

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL

4.30pm 17 DECEMBER 2015

COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Hyde (Chair), West (Deputy Chair), Allen, Atkinson, Barford, Barradell, Bell, Bennett, Bewick, Brown, Cattell, Chapman, Cobb, Daniel, Deane, Druitt, Gibson, Gilbey, Greenbaum, Hamilton, Hill, Horan, Inkipin-Leissner, Janio, Knight, Lewry, Littman, Mac Cafferty, Marsh, Meadows, Mears, Miller, Mitchell, Moonan, Morgan, Morris, Nemeth, A Norman, K Norman, O'Quinn, Penn, Phillips, Robins, Simson, Sykes, Taylor, C Theobald, G Theobald, Wares, Wealls and Yates

PART ONE

52 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 52.1 Councillor Inkipin-Leissner declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 68, Expansion of Gatwick Airport, Notice of Motion which had been referred from the Economic Development & Culture Committee for information; as he worked at Gatwick Airport.
- 52.2 Councillor Hamilton declared a personal interest in Item 58(a), Petition regarding Specialist Advisory Teachers in the Learning Support Service as his daughter worked for the service.
- 52.3 Councillor Bennett declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 68(a), Expansion of Gatwick Airport, Notice of Motion which had been referred from the Economic Development & Culture Committee for information; as she worked at Gatwick Airport.
- 52.4 No other declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.

53 MINUTES

- 53.1 The minutes of the last ordinary meeting held on the 22nd October 2015 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings; subject to an amendment to paragraph 39.15 which was changed as shown in bold italics to read as follows at Councillor Cobb's request:

39.15 “Councillor Cobb stated that she fully agreed with the petition and felt that the city was behind in regard to the provision of leisure facilities and noted ***that technology more than 30 years ago used the heat from a swimming pool to cool the ice of an ice rink and vice versa. She was sure that technology had advanced over this time period, and suggested that the proposed King Alfred development should be able to provide such a facility to enable the inclusion of an ice-rink.***”

54 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

- 54.1 The Mayor informed the Council that she had to announce the death of former Conservative Councillor Ruth Larkin who served for 21 years on Brighton Borough Council, before becoming an inaugural member of the Older People's Council in 2007. She chaired the Planning Committee for a number of years and was known for arriving at site visits on her bicycle. The Mayor then asked everyone to stand for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.
- 54.2 The Mayor stated that she was mindful that there were a number of public items on the agenda and that in order to help Members to have an idea of the items to be debated later in the meeting; she intended to adjourn the meeting for the refreshment break after she had concluded the Call Over.
- 54.3 The Mayor then offered the Council's congratulations to the Legal Services Team who had won 2 awards at the recent Local Government Legal Awards. The first was for the Governance Legal Team of the Year which was won by our Corporate Law Team. She noted that the judges of the award commented that the team “developed practical governance solutions tailored to the specific needs of a number of different projects and, significantly, met the aspirations of varied partners within those projects.” She then invited Liz Culbert and Isabella Sidoli to come forward to accept the award on behalf of their team.
- 54.4 The Mayor stated that the second award was for People Related Legal Team of the Year which was won by the Safeguarding and Litigation Legal Team. She noted that the judges of the award commented that the winner “had demonstrated a high standard across the board with particular innovation and good practice in relation to the protection of children from radicalisation and prevention of travel to war zones resulting in widespread acclaim.” She then invited Natasha Watson, Simon Court and Charmain Sadler to come forward to accept the award.
- 54.5 The Mayor noted that the Council had been named the local authority partner of the year at the Fields in Trust annual award ceremony held at Lords Cricket Ground. The award recognises the Council's work with charity Fields in Trust to protect outdoor recreational spaces in perpetuity and encouraging people to use parks and playing fields across the city. She invited Councillors Mitchel and Ann Norman to come forward to jointly accept the award on behalf of the council.
- 54.6 Finally, she stated that she had been made aware of the recent Big Difference Award that the Chief Executive had given to the Council's Bereavement team. She also noted that Bereavement Team had been commended by our partner organisations for their work and role during the Shoreham Airport disaster. Whilst this had been rightly recognised by the Chief Executive, she felt that on this occasion it should be reported

to all Members and the Council given the opportunity to express their thanks and recognition of the team's work. She therefore invited Sean Didcott and Sam Down to come forward on the team's behalf to receive the Big Difference certificate.

55 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.

- 55.1 The Mayor invited the submission of petitions from councillors and members of the public. She 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.
- 55.2 Mr. J. Blackbear presented a petition with 232 signatures concerning parking facilities at Ingram Crescent.
- 55.3 Ms. M. Alexander presented a petition with 827 signatures concerning the level of the Council Tax Reduction applied by the Council.
- 55.4 Ms. V. Paynter presented a petition with 122 signatures requesting that a Planning Brief be drawn up for the Kingsway.

56 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 56.1 The Mayor reported that six written questions had been received from members of the public and invited Ms. Paynter to come forward and address the council.
- 56.2 Ms. Paynter thanked the Mayor and asked the following question; "At clause 8.12.1, Supplementary Planning Guidance note SPGBH15 provides for "mid-rise" tall buildings along the Kingsway in Hove which is a designated corridor, suitable to take tall buildings. May I have, please, a definition of what is meant by "mid-rise" and how many storeys over what height this definition would allow?"
- 56.3 Councillor Morgan replied; "Mid-rise buildings are defined in the tall buildings strategic planning document as between 6-8 stories or 18-23 meters tall."
- 56.4 Ms. Paynter asked the following supplementary question; "One of the things that I think needs to be done is that this tall buildings strategy needs to be reviewed. Can you agree that the compass document was created in 2004 which is 11/12 years ago, it's time for it to be reviewed and perhaps tightened up because an awful lot has changed in that period of time?"
- 56.5 Councillor Morgan replied; "Yes I'm happy to take that up with planning officers and discuss whether there is a review due."
- 56.6 The Mayor thanked Ms. Paynter for her questions and invited Mr. Hawtree to come forward and address the council.
- 56.7 Mr. Hawtree thanked the Mayor and asked the following question; "If, Heaven forbid, Hove's Carnegie Library is sold, what Use Class would it have?"

- 56.8 Councillor Morgan replied; “The existing use is D1 and the library is a community facility. The policy Ho20 applies to the retention of community facility which says that in the event that an alternative community facility can be accommodated then a residential or mixed use scheme would be acceptable.”
- 56.9 Mr. Hawtree asked the following supplementary question; “Bearing in mind that we’ve heard quite a lot down the line so far that all this turns upon money. Could you please tell us how much more you anticipate the PFI deal for Brighton library including the ring fenced book fund will cost each year with the forth coming renegotiation of the PFI deal?”
- 56.10 Councillor Morgan replied; “I don’t have that information to hand but I’ll be happy to supply it to you on advice from officers.”
- 56.11 The Mayor thanked Mr. Hawtree for his questions and invited Mr. Sharpe to come forward and address the council.

Mr. Sharpe thanked the Mayor and asked the following question; “So this council set up the fairness commission to make sure everyone has an opportunity to lead healthy and productive lives. The Fairness Commission is set up so it will make a difference because it says in the description of the Fairness Commission the findings of the Fairness Commission will inform the Council budget.

Last Thursday 10th the Fairness Commission was looking at the life chances of children and young people. Even the introductory text to this theme noted “the benefits of early intervention to improve children's life chances. Will the council therefore commit to waiting until the commission has reported in summer 2016 before even considering any cuts to front line services that deliver early intervention for children with special educational needs?”

- 56.12 Councillor Bewick replied; “In terms of pre-school children with special education needs current proposals are looking at a flexible and responsive service to work with all children from pre-school to 18 years. I hear what Mr Sharpe’s saying about the Fairness Commission and that will of course inform the budgets over the four year budget which of course this administration is committed to. The new service however will offer an all year round service to parents, children’s and early years settings rather than mainly term time only. So I don’t accept that this administration isn’t already making the necessary reforms to ensure that those young children have their life chances met. I’d also like to stress that there are no plans to reduce the funding for dedicated one to one support for children with special needs in early years provision or the capacity of the support staff who currently work as nursery nurses in the pre-school area. It’s not possible unfortunately to delay the re-designation of children’s centres from 12 to 7 because the Council does not have enough money in the budget to continue to run that number of designated centres. However these services are available to all children as well as those with special education needs and it’s worth stressing that last year the previous administration agreed to delay a budget reduction of £670,000 for one year only. Reductions in central government funding mean that we have to look at further savings.”

56.13 Mr. Sharpe asked the following supplementary question; "I asked this question because as well as the planned cuts to children's centres which effect early years provision in the city the current publicly available information which isn't always necessarily detailed and fully up to date to be able to fully understand what's happening but my understanding of the current publicly available information suggests that the restructuring of the learning support services effectively proposes quite a significant cut in the staffing levels of the pre-school element of this service as it hasn't been specifically protected and there's no clarity about how many of the staff available will be delivering pre-school services and this cut is unfair because the children involved.

