUNITY COVENANT

71.1 The Mayor stated that he wished to welcome representatives from the armed forces, the Royal British Legion and Community Groups, who were attending the meeting as part of and to witness the signing of the community covenant.

71.2 The Mayor stated that today was a red-letter day in the relationship between Brighton & Hove City Council and our local armed forces community, and I am very happy to sign the Armed Forces Community Covenant on behalf of the council. It is the beginning of a new partnership between us, other public bodies, the armed forces and voluntary organisations to support members and former members of the armed forces and their families. The covenant aims to:

- Foster public understanding about the issues faced by the armed services community
- Ensure men and women, and their families, are not put at a disadvantage by serving in the armed forces.

It provides a framework for the work of the council and others already in place to help the armed services community and links into NHS work across Sussex to address the health needs of veterans. To support the Covenant the council set up a Civil Military Partnership Board, which met for the first time last November. Chaired by Cllr Rob

Jarrett, its members include representatives from the council and other public services, the armed forces, armed forces charities and the community and voluntary sector. It set for up four sub-groups who will meet for the first time next month. They will look at four key areas of work:

- Housing and homelessness
- Mental health
- The re launch of the Heroes Welcome and general communications campaign
- Improving data collection and support to reservists through employer policies, which will become even more important as the size of the regular army diminishes and the number of reservists increases.

The council is fully committed to this initiative, which is critical to the welfare, health and well being of soldiers, sailors and airmen and women and their families: those serving and those who are veterans. We look forward to closer working with our partners in the future”

71.3 The Mayor and the Chief Executive then joined Brigadier Wolsey, OBE and Mr. Les Coppard, County Chairman Royal British Legion on behalf of Armed Forces Charities, to sign the Community Covenant.

71.4 Following the signing, the Mayor thanked the various representatives for their attendance.

72. MINUTES

72.1 The minutes of the last ordinary meeting held on the 13th December 2012 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings.

73. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

73.1 The Mayor informed the meeting that Items 84 and 86(c) had been withdrawn from the agenda and that Item 84, Options for Providing Additional School Places in 2013 and 2014 was due to be brought to the 28th March council meeting following the conclusion of the consultation process.

73.2 The Mayor then drew the council's attention to Item 80 on the agenda, Submission City Plan, Part 1 and the proposed protocol for the debate on the matter that had been circulated separately. In accordance with the proposed protocol, he wished to move that Standing Orders be suspended for the consideration of the item to the extent that was necessary for the business to be transacted as set out in the protocol, and that the protocol be agreed as the basis for the debate and any resolution that followed.

73.3 Councillor G. Theobald stated that he wished to move an amendment to the protocol, so that bullet point 5 on page 2 was deleted. This would then enable the Conservative Group's amendments to the Spatial Strategy Theme and Healthy and Balanced Communities, which had been ruled as unsound to be considered and voted upon.

73.4 Councillor Peltzer formally seconded the amendment.

- 73.5 Councillor Mitchell stated that she could not support the amendment and noted that the protocol had been agreed at a Leaders Group meeting, in order to ensure that there was a clear process for amendments to come forward and be debated and a final plan approved.
- 73.6 Councillor J. Kitcat stated that he could not support the amendment and that the protocol should remain intact having been agreed by the Leaders as a mechanism for ensuring a sound and reasonable basis on which to debate the city plan and any such amendments to the plan.
- 73.7 The Mayor noted the comments and stated that the protocol had been drafted on the basis of previous versions and that which was used at Budget Council meetings and had been taken to the Leaders Group for agreement, in order to enable a transparent process leading up to the debate at today's meeting. However, an amendment had been moved by Councillor Theobald and he therefore put the amendment to the vote which was lost.
- 73.8 The Mayor then put the protocol for the debate of the city plan to the vote which was carried.

74. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.

- 74.1 The Mayor invited the submission of petitions from councillors and members of the public. He reminded the Council that petitions would be referred to the appropriate decision-making body without debate and the person presenting the petition would be invited to attend the meeting to which the petition was referred.
- 74.2 Mr. Lowe presented a combined e-petition and paper petition signed by 577 residents, requesting the installation of road safety measures in Pelham Street.
- 74.3 Mr. Campbell presented a combined e-petition and paper petition signed by 391 residents, calling for a vote of not confidence in the Green Administration and for the opposition groups to take control of the authority.
- 74.4 Councillor Sykes presented a petition signed by 30 residents, concerning a review of car and cycle parking in Eaton Road.
- 74.5 Councillor Fitch presented a petition signed by 32 residents, concerning the need to protect Toads Hole Valley from development and exclusion from the City Plan.
- 74.6 Councillor Bennett presented a petition signed by 8 residents, concerning the lighting in Nevill Close.

75. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 75.1 The Mayor reported that four written questions had been received from members of the public and invited Mr. Kemble to come forward and address the council.
- 75.2 Mr Kemble thanked the Mayor and asked the following question; "When consultation was carried out regarding the installation and location of the communal bins in

Connaught Road the building which is now West Hove Infant School was the Adult Education Centre. Following a serious arson incident involving the communal bins will the Council agree to consult residents again with a view to re locating the Communal bins at the Northern end of Connaught Rd.?"

- 75.3 Councillor West replied; "The short answer is yes we are very happy to have a look at the locations of these bins and officers will contact you directly."
- 75.4 The Mayor noted that there was no supplementary question and thanked Mr. Kemble for his question and invited Ms. Paynter to come forward and address the council.
- 75.5 Ms. Paynter thanked the Mayor and asked the following question, "What planned access to public toilets and disabled public toilets at Hove Town Hall has BHCC organised for people using City Direct after building works are completed, please? I note that the corridor linking the two areas has now been blocked off with newly installed doors?"
- 75.6 Councillor Littman replied, "The new Customer Service Centre at Hove Town Hall will be providing both Council and Police services as a result there may be times when one half is open the other is shut, for example on a Saturday. This requires us to have a secure doorway between the two areas. In addition staff will not be allowed to use the Tisbury Road or Norton Road entrances as these will be for customers only. This is another reason to put a door to separate the Customer Service Centre from the main building which will have security swipe mechanism to restrict access.

In order to allow this change, a new large external canopy has been provided to the customer service area which gives weather protected level access to the existing Main Town Hall entrance. Customers will therefore still have full access to the existing public toilets as they did before the building works."

- 75.7 Ms. Paynter asked the following supplementary question, "It's my understanding that the Main Town Hall will have locked front entrance as does the Brighton Town Hall and that the Main Town Hall will be unavailable to the public full stop unless it's for meetings such as this and that the public will only have free access to the area on the other side of that door which is City Direct. As this door between the City Direct area and the Main Town Hall area is blocked by a swipe only door, how are we meant to use the public toilets? I'm not sure how this is going to work?"
- 75.8 Councillor Littman replied, "That's not what I've been given to believe but I will certainly investigate and let you know."
- 75.9 The Mayor thanked Ms. Paynter for her questions and invited Mr. Barraball to come forward and address the council.
- 75.10 Mr. Barraball thanked the Mayor and asked the following question, "The reason I was putting this question to the Full Council was that after debate and decisions are made everybody who has participated in the debate whether they agree with the decisions individually or not it has to go forward as a Full Council decision and therefore to stop the sniping between parties once the decisions have been made so that everything be fully supported.

There are many problems pressing our Council as many other Councils across the country and other parties and this Unitary Authority which has a minority Administration but we need to have everybody on side once the decisions have been made, to work together and not to fire from the side lines after those decisions have been made so that is really why I am trying to put forward that we work together after decisions are made to implement those jointly made decisions.

I was thinking of addressing it to the minority parties other than the Green Party so I'm surprised that Councillor Kitcat can answer for everybody because we are a diverse Council as the community is equally diverse."

75.11 Councillor J. Kitcat replied, "Well as you rightly identify I am not able to speak for every Councillor and I think that's probably a relief to everyone involved but I my personal view is that every Councillor has to reflect on their conscience and their duty to their residents about how they vote and clearly how each of us vote is a matter of public record and is available on the webcast as well so we can all be held to account on that, but I certainly believe that our conduct should be putting City first and Politics second and I hope that's how we all come together and there have been many cases in recent times for bids such as on Ultra Fast Broadband or the City Deal where all the parties have come together and lobbied to successful outcomes.

So I do think there are signs of cross party working for the benefit of this City."

75.12 Mr. Barraball asked the following supplementary question, "I was mindful of the prayer at the beginning of the meeting which subsumed my intention of this question and also Councillor Kitcat has also summarised it that the Councillors vote according to their understanding and their priorities that they were elected but we have to work together as a community.

Councillors have to work together to implement the policies that are decided and that is the intention that I am asking that after the decisions have been made then Councillors support the final decision collectively and individually."

75.13 Councillor J. Kitcat noted the point.

75.14 The Mayor thanked Mr. Barraball for his questions and noted the Mr. Tilley was unavailable to attend the meeting to put his question and had asked that it be withdrawn and therefore this concluded the item.

76. DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

76.1 The Mayor reported that one deputation had been received from members of the public and invited Mr. Sladen as the spokesperson for the deputation to come forward and address the council.

76.2 Mr. Sladen thanked the Mayor and stated that:

"I've come here today with a deputation representing the Council Tax Payers of the Goldstone Valley. We strongly oppose the current proposal to incorporate THV in the

City Plan and our reasons are as set out in the paper in front of you. You'll be aware of the strong opposition evidenced by a petition of over 1300 signatures collected by the two Hove Park Ward Councillors, very large numbers of houses displaying posters, objecting and of course the large demonstration outside prior to this meeting.

You ignore the people at your peril. THV is an asset to the people of Brighton and Hove who we do not even own it. It belongs to somebody else. The current proposals will forever ruin the land and none of us want to be looking at the grossly over developed eye sore in the future. As for wildlife, the slow worms, adders, lizards, bees, insects, please don't pretend that they can all be moved up one end of the development and carry on as before.

That is not going to happen and you know that. There is even an article in today's Argus making the case for protecting lizards' habitats but only in Woodingdean apparently. But let's take a look at some of the examples of those who so enthusiastically support the proposal. In a letter to Councillor Jason Kitcat last October, the Brighton and Hove Economic talked to the new school as being the icing on the cake. No ever evidence to support such a statement was put forward. This was just a sound bite, the City Sustainability Workshop, not content with 700 residential units says that this is the last opportunity for substantial development on a Greenfield site and its use must be maximised. Again let's not kid ourselves, the proposals to build high rise units totally out of keeping with the existing housing stock in Hangleton and Goldstone Valley.

Let's just return to the Economic Partnership and it's gifted opinions, in the Argus of January 24th, we're informed by them that the wholesale realignment of King George 6th Avenue will be the 'icing on the cake' for the existing residents. They just repeat their stupid sound bite to support ridiculous development of a Greenfield site. It's not as though there aren't not already many Brownfield sites in Brighton and Hove which could be developed now rather than in many years time in the future with the THV proposal. The City needs to use up its existing stock before even thinking of a Greenfield site. Just refer to the pages of the Argus on Tuesday for your evidence of the current availability of office, factory and potential housing units. It is nothing but vandalism to target THV. What epitomises, in our opinion, the stupidity of the proposal is the elimination of King George 6th Avenue from the equation. No one has bothered to check traffic levels on this essential route; you cannot simply grass over this road without asking, "where is the heavy traffic supposed to go?" I'll tell you, it'll be forced to use such roads as Woodland Drive, Dyke Road Avenue, Shirley Drive and Neville Road. Clearly none of the supporters have a clue as to the impact this fundamental road change will have.

This un-costed alternative to replace King George 6th Avenue in the proposed development is a non starter for through traffic. We understand now that THV is being included in a package of proposals meaning that any meaningful debate will be lost. So much for democracy and transparency. Changes in policy are always an option for you. We take comfort that when mass opposition took place last summer to the removal of the evening 81 bus service; this led to a reversal of policy which was much appreciated. We beg you not to ignore the views of residents, we need to protect our green sites not abuse the position of trust we have for our environment. Finally we would just like to thank you for listening to this deputation."

- 76.3 Councillor J. Kitcat replied, "I do understand and note the concerns you detailed. I think that the key driver that is not recognised in the deputation is about the housing targets that this authority and every authority is having to show it's able to meet in these types of plans, which is something that is passed down from above and that even with every piece of Brownfield land included that isn't enough to meet what we are required to show we can.

Your deputation does note the changes in National Policy context which is a big part of the story which I'm sure the debate later will go into more detail. But I have to say I don't recognise your characterisations about high rises and so on for the site because the plans at the moment are just illustrative and there are no actual Planning Applications registered. The full detail will be discussed later but I do thank you very much for coming to the meeting and expressing your views."

- 76.4 The Mayor thanked Mr. Sladen for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the deputation. He explained that the points had been noted and would be taken into account as part of the debate on the City Plan item later on the agenda, for which he was welcome to remain and listen to the debate.
- 76.5 The Mayor noted that the deputation had been presented and therefore the item was concluded.

77. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.

- 77.1 The Mayor reminded the Council that written questions from Members and the replies from the appropriate councillor were now taken as read by reference to the list included in the addendum, which had been circulated as detailed below:

(a) Councillor G. Theobald

- 77.2 "Will the lead Member for Finance specifically detail how the £228k savings agreed for the Human Resources department in the 2012/13 Budget are being delivered and explain why the Administration is proposing to exempt them from any further savings in 2013/14?"

Reply from Councillor Littman, Deputy Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee (Finance)

- 77.3 "The Human Resources service started 2012/13 with an underlying budget overspend of approximately £300,000 which needed to be addressed. In addition a further £228,000 saving was brought forward to 1 January 2013 from its original planned start date of 1 April 2013 giving a part year saving of £57,000. A number of posts are being removed from the staffing structure to deliver the total savings requirements and a more efficient approach to commissioning training courses agreed. In addition the service has piloted the council's new systems thinking methodology and an implementation plan has been drawn up. The priorities for the service for 2013/14 include pay modernisation and implementing job families, supporting the introduction of a new values, behaviours and performance management framework, continuing to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the payroll function and enabling the council's broader modernisation programme, including further Workstyles rollouts. The combined impact of both bringing

forward planned 2013/14 savings and the need for the service to support large change programmes across the organisation means that further savings are not considered to be deliverable at this time.”

(b) Councillor Wealls

- 77.4 “Will the Chair of the Children & Young People Committee please provide an update on the proposed acquisition of the Holland Road Police Station for use as a new school?”