Will the Council please commit to providing the same level of front line services, not talking about back office savings, but front line services for special educational needs provision for children with pre-school SEN needs?"

56.14 Councillor Bewick replied; "There are no plans to reduce front line support to children with special educational needs but there are plans of course to modernise, transform and integrate the service for special educational needs and in terms of the overall headcount actually in terms of the reduction of staff and I think it's very important that members understand this because there's a lot of misinformation on social media and in the media and elsewhere but the actual reduction in staff headcount will be from 58 to 55 staff. Yes, in relation to the pre-school service we are asking for staff to work in different ways, actually in ways that other local authorities around the country already work with their staff and I'll be able to provide further detail to other questions and petitions that are out to this Council later on."

56.15 The Mayor thanked Mr. Sharpe for his questions and invited Ms. Jenkins to come forward and address the council.

56.16 Ms. Jenkins thanked the Mayor and asked the following question; "With our neighbouring local authorities continuing to recognise the value of qualified Teachers of the Deaf, employing them under teachers' pay and conditions, can the Lead Councillor for CYPs explain how the service in our city will not be affected if Brighton and Hove's Teachers of the Deaf, living in a city with very high living costs, are redefined as advisors, their pay and conditions cut and they find themselves forced to leave this authority, in order to do the job they've trained for and given so many dedicated years to?"

56.17 Councillor Bewick replied; "Can I say at the outset that what she said there about a cut in pay and conditions for advisors is absolutely not true. That is not the policy of this administration and let me tell you that this administration places the highest value on qualifications of our teachers of the deaf and thankfully they hold those qualifications in the city where there's currently relatively low incidents of need in this area. However the current proposals are about retaining the need for all SEN specialist advisors working in the area of hearing impairment to have this qualification as they do now and they will continue to have the same pay as they have in the past. Now there is currently a consultation in process with the 8 teams that provide support to schools with children with special educational needs and disabilities and this includes our services for children of course with visual and hearing impairment. This consultation ends on the 31st of January 2016 and the proposal is to bring together an integrated service of

professionals that achieves the right balance between the flexibility and the specialism to meet all needs. There is no proposed reduction in this consultation in front line services to children and families with sensory needs.”

- 56.18 Ms. Jenkins asked the following supplementary question; “Are you saying that teachers of the deaf are not going to be moved onto the Soulbury pay scale?”
- 56.19 Councillor Bewick replied; “There is a proposal which is out for consultation which we’re discussing with staff, with trade unions and other stakeholders to look at moving staff on to Soulbury scales but what I want to stress about this proposed moved is these will still be qualified teachers with qualified teacher status. The pay of those teachers on the Soulbury scales will be protected as part of transitional arrangements for three years so this is not an agenda around cutting the pay and conditions but what we are asking for as part of a modernised, transformed and integrated service is to ask these teachers for example to serve this special needs community not just from 5-16 but from pre-school right up to 18 and 25 in some circumstances. We’re asking for the service to work 365 days a year because parents have told us that the needs of their children requires that service to be provided outside of term times. That is the reason and the rationale behind moving to the Soulbury scales.”
- 56.20 The Mayor thanked Ms. Jenkins for her questions and invited Ms. Duffy to come forward and address the council.
- 56.21 Ms. Duffy thanked the Mayor and asked the following question; “One of the major arguments for moving Teachers of the Deaf off their teachers' contracts onto the Soulbury scale is the idea that these teachers are not offering a holiday service and should be moved onto a contract that offers year round cover. Is the Lead Councillor aware that that is not the case with Teachers of the Deaf in our city, for whom it is standard practise to visit a newly identified deaf child within days of diagnosis, whatever time of year, offer support to families and attend multi-agency meetings throughout the holidays?”
- 56.22 Councillor Bewick replied; “I think it’s important that members are made aware that the hearing impairment service offers all year round support to families where children are newly identified as having a hearing impairment and of course this council applauds and recognises that children and families have needs for advise, information, support where it is due in term time or not. The key reason behind the proposal is to move all current specialist teachers onto these Soulbury scales so we can absolutely guarantee and secure that all year round service that our parents are asking for and at the moment unfortunately that cannot be guaranteed within the current terms and conditions. Now other teams within the proposed integrated service such as the education psychology service I understand already work all year round.”
- 56.23 The Mayor thanked Ms. Duffy for her question and invited Ms. Cox to come forward and address the council.
- 56.24 Ms. Cox asked the following question; “Considering the high levels of engagement and anxiety from parents and families can the Lead Councillor now commit to a formal consultation of stakeholders, parents and most importantly service users on changes to the Sensory Needs Service?”

- 56.25 Councillor Bewick replied; “She referred at the start of her question to the levels of anxiety and I absolutely recognise as indeed do councillors from these benches recognise there’s been a huge amount of anxiety in the city. I think it’s incredibly unfortunate that some of that anxiety has been deliberately inflated by a misinformation campaign on social media and elsewhere which has not helped parents who’ve got children with special educational needs have a rational and informed conversation with council officers and others who are involved in this process and I hope as a result of this discussion and debate today we can move to a debate in the city that is grounded in fact and indeed there’s already been extensive consultation with a wide range of parent groups and parent representative groups including of course parents of children with sensory needs to explain these proposals. Information and other stakeholders relating to the consultation has been posted on the council and amaze websites with a contact address for views and queries. Specifically in relation to hearing impairment council officers met with the national deaf children’s society representatives on the 2nd of November and they’ve arranged further meetings. Parents of children with sensory needs were also represented at the parents and carers connect meeting where council officers consulted on these proposal on the 17th of November. I am of course attentively listening to all the representations that I’m receiving as are council members throughout this chamber who have had representations on this subject and that’s one of the reasons I agreed with officers to extend the consultation period to the end of January so we can assure we get the maximum amount of consultation in this debate.”
- 56.26 Ms. Cox asked the following supplementary question; “Can the Councillor confirm a formal consultation with parents that’s not an email address which is what we’ve been given?”
- 56.27 Councillor Bewick replied; “I’m very happy to take that back to officers and discuss with them ways in which we can consult with parents. There are formal and indeed informal channels through which parents can lobby their councillors or indeed request meetings with me or any member of this chamber to put their views to them about these proposals.”
- 56.28 The Mayor thanked Ms. Cox for her questions and noted that this concluded the public questions for the meeting.

57 DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 57.1 The Mayor reported that no deputations had been received for the current meeting.

58 PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE

- 58.1 The Mayor stated that the council’s petition scheme provided that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at a Council meeting. She had been notified of three such petitions which had sufficient signatures to warrant a debate and therefore would call on the lead petitioner to present their petition before opening the matter up for debate.
- 58.2 The Mayor invited Ms. Gillett to come forward and present her petition.

- 58.3 Ms. Gillett thanked the Mayor and presented the petition which called on the Council to not cut specialist advisory teachers from Brighton and Hove's new Learning Support Service. She confirmed that the petition had 10,020 signatures and asked that consideration be given to the families and children who would be affected by the proposed cuts and the teachers themselves who were faced with changes to their working conditions and reductions in service.
- 58.4 Councillor Bewick thanked Ms. Gillett and stated that he recognised the extraordinary high number of people who had signed the petition, which reflected the concerns that had been raised. He stated that the council was committed to children and parents with special educational needs and to continue to provide services that they deserved. He acknowledged that passions were running high and stated that the intention was to recognise qualified teachers and to provide services to meet the needs of those who required support. The overall reduction in numbers proposed was 58 to 55 and no final decision had been taken.
- 58.5 Councillor Brown stated that there appeared to be a lot of mis-information and confusion around the SEND review, along with a lack of open consultation on the proposals which required accurate explanation to alleviate the concerns. She hoped that there would be a chance to ensure the service and schools were working together to meet the needs of those affected.
- 58.6 Councillor Phillips stated that as a teacher she valued the support from specialist teachers which could not be under-estimated. She therefore hoped that some reassurances could be given in regard to the level of service and pay levels that would be maintained following the review. She therefore suggested that as well as the petition being referred to the Children, Young People & Skills Committee, there be no cuts, a continuation of the proactive work and no worse conditions for the staff concerned.
- 58.7 Councillor Bewick noted the comments and stated that he would discuss a number of the points further with officers. He also repeated that the changes were not driven by the need for cuts but rather with a view to providing a better outcome for all concerned which was the aim of good public services.
- 58.8 The Mayor sought clarification from Councillor Phillips as to whether she was moving an amendment to the recommendation in the covering report.
- 58.9 Councillor Phillips stated that she wished to move an amendment to add a further recommendation that her three points be considered by the Children, Young People and Skills Committee in conjunction with the petition.
- 58.10 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the amendment.
- 58.11 The Mayor thanked Ms. Gillett for attending the meeting and put the amendment to the vote which was lost by 9 votes to 40.
- 58.12 The Mayor then put the recommendation to refer the petition to the Children, Young People & Skills Committee to the vote which was agreed.