Reply from Councillor Shanks, Chair of the Children & Young People Committee

- 77.5 “It was agreed that the council and Police Authority would jointly appoint a company to undertake a red book valuation of the site. This has been done and the draft report sent to both the Council and the Police Authority. The Council has confirmed that it is happy with the report and is awaiting confirmation from the Police that the final report can be issued.

This is a thorough and well researched report taking into account all known information pertinent to the site. It complies with the valuation brief issued jointly by the Council and the Police and is an independent objective assessment of the value of the site.

The report to Policy and Resources Committee in July 2012 authorised the Strategic Director People jointly with the Strategic Director Resources to proceed to acquire the freehold of Hove Police station, without planning consent in place, for the express purpose of providing primary school places in Hove. The same report noted the likely purchase price of the site.

The initial draft of the report confirms that the value of the site is within the ranges mentioned in the P & R report mentioned above. Once the report is accepted by the Police and issued negotiations on the actual price to be paid will commence.”

(c) Councillor Brown

- 77.6 “Will the Chair of the Transport Committee tell me what the impact of the new cycle lane has been on bus journey times along, and in the vicinity of the Old Shoreham Road?”

Reply from Councillor Davey, Chair of the Transport Committee

- 77.7 “Thank you for your question. Brighton & Hove Bus Company has reported some delays on bus journey times for school bus services which operate in the peak and have now adjusted timing and routing of services accordingly.

It is important to understand that journey times are mostly influenced by junction capacity and in this case journey times along Old Shoreham Road are mainly influenced by the junction capacity of Upper Drive. When the council introduced the new cycle lane we also took the opportunity to improve safety for pedestrians at the Upper Drive junction, particularly school children. This was at the request of local residents and ward councillors who had been voicing concern about safety at the junction for some time. The pedestrian crossing facilities were therefore upgraded and additional crossing time

introduced which has had a slight impact on bus journey times. It is always difficult to balance the needs of all modes of transport at junctions but the safety of children is paramount if they are to be encouraged to walk to school.

As part of the post scheme monitoring, officers are further looking at the phasing of the traffic signals to ensure they are providing maximum benefit to all pedestrians while ensuring that buses and general traffic are not unnecessarily delayed.”

78. ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

78.1 The Mayor noted that notification of 5 oral questions had been received and invited Councillor Wealls to put his question to Councillor Shanks.

Value Added in Brighton & Hove’s Secondary Schools

78.2 Councillor Wealls asked the following question, Do you agree with me that value added, in other words a measurement of the performance of the school; when children arrive with a certain level of attainment and leave with a new level of attainment, is a useful measure of assessing the performance of our cities’ schools?”

78.3 Shanks replied, Councillor Wealls and I have had many discussions about this and of course I agree with him. I think one of the issues and, I’m sure we will be discussing this again, is what measure of value added you use because there are lots of different measures, as you know. We have got one on the connections to the admissions school omissions because I think it is really important that parents are able to look at that information when they’re expressing a preference to schools because it isn’t just what your child ends up with in the end in terms of how many GCSE’s but it depends how much they would have done compared to wherever they might have gone to school.

So some schools are better than other schools at increasing that value added and doing better with some children when they first come in. In fact BACA is ahead on that value added score even though it’s obviously lower on the actual GCSE score so I do agree with you.”

78.4 Councillor Wealls asked the following supplementary question, “I know we agree and I know that Councillor Pissaridou is interested in this as a measure of schools as well. So we have a cross party consensus on looking more at value added rather than just simply attainment in schools. My follow up question is what has been done to promote value added as a measure to parents? What would you like the administration and us as Councillors to do to widen the discussion about this amongst not just ourselves but amongst parents? So what has been done and what more can we do?”

78.5 Councillor Shanks replied, “What has been done is we have put the value added measure on the school admissions portal. I think it still needs more explanation. So I think we are hoping to run a workshop for Councillors and Governors that will really explain that to them. Obviously all schools understand these measures and anybody who is a school governor should be asking those questions about their school. About what their value added is, how they’re going to improve that, what their plans are for improving that.

So I think it's something that's a duty on all of us. I think parents need that information and also they need other things like going to see the school, where the school is but I think it's something we will come back to in future discussions."

Lewes Road Scheme

- 78.6 Councillor Marsh asked the following question, "In the light of the incredible delays that are being faced by residents, by commuters, by people working in the area, by the buses, would you please consider putting some traffic management into all the major junctions along the Lewes Road i.e. the lights at Moulsecomb Way. Could we consider the phasing of those and whether they are effective and also the lights at Coombe Road? Coombe Road residents are saying to me they believe that the phasing of these lights has been shifted detrimentally to residents in Coombe Road and Meadowview who now have to spend in-ordinate lengths of time both getting on to the Lewes Road and back home again.

In Bevendean at the Avenue, there is no traffic management whatsoever. Roundabouts, traffic lights, I'm not a traffic engineer but please could we consider some traffic management and also as we asked for, some signage, some warnings at bus stops which we know are being done in several phases but at the moment if you are a disabled resident or if you are somebody who's mobility is not very good and you're trying to get on to a bus say at Wild Park, you have to actually dice with death with speeding cyclists at the moment. I'm aware that that is a temporary situation but when you are a very disabled, it's not very temporary."

- 78.7 Councillor Davey replied, "There is traffic management in place and the traffic management in place is designed to minimise destruction obviously there were particular circumstances that took place last week due to the significant snowfall which meant that the Falmer Road was closed and filled with abandoned vehicles and at some point the A27 was closed as well. So clearly the Lewes Road was going to find it very difficult to cope with that.

If you want to put those specific questions in to an email I'm sure the officers will be able to respond to them very quickly as I know that officers responded to the question that you raised at 16.50pm and you received a reply at 17.01pm. As to why exactly there was a particularly temporary measure in place it's actually got nothing to do with the improvements that have taken place along the Lewes Road. It's actual urgent maintenance which has taken place totally separately so I would argue that the existing mechanisms for communicating with the officers and the officers responding to your questions is perfectly adequate."

- 78.8 Councillor Marsh asked the following supplementary question, "At Transport Committee in our letter, we asked that you would consider setting up a Joint Resident Councillor Officer Group as was done for AMEX and is still being done for the AMEX in order to monitor and review the ongoing situation in the Lewes Road because there will be hiccups we understand that, we understand that things will need tweaking and what have you.

I'm also as anxious as Councillor Davey is that poor old Robin Reeds' time isn't totally taken up with answering my emails or my residents' emails and I think that would actually go a great way for residents to feel involved and in charge and able to influence

the scheme. He did refuse that at Transport Committee and I am respectfully asking that he will reconsider that on behalf of all the residents in Moulsecoomb, Bevendean, Coombe Road and Meadowview.”

- 78.9 Councillor Davey replied, “As I said at the Transport Committee, I think it is unclear what this extra group would add and what its purpose would be and who indeed would be members of this group given the many thousands of people who actually live along the Lewes Road corridor. So the officers have already attended LAT Meetings, have offered to go to other LAT Meetings and should you wish to respond and take them up on that offer they would do so.

In the meantime, such as has been explained, if you or residents want to raise issues they can be responded to very quickly as they are clearly being done at this moment in time.”

Council Housing - Gardens

- 78.10 Councillor Barnett asked the following question, “During recent estate inspections visits in my ward I was shocked by the state that some Council tenants have left their gardens in. Letting them get completely over grown and in some cases dumping unwanted household furniture and items in them. It’s extremely unfair to residents in neighbouring properties and also drags down the look of the whole area. Does Councillor Wakefield agree with me that the Council should be enforcing the upkeep of Council properties and their gardens much more strongly than happens at present?

I’m sure that many families on the Council waiting list would give their eye teeth to have a house with a decent garden.”

- 78.11 Councillor Wakefield replied, “I think that, having been brought up in a Council house myself, the size of the gardens is absolutely amazing and I think the people in them are extremely lucky to have such large gardens. I do share your concern about the state of some of the gardens. There are checks, there are estate inspections and things that happen, I’ll certainly raise with officers the possibility of being a little bit more stringent on them. There are sanctions that are put in place and the biggest sanction is that if, once given warnings, the tenants don’t tidy up their gardens, the Council sends somebody in to tidy them up and then the tenant is charged for that.

Obviously lots of things before that happen and we try to put in place because we don’t want to be dealing out sanctions we like to offer help as well. The help that is offered is that if for some reason you are unable to cope with your garden or it’s getting too much for you, you can get free help through a gardening scheme which you can sign up to. I’ll certainly have a word, Councillor Barnett, with officers and check that perhaps we can be a bit more stringent.”

- 78.12 Councillor Barnett asked the following supplementary question, “Please will you give me some commitment to review the ridiculous rule which stops the Council installing handrails to help elderly residents access their back gardens, it’s completely stopped, I have elderly residents who would love to get into their gardens and unfortunately they were being refused a handrail. We are supposed to be giving the elderly a quality of life not depriving them of access.”

78.13 Councillor Wakefield replied, "I was unaware of this and I apologise for that fact. I'm well aware of how having gardens and having access to a garden can enhance somebody's life so I will certainly give you a promise that I will talk to officers about that and then get back to you and the officers will get back to you to find out what's going on and if we aren't doing it, it could be due to finances; I don't know but we shall try and find out why and see what can be done because if you've got a garden you should be able to get into it. Certainly my elderly mother in-law who is disabled, she gets a lot of enjoyment from going out in to her garden and she has to use two handrails to get out into her garden so I do appreciate the need."

Career Pathways

78.14 Councillor Hamilton asked the following question, "Developing Career Pathways is part of the People's Strategy and I first raised this in a question over two years ago. I was informed that a meeting was to be held last October at which the next steps were being agreed. I've had no updates since then, please could you give me an update on any progress?"

78.15 Councillor J. Kitcat replied, "As you know this was part of the People's Strategy and the feedback from the Staff Consultation in that was that a highly increasing proportion of our employees feel that opportunity for progressions were not clear and that's with the exception of specific areas like social care and finance where there are clear defined paths. In general the feedback was such that they didn't feel the opportunities were clear, so more broadly what we'd like to do in response to that is to create job families so that there's clarity about the options and the requirements of the job roles so that the individuals understand what's needed of them to progress in to a higher level post or laterally in to a different service area and so that the Council can have a more flexible workforce. Unfortunately you voted against that at P&R but thank you for your interest."

78.16 Councillor Hamilton asked the following supplementary question, "Can you please give me some information, the answers I've been receiving over the time all seem to be what I would call holding answers. Can you give me some realistic idea which I can convey to my constituent who keeps asking about this? Can you give me some ideas as to a time span as when it's likely that this policy will be in place?"

78.17 Councillor J. Kitcat replied, "Yes the time span is in the report to P&R which you voted against."

Value for Money in the HRA

78.18 Councillor Mears asked the following question, "In a recent Housing meeting, at the Housing Management Meeting we asked as Opposition Councillors quite some intense questions to get answers around why we were showing a £286,000 pressure within the budget. I would like to thank the Director who has sent me a detailed reply and I will be responding. We were finally told that through the HRA bearing in mind it's made up of tenants' rents which nearly £46,000,000 is tenants' rents. We are proposing to spend another £250,000 on the head of City Regenerations post 30% from the HRA.

It's showing as a pressure what we now hear is that actually it's an on-going revenue cost after more questions. Bearing in mind the post has already been filled can the lead member of Housing confirm why this new arrangement was not included in last year's

budget and also when she agreed this without any report first to Housing, bearing in mind we are now operating a Committee System?"

78.19 Councillor Wakefield replied, "A lot of posts have already been funded out of HRA, it's my understanding that with Jugal Sharma, Head of Housing, Nick Hibberd, Head of Regeneration that their salaries have almost reversed, if you like, because of where the amounts of money have come from. So it is my understanding that no more money is coming out of the Housing Revenue Account than came out previously. If I'm incorrect, I accept that. I think the best thing, because I don't have an amazing knowledge of all the finances, would be for me to give you a written response from officers. I'm quite happy to share that."

78.20 Councillor Mears asked the following supplementary question, "Can the Lead Member also confirm that unlike last year's budget where the homeless budget was cut, she will ensure that it is properly protected so that any money given for pressures will not be taken back as savings and real extra money will be added to mitigate the devastating effects created by the cuts to the Homeless Budget last year?"

78.21 Councillor Wakefield replied, "The amount of money that we are putting in to the Homeless Budget, we've actually recently just put a lot of extra money in because of an increased demand and increased need."

78.22 The budget as you well know when you've seen the figures, will be protected as far as possible, I certainly have no intention of taking money out of the Homeless Budget. There are ongoing savings which are to be made which are to do with value for money."

78.23 The Mayor noted that this concluded the questions from Members.

79. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

(a) Callover

79.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 80 - Submission City Plan, Part 1
- Item 82 - Community Safety, Crime Reduction and Drugs Strategy 2011-14

(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports

79.2 The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

- Item 81 - Adoption of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan
- Item 83 - Review of Secondary School Catchment Areas 2013
- Item 85 - Health and Safety Annual Service Plan 2013/14

(c) Oral Questions from Members

79.3 The Mayor noted that there were no oral questions in relation to those items that had not been reserved for discussion.

80. SUBMISSION CITY PLAN, PART 1

80.1 Councillor Mac Cafferty introduced the report and stated that he was honoured to be able to open the debate on the City Plan which outlined how the council proposed to rise to the economic and social challenges over the next seventeen years. He hoped that the City Plan would be supported and that it would carry the city forward to 2030, providing a balance between homes, jobs, open spaces and the city's heritage. The city had over eight million visitors annually and this needed to be enhanced by way of inward investment for the local economy. The new homes target listed in the plan was achievable but would require forward thinking and whilst every brownfield site was identified, it was likely that some areas of Greenfield would have to be utilised, e.g. the inclusion of Toads Hole Valley. It was a site that was privately owned and the council was seeking to proactively take account of its potential, rather than leave it open to developers under the new planning regulations. He stated that the plan sought to protect the urban fringe and the council hoped to work with the Park Authority to preserve the city's aquifers and to undertake a sustainability appraisal. He noted that the consultation process had been well supported and had provided valuable feedback and he wished to thank all those that had taken part in the process, as well as those councillors involved in the cross-party working group in enabling such a comprehensive and wide-ranging plan to be brought forward. He therefore commended the City Plan to the Council.