- 58.13 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Children, Young People & Skills Committee for consideration at its next meeting.
- 58.14 The Mayor then invited Ms. Senker to come forward and present a petition requesting that the Council take 50 Syrian Refugees into the city.
- 58.15 Ms. Senker thanked the Mayor and stated that she wished to present a petition on behalf of Eve Mathis which had a total over 2,000 signatures. She also had a similar petition with over 900 signatures giving a combined total of over 3,055 signatures in favour of extending the number of refugees to be accommodated within the city.
- 58.16 Councillor Daniel thanked Ms. Senker for presenting the petitions and stated that they clearly showed how Brighton and Hove was a city with a big heart. She fully supported the aspirations behind the petitions and noted that in order to be able to offer places there was a need to get private landlords on board to put forward potential homes. She also noted that the Council had agreed to take in 5 families and thanks to the hard work of officers; it was recognised by the Home Office for its work which was being recommended to other authorities as an example of good practice.
- 58.17 Councillor Simson stated that the Conservative Group fully supported the petition being referred to the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee for consideration.
- 58.18 Councillor Littman welcomed the petition and stated that there was a need to continue to push the authority to take action. He was also concerned about the number of unaccompanied children entering the country and the pressure this put on neighbouring authorities and hoped that a report would be forthcoming on the resources available to tackle this.
- 58.19 Councillor Daniel noted the comments and hoped that further discussion could take place at committee level.
- 58.20 The Mayor thanked Ms. Senker for attending the meeting and noted that the recommendation was to refer the petition to the Neighbourhoods, Communities and Equalities Committee for consideration and put it to the council to agree.
- 58.21 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee for consideration at its next meeting.
- 58.22 The Mayor then invited Ms. Rees to come forward to present a petition requesting the council to open up its empty properties to the homeless for the duration of the winter.
- 58.23 Ms. Rees thanked the Mayor and stated that the petition had 8,058 signatures and sought agreement to enable homeless people to be given access to empty properties for the winter along similar lines to that agreed by Manchester. There were a number of homeless people sleeping on the streets and without an address it was impossible to find work. She hoped that the council would support the proposal and take the issue to Parliament in order to get necessary changes to help meet the Council's aspiration of not having homeless people in the city by 2020.

- 58.24 Councillor Moonan thanked Ms. Rees for her petition and for bringing the matter to the attention of the council. She fully agreed it was unimaginably tough to live on the streets; however there was a need to consider the implications for the council should it follow the example of Manchester. If properties were made available then council would have a duty of care, for example there would need to be running water and facilities and provision to deal with issues such as drug taking and protection. She noted that shelters were opened in the winter and that the council already worked with local charities and churches to provide food and shelter. She also noted that the Government had recently announced additional resources for 25 Authorities to help with this situation and that Brighton was one of a few outside London who could apply for those resources.
- 58.25 The Mayor noted that there were no other speakers and thanked Ms. Rees for attending the meeting. She also noted that the recommendation was to refer the petition to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration and put it to the council to agree.
- 58.26 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration at its next meeting.

59 TO CONSIDER NOMINATIONS FOR THE DEPUTY MAYOR-ELECT

- 59.1 The Mayor noted that the arrangements for the mayoralty had been changed in the previous year and therefore sought nominations for the Deputy Mayor-elect for the 2016/17 municipal year.
- 59.2 Councillor Meadows nominated Councillor Mo Marsh as Deputy Mayor-elect.
- 59.3 Councillor Morgan formally seconded the nomination.
- 59.4 Councillor G. Theobald stated that the Conservative Group were happy to support the nomination.
- 59.5 The Mayor noted that there were no other nominations and put the nomination of Councillor Marsh as Deputy Mayor-elect for the 2016/17 municipal year to the Council which was agreed.
- 59.6 **RESOLVED:** That Councillor Marsh be appointed as Deputy Mayor-elect for the 2016/17 municipal year.

60 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.

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

(a) Councillor Taylor

- 60.2 "Will the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee estimate the cost of installing single yellow lines per metre and the cost of their enforcement?"

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

- 60.3 “The cost of installing single yellow lines is approximately £10 per metre but this doesn’t include the legal traffic order cost (depends on amount of proposals within the order which we batch up for economies of scale) and the signing involved (about £100 per sign required).
- 60.4 The enforcement costs cannot be worked out per metre as we don’t work costing fro

(b) Councillor Simson

- 60.5 “At a recent meeting of the Children, Young People and Skills Committee the Chair stated that it was the Administration’s policy not to agree any amendments to recommendations put forward in Committee reports. Will this policy be consistent across all Committees for the remainder of the Administration’s term?”

Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council.

- 60.6 “I can confirm that the Administration recognises the right of any Councillor to put forward an amendment for consideration. Indeed we are happy to discuss any proposed changes to recommendations prior to a meeting which may lead to an improvement. At the recent Children, Young People and Skills Committee, Councillor Daniel, as a committee member, was representing the view that the Labour Group Members did not feel that the proposed amendment under discussion was substantively improving the recommendation, because the recommendation as it stood covered the scenario that the amendment related to, but did not name any specific provider. You will note that the administration abstained rather than voted against the amendment for that reason, which allowed the amendment to go through. There was no intention to suggest that there had been a change of policy in respect to amendments to recommendations, which anyway would have to go to the Council’s Constitutional Working Group.”

(c) Councillor G. Theobald

- 60.7 “What does the Council do to monitor the reliability of bus services in the City and do they work with the bus companies to try and improve this?”

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

- 60.8 “Bus companies are required to supply an annual punctuality figure to the council. The Key Performance Indicator figure, which is then supplied to the Department of Transport, was 85.5% for 2014-15. The figure was slightly lower than the previous year’s figure of 89.4% because of the number of road works that were temporarily impacting on the bus network (including North Street and Brighton Station), combined with the essential partial closure of the A259 west of Brighton Pier for structural works.

60.9 The council employs a bus inspector to monitor the performance of supported bus services, which represent 3% of the city's bus network. 97% of the bus network is operated commercially: the council does not monitor them but does work with the bus operators, through the Quality Bus Partnership as well as the Transport Partnership, to tackle issues which impact on the reality of bus services."

61 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

61.1 The Mayor noted that notification of 7 oral questions had been received and that 30minutes were set aside for the duration of the item. She then invited Councillor G. Theobald to put his question to the Leader of the Council.

(a) Council Budget

61.2 Councillor G. Theobald asked, "Will Councillor Morgan tell me what sort of responses he expects to receive to his city innovation challenge for new budget ideas with £1000 on offer to each of the five best suggestions?"

61.3 Councillor Morgan replied, "I hope to have a great many and very good suggestions from the imaginative people of Brighton and Hove."

61.4 Councillor G. Theobald asked the following supplementary question, "I understand that it's not until January the 4th that Councillor Morgan will be taking these suggestions according until the Argus. I want to thank him for that response and I wonder if he could tell me whether this competition can be back dated to May 2015 because if he cares to look again at our local election manifesto our 'Common Sense Council for Brighton and Hove' he will find many innovative ideas some of which have already been taken up by his administration but there are some others which he may find of great help?"

61.5 Councillor Morgan replied, "I think it was a competition for ideas and proposals back in May and sadly Councillor Theobald and his team were runners up."

(b) Mazda Fountain

61.6 Councillor Littman asked, "In the 32 weeks since this administration was elected on how many days has the Mazda Fountain been operating?"

61.7 Councillor Mitchell replied, "I don't have the information to hand as to the number of days that the Mazda fountain has been operating but I can supply that in a written answer to Councillor Littman."

61.8 Councillor Littman asked the following supplementary question, "Including maintenance, repairs, officer's time, running cost etc. how much does this cost the council?"

61.9 Councillor Mitchell replied, "The fountain is maintained by property and design the operational costs average out at £7000p/a."

(c) Member / Officer Roles and Responsibilities

- 61.10 Councillor Bell asked, "Does the Leader believe it is appropriate for the Chief Executive to write to a committee and for the directors of Brighton and Hove City Council to endorse on committee paperwork an item on which they are trying to apply pressure on elected Members to make a decision. Surely as officers of this city who are paid employees by the residents of this city through the council tax they should be there to support the administration and not to be a lobbying group which is what they appear to have become?"
- 61.11 Councillor Morgan replied, "If Cllr. Bell is willing to share details then I'd be happy to look into it for him."
- 61.12 Councillor Bell asked the following supplementary question, "I'm very happy with that but as I've asked a question in full Council I would hope that once I do submit this Councillor Morgan that it will actually be explained publicly as well."
- 61.13 Councillor Morgan replied, "If suitable I'll bring it to the next council meeting."