80.2 Councillor J. Kitcat formally seconded the City Plan report to the Council and stated that such a decision came to the council once in a generation. It was a decision that would affect residents and visitors today as well as those yet to be born. He believed that the scarcity of amendments being put forward showed that it was right for the city and stated that the majority of the amendments would be accepted. He also wished to thank everyone involved in bringing the Plan to the meeting, it set out a bold and clear vision for the city which he hoped all would support.

80.3 Councillor G. Theobald stated that he wished to express his disappointment that a number of the Conservative Group's amendments had been ruled unsound by officers and therefore prevented from being debated. He believed that it was an important decision for the council and therefore all aspects and views should be considered. In regard to the plan itself, he stated that the need for high quality housing was recognised, however it was irresponsible to include Toads Hove Valley before all other avenues and brownfield sites had been explored. Toads Hove Valley was an area of outstanding natural beauty and should not be placed under threat at this point in time. It only represented 6% of the total housing need and he suggested that as such it should be possible to find the equivalent area of land within the city's brownfield sites. He stated that there was also a question mark over the proposed permanent Traveller site and noted that the Park Authority was not in favour of the proposed location. As things stood, the Conservative Group could not support the recommendations before the council.

- 80.4 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the City Plan and wished to thank the officers involved and the public for their response to the consultation process. She stated that the city's location gave it specific challenges which had to be faced and tackled constructively and difficult decisions taken when necessary. She hoped that the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendments would be accepted as they sought to achieve a balanced plan and take account of transport aspects and provision of new schools in the city. There was some concern that the current policy of expanding existing schools would not be sufficient to meet demand. She noted that the plan had to be sound, in order to stand up to the Planning Inspector's requirements and any public enquiry and therefore only sound amendments could be considered and possibly adopted.
- 80.5 The Mayor noted that each Theme listed in the Plan would be moved and seconded and any amendments relating to those themes would also be moved and seconded as detailed in the addendum papers. He therefore called on Councillor Kitcat to move the Spatial Strategy Theme.
- 80.6 Councillor J. Kitcat moved the proposals listed under the Spatial Strategy Theme and noted the comments of the other Group Leaders. He stated that the previous Administration had applied for funding to enable a permanent traveller site to be provided and as such the current proposal was seeking to use that funding. With regard to the Labour & Co-operative amendments, he was happy to accept amendments 1 – 4 as they clarified the wording of the policies. He also recognised the need for new schools in the city and believed the plan offered a clear framework for the economic development of the city. As for housing, the available brownfield sites did not provide sufficient capacity to meet the target and therefore other avenues had to be identified.
- 80.7 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the proposals under the Spatial Strategy Theme and noted that the housing shortage had been previously identified by the Planning Inspector in 2010 and the council had no choice but to address this matter. He stated that the Plan also sought to improve access to the National Park and to provide a realistic and deliverable strategy for the city.
- 80.8 Councillor Pissaridou moved the Labour & Co-operative Group amendment under the Spatial Strategy Theme which sought to clarify the process for building and expanding schools and where possible with the consent of the school.
- 80.9 Councillor Morgan formally seconded the amendment.
- 80.10 Councillor Morgan then moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's second amendment under the Spatial Strategy Theme, which sought to clarify the need to improve the Brighton Station Gateway area for the benefit of the local economy and visitors to the city.
- 80.11 Councillor Pissaridou formally seconded the amendment.
- 80.12 Councillor Morgan then moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's third amendment under the Spatial Strategy Theme, which sought to require the undertaking of a feasibility study for the re-routing and reduction of through traffic in relation to the 3Ts development.

- 80.13 Councillor Pissaridou formally seconded the amendment.
- 80.14 Councillor Morgan then moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's fourth amendment under the Spatial Strategy Theme, which sought to protect the urban fringe from development in view of recent changes to the national planning framework.
- 80.15 Councillor Pissaridou formally seconded the amendment.
- 80.16 Councillor Bowden then moved the Strong & Prosperous City Theme and stated that he wished to echo the thanks given to officers and all others involved in the development of the City Plan. He fully supported the continued improvement in economic performance and the appropriate spread of employment sites across the city, which was an essential foundation for developing the workforce. There was a need to address the need for housing and he noted that 94% of the proposed target could be met from brownfield sites and the inclusion of Toads Hole Valley was critical to enabling the council to fulfil the overall target.
- 80.17 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the proposals listed under the Theme and noted that during the first six months of the last year over 628 new companies had formed and these needed to be supported and further ones encouraged, in order to support the local economy and encourage growth. There was a clear long-term strategy for Shoreham Harbour and the council was working with neighbouring authorities of Adur and West Sussex and the Port Authority to take this forward.
- 80.18 Councillor West formally moved the proposals listed under the Sustainable City Theme and stated that the next two decades would see a number of challenges for the planet and the need to work to protect the environment and become a One Planet City was ever more necessary. There was a need to reduce carbon emissions, improve energy resources and transport systems as well as enhancing open spaces and making them more accessible.
- 80.19 Councillor Davey formally seconded the proposals under the Theme and stated that it was imperative to deliver a sustainable transport system and noted that outside of London, Brighton & Hove was the least car dependent city. He stated that more people than ever were travelling into the city by public transport and this needed to be encouraged and improvements made to bus and rail networks. He was happy to accept the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendments other than in regard to park & ride, which he believed was no longer a viable option for the city. He also confirmed that he could not accept the Conservative Group's amendment.
- 80.20 Councillor Hyde then moved the Conservative Group amendment under the Sustainable City Theme, which sought to encourage the creation of 3 zones within the city, the central zone being considered for car free access, the middle zone having car access on the merits of any developments and the outer zone covering the suburbs and villages which required transport links into the city to discourage the use of cars.
- 80.21 Councillor Cox formally seconded the amendment and stated that there was a need for a flexible approach to parking and enabling key-workers to have parking spaces rather than preventing them from taking up the available accommodation because of the need to have a car; or simply dispersing the parking of their cars to other areas e.g. in

Westbourne Ward where a car-free block of flats has led to cars being parked in surrounding roads. There was also the need to recognise that people's circumstances changed and by only providing flats in the city centre, it prevented families from moving out because of the high cost of housing elsewhere in the city.

- 80.22 Councillor Mitchell moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's first amendment under the Sustainable City Theme, which sought to encourage high sustainable building design without placing too much demand on potential developers.
- 80.23 Councillor Robins formally seconded the amendment.
- 80.24 Councillor Mitchell moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's second amendment under the Sustainable City Theme, which sought to enable the consideration of a park & ride solution for the city's transport needs, rather than ruling it out until 2030. She suggested that there was a need to look at enabling traffic to remain outside of the city and for people to then travel in on public transport.
- 80.25 Councillor Robins formally seconded the amendment and stated that there was a need to identify a location and provide a park & ride facility which would then encourage more visitors to the city.
- 80.26 Councillor Mitchell moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's third amendment under the Sustainable City Theme, which sought to encourage the development of a second main rail line for Brighton, which would be viable and lead to economic benefits for the city and surrounding areas.
- 80.27 Councillor Robins formally seconded the amendment and stated that the existing rail line was running at capacity and more investment was required and a new Brighton Main Line 2 would provide additional capacity and greater links as well as benefitting the Amex stadium.
- 80.28 Councillor Deane moved the proposals listed under the Attractive City Theme and stated that there was a need to safeguard the city's assets and to promote its heritage. It was important that new developments could be encouraged and additional housing and employment facilities provided to enable the city to grow. She fully supported the role of the arts and tourism in helping to promote the city and hoped that the Plan would enable the council to maintain and build on the legacy that the city had. She also acknowledged that she was happy to accept the Conservative Group's amendment.
- 80.29 Councillor Hawtree formally seconded the Theme and stated that it promoted new opportunities for recreation and sport as well as enhancing and protecting the city's green spaces. He believed that it offered an opportunity for greater investment and sustainable solutions that would benefit everyone in the city.
- 80.30 Councillor Peltzer Dunn moved the Conservative Group's amendment under the An Attractive City Theme, which sought to ensure that residential developments were considered on a case by case basis and enabled positive negotiation to that end.