(d) Innovative Thinking

- 61.14 Councillor Simson asked, "Before I ask my question I would like to clarify that it is not to do with the competition currently running or the steps taken to manage budget reductions. I recently read that over half of councils anticipate that between a 10th-5th of their income will be derived from entrepreneurial sources in four years. So what I would like to know is what your Administration is doing if anything to look at new ways to generate additional income and I stress income. We're not talking about additional revenue from parking or anything else like that. It's not about increasing revenue but my question is about newly generated income something new, additional and innovative."
- 61.15 Councillor Morgan replied, "Yes, our Administration is engaging actively in many different ways of bringing in income. One of those is the depot at City Clean where we're investing in a new workshop which will bring in income from fleets of vehicles that'll be serviced there. We'll be announcing a range of projects in the new year which will bring in additional income from new council tax from new revenue from rental streams but we will be taking up ideas that are presented by business, by residents, by school children in the competition which we are launching this year. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Brighton and Hove Buses, The Hilton Brighton metropole hotel, Nat West entrepreneurial spark, The University of Sussex and Microsoft for their support for our campaign, our innovation challenge which we'll be launching on January 4th."
- 61.16 Councillor Simson asked the following supplementary question, "In some local government research that I was also reading it mentioned that about half of the councils that took part had at least one post dedicated to encouraging their authority to be more commercial and I just wondered if this was something we had within this council?"

61.17 Councillor Morgan replied, "We do indeed have officers dedicated in grant support but it is the job of every officer, every Member and indeed now every resident to think of ways of generating income of keeping our services going because as was announced today by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government councils will no longer receive any funding by 2020 and so it is entirely the burden on the residents to fund their local services from that date."

(e) Drainage

61.18 Councillor Wares asked, "Recently a report was put forward regarding flood risk management and it highlighted that we have seven hotspots around the city that would receive some project to actually alleviate that problem between 2016 and 2017. In that report it said that extensive cleansing was required to the drainage infrastructure and part of that infrastructure is the cleansing of gullies and at the present time the city does that on a cycle of I believe about every 18 months and I would just like to ask the Chair of Environment, Transport & Sustainability whether or not she would actually consider speaking with officers to implement a revised cleaning schedule of say every 6 months to those area where the seven hotspots exist until such time as these major works are implemented?"

61.19 Councillor Mitchell replied, "Brighton and Hove is primarily a dense urban area with lots of structures and hard landscapes in close proximity to each other. Many properties have hard landscaped their front gardens to facilitate parking and this has had the effect of diverting additional rain water on to the highway. Policies have been introduced to mitigate this. Highway verges do however form a useful and natural type of drainage and it has been recognised more recently that they should not be hardened. Where increased about of water gets discharged onto the highway the drainage infrastructure needs to be enhanced. This has constantly been undertaken by councils over the years and the resultant infrastructure 19,000 gullies and 5,000 soakaways in the highway if working correctly and to capacity are sufficient to deal with the majority of the rainfall even if it is more frequent. As an Administration we have decided to take a more risk based approach to cleaning gullies and improving the service. We are undertaking a study which is looking at things like historic flood events, tree density, local topography and the silt levels in gullies to develop a prioritised list of areas that may require an increased frequency of cleansing. This work will be completed by next April and as always our priority will be to protect homes from flooding and other safety issues."

61.20 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question, "My question was actually whether or not we would increase the frequency of cleaning gullies and perhaps to assist with the survey that's being undertaken on the 10th of December a number of residents and myself actually went round Patcham and in that instance we actually found that 37% of every gully was actually blocked or surcharging so I don't think it will take very much to actually undertake this survey but again I repeat can we actually have some works to these gullies rather than us being in a position where we either resemble Venice or we actually have some of the same problems as our colleagues in the likes of Cumbria are currently experiencing?"

61.21 Councillor Mitchell replied, "Perhaps you missed it but in my previous response to you I did say that the outcome of this review may well indicate that some gullies need to be

cleansed more frequently than some others in other areas. So yes that is something we are looking at.”

(f) School Parking

61.22 Councillor Taylor asked, “Across the city many residents have concerns regarding the lack of off street car parking in our schools this issue particularly effects residence in Withdean ward where we have five schools very near to each other. What assurances can the Chair of the Children’s Committee give the residents of the city and Withdean in particular that they will look to resolve this problem?”

61.23 Councillor Bewick replied, “I must actually confess that I was under the wrong illusion that it would be my colleague Councillor Mitchell who would respond as it was to do with parking but obviously the word ‘schools’ comes in the brief as well. My committee has recently of course looked at issues to do with ice cream vans outside schools. I’m happy for this to be taken up at the next committee meeting and to provide a response in committee to Councillor Taylor. My apologies for not having a more thorough response today.”

(g) Park Rangers

61.24 Councillor Miller asked, “Can I ask the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to explain how the community will be assisted by the council to keep our precious parks look pristine prior to reducing the number of park rangers from 9 to 3 as the justification of this two thirds reduction is an expectation that the community will step in to fill the gap of six park rangers and would she also like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Administration to apologies for the appalling way that staff were notified of their job losses?”

61.25 Councillor Mitchell replied, “I’ll answer the last bit first as I believe you are alluding or you’re trying to suggest that staff were informed that they had lost their jobs by text and that was not the case, nobody was informed they lost their job via a text message. In relation to the park ranger issue as part of the need to find the £68 million savings due to steadily decreasing funding from your Conservative Government City Clean and City Parks are being asked to find potential savings of £4 million and they’re looking at that in a number of ways not just with the park ranger issue but more broadly with how they continue to maintain parks and preserve them into the future. Policy & Resources Committee recently approved consultation on a proposal to reduce the rangers service and officers will therefore be working up these proposals and formally consulting with staff, stakeholders and trade unions but the key elements of the service will be retained those of conservation, rights of way, volunteering including recruitment and support. We will protect statutory and essential frontline services as much as possible, we will look for alternative funding and delivery models too but these are very difficult budget decisions that need to be made and if there are other way of finding the funding to prevent these or other budget reductions then these will of course be looked at very seriously. I am pleased to report that these discussions are very positive and that some worthwhile options are actively now being pursued.”

61.26 Councillor Miller asked the following supplementary question, “I’d just like to ensure that those worthwhile options are pursued sooner before the cuts of six park rangers

goes ahead and I would also question whether the Administration should look into why the interim executive director apologised in the paper for the sacked by text if that wasn't necessarily the case?"

61.27 Councillor Mitchell replied, "Well the Interim Director apologised for the clumsy way that any message relating to the future of a member of staff's job was communicated and that was entirely the right thing to do. In relation to the ongoing discussion and consultation around the park ranger service I assure you that this is being pursued with all speed not least to give reissuance and some comfort to the staff involved."

62 CALL OVER FOR REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

(a) Callover

62.1 The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that Items X had been reserved for discussion; and

- Item 64 - Council Tax Reduction Review
- Item 66 - Response to Scrutiny Panel Report on Private Sector Housing
- Item 67 - Welfare Reform, Response to Recommendations made by the Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion
- Item 68 - Expansion of Gatwick Airport – Notice of Motion

(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports

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

- Item 63 - Gambling Act 2005 – Revised Policy
- Item 65 - Support Serviced Review

(c) Oral Questions from Members

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

63 GAMBLING ACT 2005 - REVISED POLICY

63.1 **RESOLVED:** That the final Statement of Gambling Policy (as appended to the report) be approved and adopted by the Council.

64 COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION REVIEW

64.1 Councillor Hamilton introduced the report which outlined the recommendations resulting from a review of the Council Tax Reduction (CTR) scheme that had been introduced in April 2013. He noted that there was a need to review the scheme annually and as things stood there would be a shortfall of £3.6m in 2016/17 to fund the scheme if no action was taken. As such it was recommended that those people on CTR should receive an 80% discount on their council tax, resulting in the minimum contribution people of working age pay towards their council tax would change from

15% to 20%. This would result in an increase on average of 97p week and would be capped at £1.65 per week.

- 64.2 Councillor Sykes stated that it was a complex matter and suggested that had action been taken in previous budgets it would not be necessary to increase the minimum contribution from 15% to 20% and affect the most vulnerable in the city. He was concerned that the council tax process was becoming more centralised and controlled by the Government and could not support the changes.
- 64.3 Councillor Wealls stated that it was a difficult decision to take and noted that the council was moving closer to the average rate for an Authority in the country. He noted that the council tax collection rate had improved and suggested that it was partly as a result of improvements in the economy. He also felt that the previous Administration could have taken action to enable resources to be available to help address the situation.
- 64.4 Councillor Littman stated that he believed the vulnerable in society were being disproportionately affected as a result of the proposals and argued that there were alternative actions that could be taken; e.g. the relationship with the Revenue Support Grant could be reviewed.
- 64.5 The Mayor stated that there was a need for a point of clarification and called on the Monitoring Officer to clarify the position in relation to the decision before the council.
- 64.6 The Monitoring Officer referred Members to the extract from the proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on the 3rd December, which had been circulated with the addendum papers. He stated that the recommendations should have been clearer, in that the Council was being asked to approve the Council Tax Reduction Scheme as detailed below point 4 and listed in roman numerals. He apologised for the error in the draft minutes and noted that the Interim Executive Director for Finance & Resources had clarified this point at the Policy & Resources Committee meeting.
- 64.7 He therefore confirmed that the approval of the Council Tax Reduction scheme was reserved to full Council and the Council was recommended to approve the scheme as outlined in the extracts and the report.
- 64.8 The Mayor thanked the Monitoring Officer for the clarification and called on Councillor Hamilton to respond to the debate.
- 64.9 Councillor Hamilton stated that whilst the council tax collection rate may have improved, the income from business rates had fallen. He also noted that the previous Administration had put forward increases in the level of CTR and that given the funding shortfall outlined earlier, the proposed increase was necessary. He therefore recommended that the revised scheme be agreed.
- 64.10 The Mayor referred to the extracts from the proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee and stated that points 1 to 4 were for noting and that the scheme as detailed and listed under points i to iv was recommended for approval. She then asked for the voting system to be activated and put the recommendations to the vote.