- 80.31 Councillor Mears formally seconded the amendment and stated that it was important to be able to consider potential developments on a case by case basis, as housing density was an important element and there was a need to learn from past mistakes.
- 80.32 Councillor Wakefield moved the proposals listed under the Healthy and Balanced Communities Theme, and stated that a key aim had to be to provide stronger and safer communities within the city. She believed that everyone had a right to education, good health care and to feel safe within their homes. The intention was to provide more sustainable homes, more primary and secondary places, more affordable homes and to meet the needs of the travelling community. She hoped that community engagement would be encouraged and that the gap between deprived neighbourhoods could be narrowed.
- 80.33 Councillor Powell formally seconded the Theme and stated that new affordable housing was in desperate need to meet demand and the sliding scale for new developments was a practical approach. She noted that planning decisions could influence the health of a city and improve access, housing conditions, work and economic factors. She also welcomed the intention to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers and to take account of the need for and impact of student housing in the city.
- 80.34 Councillor Peltzer Dunn moved the Conservative Group's amendment under the Healthy and Balanced Communities Theme, which sought to enable further flexibility in regard to the number of affordable housing units that were provided in any development, whilst seeking to maximise the number achieved. He suggested that affordable units would be provided through the Private Sector and in taking into account the financial viability he hoped that the amendment would be given consideration.
- 80.35 Councillor C. Theobald formally seconded the amendment and stated that there was a need to say up to 40% affordable housing for a development, so that smaller developments could progress albeit with a lower percentage of affordable housing. She believed that without the flexibility it was likely to prevent future developments from being put forward.
- 80.36 Councillor Meadows moved the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendment under the Healthy and Balanced Communities Theme, which sought to clarify the policy with the inclusion of a specific reference to extra care housing provision. She believed that suitable accommodation would be required and that extra care facilities similar to those of Larchwood and Patching Lodge had to be provided. She also referred to the Conservative Group's amendment and stated that she could not support it.
- 80.37 Councillor Farrow formally seconded the amendment.
- 80.38 Councillor J. Kitcat confirmed that the Administration were willing to accept the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendment but not the Conservative Group's.
- 80.39 The Mayor noted that all the Themes and amendments under various themes had been moved and seconded and therefore opened the matter for general debate.
- 80.40 Councillor Wilson welcomed the City Plan and stated that the emphasis had to be on building strong communities, encouraging economic development and enabling people

to have a home. She stated that all available space should be utilised and consideration given to the geographical layout of the city so that the impact of welfare reforms could be accounted for and economic regeneration encouraged.

- 80.41 Councillor K. Norman welcomed the inclusion of the reference to extra care housing and agreed that the city already had two excellent facilities. He supported the commitment to improve the area and hoped that it would be taken forward.
- 80.42 Councillor Fitch referred to the inclusion of Toads Hole Valley and stated that he believed there were other sites within the city that could be utilised and therefore prevent the need for the inclusion of Toads Hove Valley for development. He believed that the area or outstanding natural beauty should be retained and enjoyed by residents and visitors to the city and that the alternative use of other sites would enable the council to meet its housing targets. He therefore asked the council to think again and not include Toads Hole Valley within the City Plan.
- 80.43 Councillor West stated that there was a need to look at sustainable solutions to the city's needs and to address the issues of housing, office space and transport. He noted that a report on parking facilities was due to be considered by the Environment & Sustainability Committee and questioned the suggestion and viability of providing a park & ride site within the city as had been promoted by the Labour & Co-operative Group.
- 80.44 Councillor Bennett referred to Toads Hole Valley and stated that she could not support its inclusion in the City Plan and suggested that it would result in developers choosing to put forward schemes in favour of available brown-field sites. She also believed that should any development take place it would lead to further transport issues and impact directly on the local community. She therefore wished to see its removal from the City Plan.
- 80.45 Councillor Simson stated that she supported the Conservative Group's amendment in relation to CP9, as there was a need to recognise that future developments had to account for the use of the car. If there was a blanket policy for car-free developments it would only exacerbate the problem of cars being parked in surrounding areas, on verges and without public network links would isolate the outlying wards.
- 80.46 Councillor Davey stated that the provision of a park and ride scheme had not been delivered by previous administrations and the sites suggested to date had proved to be unviable. He did not believe a viable site existed in the city and suggested that park and ride would not work for the city and therefore it should be dropped as a proposal.
- 80.47 Councillor Brown questioned the process for the consideration of amendments and the decision of officers to determine that some were unsound. She believed that Toads Hole Valley should remain free from development and queried whether an appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment had been completed in regard to the proposed of the land. She did not believe that sufficient consideration had been given to the need for transport links and the pollution that would result from increased car usage.
- 80.48 Councillor Shanks stated that the need for more schools in the city was recognised and welcomed the Labour & Co-operative Group amendment. She noted that the Government's position prevented the council from building new schools and hoped that

pressure could be put on the government to enable local authorities to address this problem. Although it was possible to expand existing schools it was not necessarily going to be sufficient to meet the demand for school places in the city.

- 80.49 Councillor Wealls noted the proposed Labour & Co-operative Group's amendment in relation to schools and stated that the Conservative Group amendment would have gone further but had been ruled out as being unsound. He also noted that a provision for an additional 200 homes at Brighton Marina had been made without a new school being identified, and there were over 1800 new homes listed for the New England Quarter but again no school provision. He suggested that there was a need to look at these and other proposed levels of development and to ensure that school provision was also included.
- 80.50 Councillor Mears referred to the proposed increase in the provision of one and two-bedroom units and suggested that the level of density needed to be relooked at and reconsidered. She also expressed concern over the need for extra care housing provision and ways to ensure that it was delivered identified and listed.
- 80.51 Councillor Hawtree stated that housing density was an important issue and one that would be taken into consideration, bearing in mind the nature of the city and the differing factors for the town centre and the outskirts of the city.
- 80.52 Councillor G. Theobald stated that he could not support the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendments which were effectively a play on words and delivered no real change. He questioned the need for the car-free developments and noted that the Park Authority had expressed concern over the inclusion of the permanent traveller site within the national park boundary and he also questioned the impact on the city's aquifer.
- 80.53 Councillor Janio referred the housing target listed in the Plan and asked for a legal ruling as he believed the original housing needs survey had identified a higher number of housing units that were required for the city. He noted that the Conservative Group's amendment had been ruled out and queried whether the revised target was something that the Planning Inspector could determine.
- 80.54 The Monitoring Officer stated that it was important to note that officers had not made a decision to prevent amendments from being submitted, but had expressed a view on the soundness of the amendments. The Leaders Group had agreed the use of the proposed protocol that was then put before the Council for determination. The protocol was based on previous versions used for both the City Plan and the Budget setting process. It was custom and practice for councillors to take into account the opinions of officers and the protocol only came into effect with the consent of the Council. In regard to the submission of the amendments, the question of 'soundness' was one for officers to express their professional opinion and this was based on planning considerations, evidence received, the Inspector's comments and the use of the compulsory purchase Act. He also noted that the National Planning Policy Framework required the submission of the City Plan to be on a sound basis. The planning officers had taken into account the report of the Inspector in 2012 and advised that the Conservative Group's proposed amendment was unsound and he had found no basis on which to defer from that judgement. The use of the protocol was custom and practice for the authority and

having been approved by the council was appropriate as a basis for enabling the consideration of the City Plan.