64.11 The Mayor confirmed that the recommendations had been approved by 41 votes to 9 as detailed below:

64.12 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That it be noted that the Council undertook formal consultation as a part of this review and that as part of the formal consultation a draft scheme was published and people were invited to give their views on that scheme;
- (2) That the outcome of that consultation (appendix 1) which has been summarised in section 5.4 be noted;
- (3) That it be noted that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) (appendix 2) has been undertaken on the proposed changes in the draft scheme and the recommendations in this report. It should further note that, to meet their Public Sector Equality Duty, members must give conscientious consideration to the findings of this assessment when making a decision on the recommendations in 2.9.1 – 2.9.4. The actions which will be undertaken as a result of this EIA are set out in section 7.4.
- (4) That it be noted that the Chief Finance Officer (s151) will, prior to 1st April 2016, exercise delegated powers to increase the appropriate calculative elements of the scheme to give effect to national changes.

Scheme from 1st April 2016

- (5) That the changes set out in paragraphs 2.9.2 and 2.9.3 of the report are made to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (Persons who are not Pensioners)(Brighton & Hove City Council) 2013 to take effect from 1st April 2016;
- (6) That people on CTR will receive up to an 80% discount on their Council Tax meaning the minimum contribution people of working age pay towards their Council Tax be changed from 15% to 20%;
- (7) That for customers entitled to CTR on 31st March 2016 transitional protection be provided until either the claim ends; the customer moves property; or 31st March 2017 (whichever occurs first) to minimise the increase paid by any household to £1.65 per week inclusive of the separately agreed Council Tax rise as a result of the change set out in 2.9.2 only; and
- (8) That the discretionary fund used to support the CTR scheme be set at a minimum of £0.1m and maintained at the 2015/16 level of £0.15m through the use of up to £0.05m from the Welfare Reform reserve.

Note:

64.13 The Mayor then adjourned the meeting at 6.40pm for a refreshment break.

64.14 The Mayor reconvened the meeting at 7.15pm.

65 SUPPORT FUNCTIONS REVIEW**65.1 RESOLVED:**

- (9) That Brighton & Hove City Council joins the Orbis Joint Committee as a founding partner, with the terms of reference as set out in appendix 2 (as they now stand) subject to necessary modifications to reflect expanded membership and the Council's committee system;
- (10) That it appoints Councillor Les Hamilton to the Orbis Joint Committee on behalf of Brighton & Hove City Council;
- (11) That subject to Council agreeing to recommendation 2.5 in the report and satisfactory due diligence, delegate the power to enter into the inter-authority agreement and the power to make the final decision on operational changes to the Chief Executive, Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer and authorise the same to take all steps necessary or incidental to the implementation of the recommendations;
- (12) That the terms of reference of the Orbis Joint Committee as detailed in the appendix 1 to the extract be approved; and
- (13) That the appointment of a substitute Member of the Joint Committee as designated by the Leader of the Council and notified to the Chief Executive be agreed.

66 RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY PANEL REPORT ON PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING

- 66.1 Councillor Hill introduced the report which detailed the findings of a Scrutiny Panel that looked at Private Sector Housing and the response to the Panel's recommendations from the Housing & New Homes Committee. She stated that there were too many properties in the private sector that fell below a decent living standard and noted that it was intended to develop a Housing Strategy Plan to find ways to tackle the problem. She also noted that further work was to be undertaken in respect of the licensing of HMO's and with letting agents to encourage clearer information in relation to fees etc...
- 66.2 The Mayor congratulated Councillor Hill on her maiden speech on behalf of the council.
- 66.3 Councillor Gibson welcomed the report and sated that it highlighted an important issue which affected a large number of people in the city. He believed that the current situation in the private sector market favoured landlords and this needed to be addressed in order to ensure that tenants had some support and protection. He noted that it was likely to require a national change but in the meantime hoped that the good landlord scheme could be extended and ethical lettings encouraged.
- 66.4 Councillor Wealls welcomed the report and noted that a number of elements in the Housing & Planning Bill that were due to be discussed later would help to achieve the aims set out in the report.

- 66.5 Councillor Miller suggested that it would be beneficial if home ownership was encouraged and taken up by more people as this would reduce the demand on the private sector and lead to more availability for private tenants. He noted that recent Government announcements were aimed at enabling this change and hoped that this would be supported by the council.
- 66.6 Councillor Mears stated that as a member of the Housing & New Homes Committee she was concerned about the number of properties that were being used for student accommodation. She hoped that discussions could be held with the universities and ways found to provide more affordable housing for residents and universities to provide their own accommodation.
- 66.7 Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that as the only remaining member of the Scrutiny Panel he wanted to acknowledge the work previous Councillor Wilson in helping to formulate the report.
- 66.8 Councillor Hill noted the comments and stated that further work was being undertaken by officers in relation to the issue of studentification and she hoped a report would be forthcoming.
- 66.9 The Mayor stated that the report had been referred to the council for information and therefore moved that it be noted.
- 66.10 **RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

67 WELFARE REFORM, RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

- 67.1 Councillor Daniel introduced the report which set out the council's response to the recommendations of the Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion in relation to the impact of welfare reform. She noted that there was an intention to continue to support people affected by the changes and to provide affordable housing in the city and to mitigate the reforms wherever possible.
- 67.2 Councillor Taylor stated that he believed there were levels of support for people such as universal credit and increases in tax allowance which enabled people to get into work and retain more of what they earn.
- 67.3 Councillor Littman stated that the changes to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme would result in more people being affected and struggling on a daily basis. The various welfare reforms were leading to people being unable to remain in the city and it was not the council's or residents' fault but the Government which was removing support and preventing sustainable housing solutions for residents.
- 67.4 Councillor Mears noted that the report had been referred to the Housing & New Homes Committee in January, but questioned the process and why it had not come direct to the Committee given the fact that it was the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget that was mainly affected. She believed that it should be for the Housing Committee to consider and agree any actions and was concerned that the committee's remit was being over-ridden.

- 67.5 Councillor Meadows stated that a number of families in the city were likely to be affected by the various changes and there was a need to enable them to make informed choices. She also noted that the housing component for universal credit was not paid to anyone under the age of 21, which meant additional support was required for those residents. She also believed it was likely that there would be an increase in rent arrears and potential for a rise in the number of homeless people in the city.
- 67.6 Councillor Yates stated that there was a need for debate and consideration of how to address the impacts of welfare reform.
- 67.7 Councillor Gibson stated that the figures were terrifying and that there was a need for action to be taken. The council could have chosen not to increase council tax and thereby supported residents but this had not been the case to date.
- 67.8 Councillor Miller stated that there was a need to ensure that those on welfare were not better-off than those who chose to work and paid tax. He did not believe it was fair for those on welfare to be better-off than those who worked.
- 67.9 Councillor Daniel noted the comments and stated that there was a need to address the impact of the welfare reform programme and endeavour to support the residents of the city. The issue was about inequality across all sectors of the population and was broader than just a housing matter; although it needed to be taken into account.
- 67.10 The Mayor stated that the report had been referred for information and therefore moved that it be noted.
- 67.11 **RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

68 EXPANSION OF GATWICK AIRPORT - NOTICE OF MOTION

- 68.1 Councillor Morgan noted that the Economic Development & Culture Committee had agreed to support the expansion of Gatwick Airport and stated that whilst a reduction in overall air travel was a valid aspiration, the expansion of Gatwick would result in benefits to the local economy and should be supported. The airport had one of the cleanest fleets and had taken innovative action to reduce noise levels. In view of the likelihood that either Heathrow or Gatwick would get a second runway, he believed as did many other businesses and organisations in the region that Gatwick was the right choice.
- 68.2 Councillor Littman referred to the recent Paris Climate debate and the comments of the Director General of the CBI which supported his view that the intention to increase air travel with a second runway was taking the climate change policy in the wrong direction.
- 68.3 Councillor West questioned the view that a second runway at Gatwick would have economic benefits for the city in so much as there were other factors that needed to be considered such as traffic flows. The transport links passed through the National Park and the National Park Authority had already expressed concerns over the impact of

increased traffic through the area. He believed that further consideration needed to be given to environmental factors and the incompatibility with any expansion at Gatwick.

- 68.4 Councillor G. Theobald stated that there was a need for Gatwick to remain at the centre of air travel for Europe rather than lose that to an airport abroad. The expansion of Gatwick would have the potential to release further opportunities for the residents of the city as well as the local economy and it was the right thing to support this proposal.
- 68.5 Councillor Bell stated that the expansion of Gatwick Airport had to be supported as the potential benefits for the economy; jobs and the development of transport links were evident and should not be ignored.
- 68.6 Councillor Greenbaum queried how any expansion of the airport could be justified when the recent Paris summit had made a commitment to a 2% increase in global climate change. She believed that around 80% of flights at Gatwick were leisure related and argued that any increase in its capacity could not be justified in terms of climate change. There were other local airports that could take more flights and these options should be explored.
- 68.7 Councillor Druitt questioned where the potential for jobs would come from as a result of a second runway at Gatwick. He also suggested that people should be encouraged to stay in this country and visit the city rather than making it easier for them to go abroad for a holiday. He believed that a healthy economy relied on a healthy environment and the protection of the environment had to be the prime concern.
- 68.8 The Mayor stated that the notice of motion had been referred for information and noted that a request for a recorded vote had been made which she was inclined to accept. She therefore asked for the voting system to be activated and put the motion to be noted to the vote which was **carried** by 38 votes to 0 with 10 abstentions as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen	√			Mac Cafferty		X	
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears	√		
Barradell	√			Miller	√		
Bell	√			Mitchell	√		
Bennett	Withdrew			Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown	√			Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth	√		
Chapman	√			A Norman	√		
Cobb	√			K Norman	√		

Daniel	√			O'Quinn	√		
Deane		X		Page	Absent		
Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson		X		Penn	√		
Gilbey	√			Phillips		X	
Greenbaum		X		Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson	√		
Hill	√			Sykes		X	
Horan	√			Taylor	√		
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald	√		
Inkpin-Leissner	<i>Withdrew</i>			G Theobald	√		
Janio	√			Wares	√		
Knight		X		Wealls	√		
Lewry	√			West		X	
Littman		X		Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	38	10	1

68.9 **RESOLVED:** That the decision to support the expansion of Gatwick Airport as outlined in the agreed Notice of Motion be noted.

Note:

68.10 Councillors Inkpin-Leissner and Bennett withdrew from the Chamber during the debate and voting thereon, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item.

69 THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION:

69.1 Prior to the consideration of the item, the Mayor noted that the Notices of Motion listed as items 69 (a) and 69 (f) in the agenda related to the Housing & Planning Bill. As such she was minded to take both motions in one debate and to then hold separate votes on each one.

(a) Housing & Planning Bill

69.2 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Meadows and seconded by Councillor Cattell.

69.3 Councillor Cattell stated that she had worked in local government for a number of years and had not seen such an onslaught on the planning system as was the case today. She could not see who would be able to afford the average price of a home

which now stood at £250k outside of London; and yet the Government planned to require councils to sell-off homes and pay an amount to the Government. She had recently attended a planning summit and many there had expressed concerns about the Bill which was regarded as being ill-thought out and fundamentally flawed. She therefore hoped that the motion would be supported.

69.4 The Mayor congratulated Councillor Cattell on her maiden speech on behalf of the council.

(f) Payments for High-value Council Housing

69.5 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Gibson and seconded by Councillor Phillips.

69.6 Councillor Gibson noted that under the right to buy scheme the council had lost around 1,400 properties and was now going to be required to make a payment to the Government on the assumption that it would sell a number of properties. He did not believe that central government should be controlling council housing and that of Housing Associations who would also be affected. He suggested that there was a need to get the Bill amended and to enable councils to retain the receipts from sales so that they could replace lost properties.

69.7 Councillor Miller noted that there were families living in accommodation that was too small for their needs, whilst others were living in accommodation that was too large. There was a need to encourage people to move out of large three-bedroom properties so that they became available for those families in need of such accommodation. It was a situation that would not be found in the private sector and by enabling receipts from right to buy to go into starter homes; it would enable younger people to get onto the property ladder. He also suggested that there were people living in council homes that could live in the private sector which would then release properties to those in need. The properties that were sold-off did not disappear and would remain part of the housing market.

69.8 Councillor G. Theobald stated that the Government had made it clear that it was committed to seeing every home that was sold under right to buy replaced by another. He therefore supported the Bill and the need to reinvigorate the housing market.

69.9 Councillor Mears stated that the number of properties that would be affected by the Bill was not known and suggested that it was a matter of choice which would enable people to own their own homes.

69.10 Councillor Taylor stated that the intention was to enable people to fulfil their own aspirations and to own their own homes, which was something that should be encouraged.

69.11 Councillor Bewick stated that since right to buy had been introduced more than 35,000 council properties had been sold and only 4,000 had been built to replace them. In the last year alone 12,320 had been sold and only 1,863 started or acquired to replace them. He was yet to see how a like for like replacement would be achieved.

69.12 Councillor Meadows questioned why people who had lived all their lives in a family home should be asked to leave that home. She also noted that the majority of homes sold to private landlords under right to buy had been converted into houses for multiple occupation rather than kept as a family home.

69.13 Councillor Gibson stated that council housing was not subsidised and the fundamental point of the Green Group’s notice of motion was that local authorities should decide what happens to council housing and not central government.

69.14 The Mayor then put the following motion 69 (a) to the vote:

“This council notes that the Housing and Planning Bill, if passed, would threaten the provision of affordable homes for rent and to buy in the city through:

- forcing 'high-value' council homes to be sold on the open market;
- extending the right-to-buy to housing association tenants; and
- undermining section 106 requirements on private developers to provide affordable homes.

This council resolves to ask the Chief Executive:

- (1) to write to the Secretary of State expressing its concerns about the Bill; and
- (2) to set up an urgent meeting between the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive with the local Members of Parliament to raise our concerns.

69.15 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** by 33 votes to 16 with 1 abstention as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen	√			Mac Cafferty	√		
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears		X	
Barradell	√			Miller		X	
Bell		X		Mitchell	√		
Bennett		X		Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown		X		Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth		X	
Chapman	√			A Norman		X	
Cobb		X		K Norman		X	
Daniel	√			O’Quinn	√		

Deane	√			Page	Absent		
Druitt	√			Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson	√			Penn	√		
Gilbey	√			Phillips	√		
Greenbaum	√			Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson		X	
Hill	√			Sykes	√		
Horan	√			Taylor		X	
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald		X	
Inkpin-Leissner	√			G Theobald		X	
Janio		X		Wares		X	
Knight	√			Wealls		X	
Lewry		X		West	√		
Littman	√			Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	33	16	1

69.16 The motion was **carried**.

69.17 The Mayor then put the following motion 69 (f) to the vote:

“This council notes proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill for Local Housing Authorities to be required to consider selling high value housing as it becomes vacant, and for a payment to be made to the Secretary of State of the market value of such housing, whether or not any sale is made.

The council further notes that if this money is lost to Brighton and Hove it could severely impair the council’s ability to build affordable housing to tackle the growing housing crisis in the city. This council therefore;

- (1) Requests the Chief Executive to write to the Housing Minister, expressing its support for the principle that councils should decide on how many of their empty properties are sold off and that any payments to the Secretary of State be made only after sufficient funds have been set aside to repay debt and replace the council property with an equivalent at the same rents;
- (2) Agrees that the council will issue an immediate press release to publicise this decision.”

69.18 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** by 33 votes to 17 with 1 abstention as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen	√			Mac Cafferty	√		
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears		X	
Barradell	√			Miller		X	
Bell		X		Mitchell	√		
Bennett		X		Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown		X		Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth		X	
Chapman	√			A Norman		X	
Cobb		X		K Norman		X	
Daniel	√			O'Quinn	√		
Deane	√			Page	Absent		
Druitt	√			Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson	√			Penn	√		
Gilbey	√			Phillips	√		
Greenbaum	√			Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson		X	
Hill	√			Sykes	√		
Horan	√			Taylor		X	
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald		X	
Inkpin-Leissner	√			G Theobald		X	
Janio		X		Wares		X	
Knight	√			Wealls		X	
Lewry		X		West	√		
Littman	√			Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	33	17	1

69.19 The motion was **carried**.

69.20 Prior to the consideration of the next item, Councillor G. Theobald asked for clarification in terms of the validity of the motion, in having regard to the position of the proposer and a potential conflict of interest as a member of a trade union.

69.21 The Monitoring Officer stated that under the Council's code of conduct the membership of a trade union could be made as a declaration of interest under the membership of a voluntary organisation. The nature of the declaration would also depend upon the financial aspects of any membership which may then affect the ability of a Member to take part and vote in a debate. He also noted that any declaration of interest was for each individual Member to decide although advice could be sought from officers and a declaration made prior to an item being taken. In regard to the next item, he was not aware of any interest that would prevent the Member from speaking or voting on the item.

(b) Trade Union Bill

69.22 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Atkinson and seconded by Councillor Gilbey.

69.23 Councillor Atkinson stated that he wished to clarify that he was a member of UNISON at the Sussex Partnership Trust and held a non-paid role there. He wished to apologise for any confusion caused which had not been his intention.