- 80.55 Councillor J. Kitcat questioned whether Councillor Theobald supported the use of 'Fracking' and pointed out that the council was unable to build new schools as had been previously suggested as being an option available to it. He welcomed the Labour & Co-operative's amendment for the inclusion of a second main line for Brighton, BML2. He stated that congestion was an issue that the city had to tackle, and whilst park and ride may have helped in the past, it was not something that was likely to happen and therefore should be discounted.
- 80.56 Councillor Peltzer Dunn referred to the issue of Toads Hole Valley and noted that it was a green-field site and therefore queried on what basis the land for housing provision had been identified and where it had been identified prior to Toads Hole Valley being included as a potential site for development.
- 80.57 The Mayor noted that the debate had come to an end and invited Councillor Mac Cafferty to respond.
- 80.58 Councillor Mac Cafferty thanked the Mayor and stated that he wished to thank all the Members for the debate on the issue. He stated that in regard to fulfilling the housing target, the City Plan had identified 94% of the required units being on brown-field sites and the potential development on Toads Hole Valley was equivalent to the required 6% that remained. He noted that the National Planning Policy Framework required local authorities to consider both brown-field and green-field sites. He believed that the affordable housing policy maximised the provision for affordable housing and recognised the economic climate that potential developers were working in.
- 80.59 The Mayor stated that he would put each of the amendments to the vote before putting the final recommendations as amended, if amended to the vote.

The Spatial Strategy

- 80.60 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.1 to the vote which was carried:

SO21 *Replace '...future increases in population through expansion of successful schools and by providing new schools' with '...future increases in population by working with partners, including not for profit organisations, to build new schools and by expanding successful schools (where possible, with the consent of the school)'.*

SA6 Sustainable Neighbourhoods

Amend sentence being 'Where there is an identified shortfall of places...' to: 'Where there is an identified shortfall of school places the city council will work with partners, including not for profit organisations, to identify sites and build new schools and expand successful schools (where possible, with the consent of the school)'.

- 80.61 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.2 to the vote which was carried.

DA4 New England Quarter/London Road

Replace part 5 of the policy to: 'Working with Southern Rail, Network Rail and partners to enhance the environment and maximise use of space around Brighton Rail Station (Brighton Station Gateway) recognising its important role as a gateway to the city, a public space, a major transport interchange and the need to improve links to and from the station.'

80.62 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.3 to the vote which was carried.

DA5 Eastern Road and Edward Street

Add the following (underlined) to first sentence of paragraph: 'A feasibility study will be carried out to consider the re-routing and reduction of through traffic (with the exception of residents' vehicles, public transport including taxis, ambulances other hospital transport and vehicles directly accessing the hospital) and if approved implemented prior to completion of the 3Ts development at the Royal Sussex County Hospital ...'

80.63 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.4 to the vote which was carried.

SA4 Urban Fringe

Amend introductory sentence from 'Development within the urban fringe will only be permitted where' to state: 'Development within the urban fringe will not be permitted except where.'

A Sustainable City

80.64 The Mayor then put the Conservative Amendment to the vote which was lost.

80.65 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.1 to the vote which was carried.

CP8 Sustainable Buildings

Replace the existing text with the underlined text below to paragraph 4.77 of the supporting text of the policy: '... Within this context, the need to secure improvement in the environmental performance of the existing stock and more resource efficient and carbon neutral development whilst delivering homes and jobs through development is challenging. The combination of standards with provisions for viability assessments will help to address this challenge. These will provide the flexibility needed to ensure the right balance between the economic, environmental and social objectives of the City Plan. Energy, water ...'

80.66 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.2 to the vote which was lost.

80.67 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment No.3 to the vote which was carried.

CP9 *Amend text to last sentence of para 4.98 to: 'The need for rail service capacity and line improvements between the Sussex coast and London, including the reinstatement of the rail line between Lewes and Uckfield, are supported.'*

An Attractive City

80.68 The Mayor then put the Conservative Amendment to the vote which was carried.

CP14 Housing Density

Just alter first sentence of policy to read: Residential development should be of a density that is appropriate to the identified positive character of the neighbourhood and be determined on a case by case basis.

Healthy and Balanced Communities

80.69 The Mayor then put the Conservative Amendment to the vote which was lost.

80.70 The Mayor then put the Labour & Co-operative Amendment to the vote which was carried.

CP19 Housing Mix

Add 'extra care housing;' after ;....older and disabled people;'

80.71 The Mayor noted that a number of amendments had been carried and therefore moved that the recommendations relating to the City Plan report as amended be approved and put this to the vote which was carried.

80.72 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the summary of the responses to the consultation on the draft City Plan Part 1 (as amended), (summarised in Appendix 1 to the report with a full schedule attached to the Statement of Consultation on city council's website, placed in the Members' Rooms and in Customer Service Centres) be noted;
- (2) That the Proposed Submission City Plan Part 1 (as amended), be agreed and published for statutory public consultation for a six week period commencing in February 2013, (Along with appendices and supporting documents);
- (3) That the document should be subsequently submitted to the Secretary of State subject to no material changes, other than alterations for the purposes of clarification, improved accuracy of meaning or typographical corrections, being necessary;
- (4) That the Head of Planning and Public Protection be authorised to agree any draft "main modifications" to the City Plan Part 1 necessary to make it sound and to authorise the publication of such draft modifications for public consultation save that should any draft modification involve a major shift in the policy approach of the City Plan Part 1 the draft modification shall be referred by the Head of Planning and Public Protection to the Policy & Resources Committee for approval;

- (5) That it be noted that all modifications to the Plan will be presented to the Policy & Resources Committee and Full Council in due course as part of the adoption of the City Plan Part 1; and
- (6) That the following studies as supporting evidence for the City Plan and further Local Development Documents be approved:
 1. The Employment Land Study Review 2012
 2. Draft Transport Assessment 2012
 3. The Brighton and Hove Energy Study 2012
 4. Local Housing Requirements update 2012
 5. Strategic Housing land Availability assessment (SHLAA) Update 2012
 6. Housing Needs Assessment 2012
 7. Site capacity assessments 2012.

Note: The Conservative Group abstained from voting on the above item.

Motion to terminate the meeting:

80.73 In accordance with Procedural Rule 17, the Mayor noted that the meeting had been in session for over four hours and he was therefore required to move a closure motion to effectively terminate the meeting.

80.74 The Mayor moved the closure motion and put the matter to the vote which was carried and therefore the Mayor noted each of the remaining items would need to be taken and voted on or withdrawn by the mover before the meeting was concluded. He noted that the remaining item was No. 86(b).