69.24 In regard to the actual motion, he believed that the Bill would result in a fundamental change in relations between trade unions and employers. Rather than enabling them to have good working relations, where unions can be a critical friend and help to take on board changes, it was likely to be more adversarial. Whereas unions currently offered advice and were there to help find ways to save money; this was unlikely to continue. He believed that many employer organisations and councils in the region had expressed concerns about the Bill and hoped that the motion would be supported. He also confirmed that he was happy to accept the Green Group's amendment.

69.25 The Mayor congratulated Councillor Atkinson on his maiden speech on behalf of the council.

69.26 Councillor Gilbey stated that she had been a UNISON member and was currently a member of the GMB. She believed it was an unnecessary Bill and one that would damage relations given the level of restrictions that would be imposed and effectively turned the clock back.

69.27 Councillor Mac Cafferty moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group and stated that it was a piece of legislation that was ideologically driven and sought to end the collective bargaining process that was essential for social justice in the workplace.

69.28 Councillor Littman formally seconded the amendment.

69.29 Councillor Janio stated that the intention was to return the control of unions to their members and enable them to choose how to inter-act with their employers. It also gave the members the choice to opt in or not in regard to making political donations and was the right way forward, so he could not support the motion.

69.30 Councillor G. Theobald stated that he had to disagree with the Monitoring Officer on this occasion and felt that there was a conflict of interest. He also noted that there had

been a high number of disputes both within the council and across the country so could not accept that unions provided a good working relationship with employers. He also questioned the cost of union officials and the amount of time off that was granted to union reps.

69.31 Councillor Bell stated that he believed the Bill was fair and reasonable and provided control to local working people so that they had a choice in regard to how matters were taken forward.

69.32 Councillor Atkinson noted the comments and stated that he believed trade unions of today were modern and open and that elements of the Bill could be positive. However, it was unnecessary and should not be taken forward.

69.33 The Mayor then put the following motion as amended 69 (b) to the vote:

“This Council notes with concern the Trade Union Bill which would adversely affect this Council’s relationship with its trade unions and its workforce.

This Council recognises the positive contribution that trade unions and trade union members make in the workplace. The Council values the constructive relationship that it has with the trade unions and recognises their commitment, and that of staff, to the delivery of good quality public services in Brighton and Hove.

This Council is content with the arrangements currently in place for deducting trade union membership subscriptions through payroll. This is an important part of maintaining positive industrial relations and a simple way to administer a system that supports employees. This system is an administrative matter for the Council and should not be interfered with by the Government in Westminster.

This council resolves to:

- Request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills stating the Council’s opposition to the Government’s Trade Union Bill.
- Request the Policy & Resources Committee to continue the council’s own locally agreed industrial relations strategy, take every measure possible to maintain its autonomy and;
 - (i) To maintain the current facility that recognised trade unions can have subscriptions deducted through payroll, unless legally obliged not to, in which case the Council will support trade unions’ efforts to move members onto direct debit.
 - (ii) Maintain an adequate level of release time for Trade Union representatives.
- Support the Heart Unions week of action on 8-14 February 2016.”

69.34 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** by 33 votes to 17 with 1 abstention as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen	√			Mac Cafferty	√		
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears		X	
Barradell	√			Miller		X	
Bell		X		Mitchell	√		
Bennett		X		Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown		X		Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth		X	
Chapman	√			A Norman		X	
Cobb		X		K Norman		X	
Daniel	√			O'Quinn	√		
Deane	√			Page	Absent		
Druitt	√			Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson	√			Penn	√		
Gilbey	√			Phillips	√		
Greenbaum	√			Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson		X	
Hill	√			Sykes	√		
Horan	√			Taylor		X	
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald		X	
Inkpin-Leissner	√			G Theobald		X	
Janio		X		Wares		X	
Knight	√			Wealls		X	
Lewry		X		West	√		
Littman	√			Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	33	17	1

69.35 The motion was **carried**.

Closure Motion

69.36 The Mayor noted that the meeting had been in session for 4 hours and in accordance with council procedure rules had to move a motion to terminate the meeting. She therefore put the motion to the vote which was **lost** by 22 votes to 26 with 2 abstentions as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen			Ab	Mac Cafferty		X	
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears		X	
Barradell	√			Miller		X	
Bell		X		Mitchell	√		
Bennett		X		Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown		X		Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth		X	
Chapman	√			A Norman		X	
Cobb		X		K Norman		X	
Daniel	√			O'Quinn	√		
Deane		X		Page	Absent		
Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson		X		Penn	√		
Gilbey		X		Phillips		X	
Greenbaum		X		Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson		X	
Hill	√			Sykes	√		
Horan	√			Taylor		X	
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald		X	
Inkpin-Leissner	√			G Theobald		X	
Janio		X		Wares		X	
Knight		X		Wealls		X	
Lewry		X		West		X	
Littman		X		Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	22	2	26

69.37 The motion was **lost**.

(c) Multiple Births

69.38 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Taylor and seconded by Councillor A. Norman.

69.39 Councillor Taylor stated that as a triplet he was acutely aware of the high rates for still births and neonatal deaths associated with multiple births. He hoped that by highlighting this issue it would enable further work to be undertaken and improvements made to support those women carrying multiple babies and the babies themselves after their birth. He was also happy to accept the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendment but could not agree with the Green Group's amendment.

69.40 Councillor A. Norman stated that there was a clear need for more resources to be available to people experiencing multiple pregnancies and she hoped that the needs assessment suggested by the Labour Group would identify how improvements could be made.

69.41 Councillor Yates moved an amendment on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group and stated that it was disappointing to know that the South East came out badly compared to other regions and levels of care for multiple births.

69.42 Councillor Barradell formally seconded the amendment and noted that having had twins at 29weeks, she owed a great deal to the care and support that she and they received at their local NHS hospital some 25 years ago. She did not believe that they would have survived otherwise and could not contemplate the feeling of loss that others would have had to endure. She full supported the motion and hoped that all Members would do so.

69.43 Councillor Phillips moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group and stated that she whilst welcomed the motion, she felt that it missed the critical point. The NHS was facing severe cuts and a funding gap which needed to be addressed if the service was to remain a highly valued service that was available to everyone.

69.44 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the amendment and welcomed the request for the Health & Wellbeing Board to consider seeking a joint needs assessment for multiple births in the city. However, he was also concerned about the funding crisis that was being faced by the NHS and this was the reason for the amendment.

69.45 Councillor Taylor stated that he was pleased to bring the matter to the attention of the council, but had not intended to start a debate on funding issues. He welcomed the positive amendment from the Labour Group and hoped that the motion as amended could be accepted.

69.46 The Mayor noted that the Green Group's amendment had not been accepted and put it to the vote which was **lost** by 10 votes to 40 with 1 abstention as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen		X		Mac Cafferty	√		
Atkinson		X		Marsh		X	
Barford		X		Meadows		X	
Barnett	Absent			Mears		X	
Barradell		X		Miller		X	
Bell		X		Mitchell		X	
Bennett		X		Moonan		X	
Bewick		X		Morgan		X	
Brown		X		Morris		X	
Cattell		X		Nemeth		X	
Chapman		X		A Norman		X	
Cobb		X		K Norman		X	
Daniel		X		O'Quinn		X	
Deane	√			Page	Absent		
Druitt	√			Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson	√			Penn		X	
Gilbey		X		Phillips	√		
Greenbaum	√			Robins		X	
Hamilton		X		Simson		X	
Hill		X		Sykes	√		
Horan		X		Taylor		X	
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald		X	
Inkpin-Leissner		X		G Theobald		X	
Janio		X		Wares		X	
Knight	√			Wealls		X	
Lewry		X		West	√		
Littman	√			Yates		X	
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	10	40	1

69.47 The motion was **lost**.

69.48 The Mayor noted that the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendment had been accepted and therefore put the following motion 69 (c) as amended to the vote:

“This Council notes with regret figures from the Twins & Multiple Births Association (Tamba) which state that multiple pregnancies make up 3% of all births but account for more than 7% of stillbirths and 14% of neonatal deaths.

This Council notes the £3.8bn of additional funding for the NHS allocated for 2016/17 announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and resolves to:

1. Call on NHS England to consider the allocation of funds for further assistance to parents who have experienced multiple births and investigate improvements in care to reduce the number of stillbirths and neonatal deaths.
2. Request the Chief Executive to write to Brighton and Hove CCG to ask to what degree the clinical guidance and quality standards published by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) have been implemented in Brighton and Hove.
3. Request the Health and Wellbeing Board ensure that a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment on Multiple Births is added to the work programme.”