81. ADOPTION OF THE EAST SUSSEX, SOUTH DOWNS AND BRIGHTON & HOVE WASTE AND MINERALS PLAN

81.1 RESOLVED:

8. That the WMP, incorporating the Main Modification and minor modifications, as waste and minerals planning policy subject to the Head of Planning and Public Protection agreeing any further minor changes to the text of the Waste and Minerals Plan with East Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority be adopted;
9. That the analysis of the responses to the consultation on the Main Modification to the WMP be noted;
10. That the contents of the Inspector's Report and her conclusion that the WMP is legally compliant and 'sound' be noted;
11. That the minor non-material modifications made to the WMP be noted; and
12. That the Main Modification made to the WMP be agreed.

82. COMMUNITY SAFETY, CRIME REDUCTION AND DRUGS STRATEGY 2011-2014

- 82.1 Councillor Jarrett introduced the report which outlined the Community Safety, Crime Reduction and Drugs Strategy for the period 2011 to 2014 and noted that it was a statutory and city-wide plan which set out the priorities and work programme for delivery by the Community Safety Partnership. He stated that it was an important issue and involved a number of partner agencies and would be kept under review. He also drew the council's attention to a number of new initiatives that were being taken forward and hoped that all Members would support the strategy.
- 82.2 Councillor Morgan welcomed the strategy and stated that he believed it offered a good way forward and noted that there were still areas of concern which would need joint working if they were to be addressed effectively. He wished to thank the officers involved in producing the strategy and stated that all residents should feel safe and protected within their communities.
- 82.3 Councillor K. Norman welcomed the report and stated that it was a wide-ranging strategy and one that should be fully supported.
- 82.4 Councillor Cox stated that it would be helpful to have a summary of the strategy so that those interested in it and wishing to raise awareness could use it to encourage others to get involved and look at the whole document.
- 82.5 Councillor Jarrett welcomed the cross-party support and stated that he would discuss the option of producing a summary document with officers and take it forward.
- 82.6 The Mayor noted that the recommendations contained in the report had been moved and put them to the vote.
- 82.7 **RESOLVED:**
1. That the crime reduction and safety priorities included within the updated Community Safety, Crime Reduction and Drugs Strategy 2011 – 2014 be approved; and
 2. That the summary of some of the new work included within the Strategy together with action being taken to improve value for money be noted.

83. REVIEW OF SECONDARY SCHOOL CATCHMENT AREAS 2013**83.1 RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the summary details of the Review into the Secondary School Admissions process for Brighton & Hove and its particular focus on the delineation of catchment areas be noted;
- (2) That it be agreed that no changes be made to the existing Secondary Catchment areas for the academic year 2014/15;

- (3) That the cross party working group should continue to meet on a six weekly basis to monitor the impact of national and local changes related to Secondary Admissions. This will include the creation of new academies or free schools;
- (4) That the cross party working group should reform its stakeholder group as and when needed to consider proposals for any change beyond 2014/15;
- (5) That it be noted that the Admissions Team would review its annual publications in the light of concerns over the “equal preference” system and the continued misunderstanding regarding parental “choice.”

84. OPTIONS FOR PROVIDING ADDITIONAL SCHOOL PLACES IN 2013 AND 2014

Note: This item had been withdrawn.

85. HEALTH AND SAFETY ANNUAL SERVICE PLAN 2013/14

85.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Health & Safety Annual Service Plan 2013/14 as detailed in appendix 1 to the report be approved.

86. NOTICES OF MOTION.

(a) Council Structure & Service Delivery

86.1 The Notice of Motion as detailed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Janio on behalf of the Conservative Group and seconded by Councillor Cox.

86.2 The Mayor then put the following motion to vote:

“This Council notes that local authorities have a statutory obligation to their residents to secure continuous improvement in the way in which their functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

Therefore, this Council notes with concern the recent assessment of the Audit Commission that spending at Brighton & Hove is ‘generally in the top 10%’ of councils and that the Council’s unit costs ‘also appear high compared to other local authorities’.

This Council further notes that the ratio of managers to staff in the organisation is relatively high in comparison to the private sector and, given that staff account for over a third of the Council’s total expenditure, agrees that a review of staffing structures would be beneficial for council taxpayers.

This Council also notes that there are functions still being carried out, such as the collection of large volumes of performance data, that Communities & Local Government has recommended should stop, and that are continuing to absorb funds that could be usefully redeployed to front line services.

This Council is also greatly concerned that the current Administration has effectively abandoned any attempts to introduce and bed in a commissioning model of service delivery and continues to prioritise in-house services for political reasons without any

evidence that they provide taxpayers with better value for money. This failure to take an open-minded and holistic approach to the delivery of services condemns the local authority to years of further salami-slicing of budgets with the result being an inevitable deterioration in the standard of essential frontline services.

Therefore, this Council:

- (i) Requests the Chief Executive to carry out a review of the structure of the organisation as part of the modernisation programme, with particular reference to layers of management and numbers of managers per member of staff, and to report back to Policy & Resources Committee;
- (ii) Requests the Policy & Resources Committee to consider the report and make decisions about who delivers Council services based on objective evidence of costs and benefits to residents rather than on political dogma.

86.3 The motion was lost.

(b) Reject the Benefit Cap

86.4 Councillor J. Kitcat confirmed that he wished the Notice of Motion as detailed in the agenda to be taken.

86.5 The Mayor then put the following motion to the vote:

“This council notes that the Government plans this year to implement an annual cap on the total benefits a household can receive. This cap will be £26,000 a year for a household with children living in it, and £18,200 for those without [1].

This council believes the cap is a punitive and unnecessary measure which penalises the poor whilst the government has failed to make the wealthy and major companies as Amazon and Starbucks pay their fair share for supporting the costs of running a fair and decent welfare system. It is estimated that 60% of those in receipt of benefits and tax credits are in some form of work. Rather than seeking to reduce the welfare bill by cutting benefits, the government should seek to increase wages taking people out of the need to make ends meet through benefits.

This council also notes the logistical difficulties the government is experiencing in delivering this ill-considered policy, including the recently delayed implementation date for the cap from April 2013 to as late as September 2013.

It is estimated that when it is implemented the cap will force around 300 of Brighton and Hove's poorest families out of their homes. The government has confirmed that they cannot be considered 'intentionally homeless' and so the council will have a duty of care to them. The council estimates the cost of housing these families will be approximately £1.1m in the first year alone.

This council also notes the Department for Communities and Local Government's 2011 New Burdens Doctrine, which states that:

"the Cabinet has agreed that all new burdens on local authorities must be properly assessed and fully funded by the relevant department... [this is] to ensure that the pressure on council tax is kept down"[2]

The Council therefore resolves:

- (1) To note that the benefit cap will unfairly penalise and dispossess the poorest families in our city and result in perverse additional costs to the public purse; and
- (2) Requests the Chief Executive to write to the senior ministers responsible in both the Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Communities and Local Government seeking;
 - (i) the abolition of the benefits cap,
 - (ii) to acknowledge that should it not be cancelled, the results of the benefit cap impose a new burden on local government; and
 - (iii) As such, this new burden should be funded by central government so that the council can support those affected by its introduction."

86.6 **The motion was carried.**

87. CLOSE OF MEETING

87.1 The Mayor thanked everyone for attending and declared the meeting closed.

The meeting concluded at 9.50pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2013