69.49 The Mayor confirmed that the motion 69 (c) as amended had been **carried** unanimously as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen	√			Mac Cafferty	√		
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears	√		
Barradell	√			Miller	√		
Bell	√			Mitchell	√		
Bennett	√			Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown	√			Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth	√		
Chapman	√			A Norman	√		
Cobb	√			K Norman	√		
Daniel	√			O'Quinn	√		
Deane	√			Page	Absent		
Druitt	√			Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson	√			Penn	√		
Gilbey	√			Phillips	√		

Greenbaum	√			Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson	√		
Hill	√			Sykes	√		
Horan	√			Taylor	√		
Hyde	√			C Theobald	√		
Inkpin-Leissner	√			G Theobald	√		
Janio	√			Wares	√		
Knight	√			Wealls	√		
Lewry	√			West	√		
Littman	√			Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	51	0	0

69.50 The motion was **carried**.

(d) PaybyPhone Parking Scheme

69.51 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Janio and seconded by Councillor Nemeth.

69.52 Councillor Janio stated that the intention of the motion was to bring fairness to the council' sparking scheme, which currently penalised those choosing to pay by phone by making an extra charge. He believed the council's parking charges brought in a significant amount of revenue and therefore the abolition of the additional charge could be accommodated and provide a fair scheme for all.

69.53 Councillor Nemeth stated that the proposal to drop the additional charge was fair and would not impact on the cost to administer the scheme. He noted that unless you chose to un-tick two boxes when you signed up to the scheme, you would pay an additional 40p rather than the standard extra 10p for each parking fee. He had received a number of complaints about the issue and hoped that the council would act appropriately.

69.54 Councillor Mitchell noted that in order to sign up to the scheme you could use an ordinary mobile phone or a land-line and that the additional 10p charge for paying by phone had been part of the budget setting proposals passed last February. She also noted that the council currently subsidised the scheme and that other authorities such as East Sussex had higher charges. The total income from the charge also contributed to the surplus that was used to meet the costs of providing bus passes for older people and bus routes. She was therefore concerned as to how these would be maintained. However, she believed that improvements could be made and was happy to work with officers to keep the scheme under review.

- 69.55 Councillor Robins stated that as a local trader he found the ability to pay by phone easy and accessible and flexible as he was able to pay for a set period and top up if necessary, which meant he didn't have to over pay or keep the right change available.
- 69.56 Councillor West noted that transactions by phone for parking were now at 40% and likely to increase which was a welcome factor. He also noted that there was one coin operated machine available for use in each area and payment could be made in a number of local shops. It was also safer to use the phone and safer as those having to empty the coin machines in terms of the number and how much money they had to carry. He could not understand the need for the motion and could not support it.
- 69.57 Councillor C. Theobald stated that it remained unfair for those using their phone to pay an extra 10p and noted that one coin operated machine was not sufficient as it could be too far away. She believed that local businesses had been affected by this fact and people had been unable to locate a machine. There was a need for a fairer system.
- 69.58 Councillor Janio stated that an alternative option to pay by phone was required and it needed to be fair in terms of the cost of using it.
- 69.59 The Mayor then put the following motion 69 (d) to the vote:

"This Council notes the recurrent criticism of the Council's PayByPhone Parking Scheme, most recently as "discrimination against older people and those without smart phones".

This Council notes the £8,439,569 income generated by on street parking charges in 2014/2015 and the £0.225m saving agreed at this year's Budget Council by reducing the need to maintain, replace and collect cash from coin operated Pay & Display machines.

This Council resolves to request that officers bring a report to the appropriate Committee which, if agreed, would seek to remove the mandatory 10 pence charge for 'pay by phone' parking where currently operational in Brighton and Hove, in light of the above savings generated by the replacement of coin operated machines and the related costs associated with their servicing and maintenance."

- 69.60 The Mayor confirmed that the motion 69 (d) had been **lost** by 17 votes to 31 with 1 abstention as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen		X		Mac Cafferty		X	
Atkinson		X		Marsh		X	
Barford		X		Meadows		X	
Barnett	Absent			Mears	√		
Barradell		X		Miller	√		
Bell	√			Mitchell		X	
Bennett	√			Moonan		X	

Bewick		X		Morgan		X	
Brown	√			Morris		X	
Cattell		X		Nemeth	√		
Chapman		X		A Norman	√		
Cobb	√			K Norman	√		
Daniel		X		O'Quinn		X	
Deane		X		Page	Absent		
Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson		X		Penn		X	
Gilbey		X		Phillips		X	
Greenbaum		X		Robins		X	
Hamilton		X		Simson	√		
Hill		X		Sykes		X	
Horan		X		Taylor	√		
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald	√		
Inkpin-Leissner		X		G Theobald	√		
Janio	√			Wares	√		
Knight		X		Wealls	√		
Lewry	√			West		X	
Littman		X		Yates		X	
					For	Against	Abstain
				Total	17	31	1

69.61 The motion was **lost**.

(e) Boosting Alcohol Related Policing and Prevention

69.62 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Deane and seconded by Councillor Druitt.

69.63 Councillor Deane stated that the motion was not intended to circumvent the Late Night Levy consultation process that was going through the Licensing Committee. However, the concept was flawed as no allowance was made for those premises that could sell alcohol during the day and early evening which supplemented the pre-drinks culture amongst people that enjoyed the night-time entertainment experience. She was hoping that alternative approaches to supporting the police and those involved in dealing with late night revellers could be found and hoped that the motion would be supported.

- 69.64 Councillor Druitt stated that Councillor Page had been unable to attend the meeting and he was therefore seconding the motion on his behalf. He noted that should a Late Night Levy be introduced it was likely to affect small businesses and it was those businesses that the council needed to nurture and support.
- 69.65 Councillor Simson stated that she believed it was premature to bring such a motion forward. She agreed that funding to support those services involved in managing the late night economy were required, however at the last Licensing Committee it was decided not to consult on the Late Night Levy and to look at other options which would be brought back to the committee.
- 69.66 Councillor Wares suggested that it would be better to wait and withdraw the motion as it was premature and it would be better to wait until the matter was considered fully by the Licensing Committee.
- 69.67 Councillor O'Quinn stated that 1 in 3 adults had a drink at home and alcohol was a major factor in all violent crime, and had a cost of around £3b to the NHS. She also noted that the UK paid the highest tax on alcohol which brought a significant amount of revenue to the government. Brighton had a thriving night-time economy but she was not sure that the cost of excessive drinking should be spread across the city rather than the town centre. There was evidence that a substantial amount of alcohol was bought from supermarkets and off-licences for pre-drinks before people went out and this needed to be considered.
- 69.68 The Mayor congratulated Councillor O'Quinn on her maiden speech on behalf of the council.
- 69.69 Councillor Marsh stated that she had a great deal of sympathy with the motion and noted that no decision had been made as yet on the question of a Late Night Levy. She felt that it would help to see if the government decided to provide any funding towards the matter but in the meantime was happy to support the motion.
- 69.70 Councillor Deane welcomed the comments and noted that the motion did not preclude any consultation or decision on the Late Night Levy issue, but simply sought to give consideration to other options that might be available. As things stood currently there would be a 70:30 split of revenue between the Police and the Local Authority which has the responsibility for administering any Late Night Levy scheme.
- 69.71 The Mayor then put the following motion 69 (e) to the vote:

“This council notes the proposal before the Licensing Committee to consult on introducing a Late Night Levy for the city, and the practical difficulties and costs associated with the Levy and its collection at a local level.

Therefore, the Council requests that:

The Chief Executive write to the Home Office Minister of State (Minister for Policing, Crime and Criminal Justice and Victims) and the Local Government Association requesting that, in the spirit of devolution, a proportion of revenue raised from alcohol taxation should be granted directly to local Police and Crime Commissioners and

Directors of Public Health, to contribute towards the extra costs of policing and targeted support services in the night-time economy, and other preventive programmes for tackling alcohol-related harm.”

69.72 The Mayor confirmed that the motion 69 (e) had been **carried** by 32 votes to 0 with 17 abstentions as detailed below:

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Allen	√			Mac Cafferty	√		
Atkinson	√			Marsh	√		
Barford	√			Meadows	√		
Barnett	Absent			Mears			Ab
Barradell	√			Miller			Ab
Bell			Ab	Mitchell	√		
Bennett			Ab	Moonan	√		
Bewick	√			Morgan	√		
Brown			Ab	Morris	√		
Cattell	√			Nemeth			Ab
Chapman	√			A Norman			Ab
Cobb				K Norman			Ab
Daniel	√		Ab	O'Quinn	√		
Deane	√			Page	Absent		
Druitt	√			Peltzer Dunn	Absent		
Gibson	√			Penn	√		
Gilbey	√			Phillips	√		
Greenbaum	√			Robins	√		
Hamilton	√			Simson			Ab
Hill	√			Sykes	√		
Horan	√			Taylor			Ab
Hyde			Ab	C Theobald			Ab
Inkpin-Leissner	√			G Theobald			Ab
Janio			Ab	Wares			Ab
Knight	√			Wealls			Ab
Lewry			Ab	West	√		
Littman	√			Yates	√		
					For	Against	Abstain

					Total	32	0	17
--	--	--	--	--	--------------	-----------	----------	-----------

69.73 The motion was **carried**.

70 CLOSE OF MEETING

70.1 The Mayor wished everyone a happy Christmas and peaceful New Year and closed the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 10.25pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2016