

**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the Council, nominated by the Mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the Mayor and voted on without discussion that the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of three Deputations has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

**(1) Deputation concerning Child Refugees****Spokesperson Elaine Ortiz**

Supported by:

Alistair Rooms

Toby Moore

Nick Norton

John Gantley

Mariam O’Gorman

Mick Sutton

Michael Hamilton

Steve Williams

Jo Sweeting

Penelope Steel

Vicki Lesley

**Ward affected: All**

Councillor Daniel, Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee will reply.

**(2) Deputation concerning The IHRA Definition of Antisemitism****Spokesperson Nadia Edmond**

Supported by:

Ms Agnes Baetens

Mr Sabri Benameur

Prof Ben Rogaly

Ms Cath Senger

Ms Dorothy Sheridan MBE

**Ward affected: All**

Councillor Yates, Leader of the Council will reply.

**(3) Deputation concerning Transparency, Accountability & Community Involvement**

**Spokesperson Steve Parry**

Supported by:  
Steve Parry,  
David Thomas,  
Maria Garrett-Gotch,  
Barry Hughes,  
Robert Carver,  
Nichole Brennan,  
David Croydon,  
Diane Montgomery

**Ward affected: All**

Councillor Marsh, Chair of the Constitution Review Working Group will reply.

**(4) Deputation concerning The IHRA Definition of Antisemitism**

**Spokesperson Fiona Sharp**

Supported by:  
Rabbi Andrea Zanardo  
Rabbi Hershel Rader  
Beryl Sharpe  
Debra Goodman  
Sarah Wilks  
Rabbi Elli Sarah Tikvah  
Rabbi de Beck Spitzer

**Ward affected: All**

Councillor Yates, Leader of the Council will reply.

**(1) Deputation concerning Child Refugees**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

I would like to start by thanking Brighton and Hove council for the brilliant work done already in supporting refugees. Our council have really shown leadership on refugee resettlement by resettling 28 refugees (as far as I know) through the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme. You have taken on the serious responsibility of working with families and supporting them to create a new life here. Thank you for taking the decision to transform the lives of families. You've also supported young people like me to come and make a new life in Brighton -- I've been able to make a home here -- so thank you for helping to make that happen.

This year is the 80th anniversary of the Kindertransport, the scheme through which Britain welcomed 10,000 child refugees over two years. This anniversary marks the best of what Britain is about: helping those fleeing war and terror make a new life.

As part of this anniversary, we are joining a national campaign led by Lord Alf Dubs, himself a Kindertransport child, to call on central Government to start a fully-funded scheme for 1,000 child refugees to be resettled in the UK every year. If the UK were to take 1,000 children a year, spread across the UK, each local authority would support just three children.

We want to recreate now what happened then. People like me from across Britain are speaking to councils over the UK, from Perth and Kinross in Scotland down to Lewes, to ask them to offer places for child refugees in a new fully-funded scheme.

We think local authorities like ours, who represent welcoming places, can show leadership on the issue and offer more than three places a year. Hammersmith and Fulham Council have offered 100 places for child refugees; Scotland's Perth and Kinross Council have offered 20 places; and Barnet has pledged 30 places for child refugees.

We think in Brighton and Hove we are a welcoming place, so we want to work with our Council to resettle 100 child refugees over 10 years -- just 10 children every year. So we are here to ask one question:--

1. Will Brighton and Hove City Council commit to resettle 10 child refugees a year if central Government were to create a new fully-funded scheme?

We would be happy to support the council to make this happen. It would help newer refugee children and children currently in care find a home.

We would be happy to meet with the Council to discuss how we could support you in this.

**Spokesperson Elaine Ortiz**





80 years on it's... **Our turn** 

## The *Our Turn* campaign – 10,000 child refugees resettled over the next 10 years

- Supported by the refugee charity Safe Passage, and led by Lord Alf Dubs, the *Our Turn* campaign is calling for the establishment of a new 'Children at Risk' resettlement scheme to bring 10,000 child refugees to the UK over the next 10 years.
- The scheme should build on and extend the current Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme (VCRS) beyond 2020, with central government providing funding to local authorities that at least equals that allocated under VCRS.
- Critically, the new scheme would be open to vulnerable children in Europe as well as other regions around the world, to reflect the urgent need for protection of many children who arrive in Europe.
- **To secure this ambitious government commitment, the *Our Turn* campaign is asking local authorities to pledge places for children for this future scheme.**

### How can local authorities support the *Our Turn* campaign and help secure a new Children at Risk scheme?

- In the past the Government has suggested that councils are unwilling to offer additional places to children. This was the justification they gave for cutting the numbers of children to be taken in under the Dubs scheme from 3,000 to just 480 places.
- **The reality is that authorities across the country have consistently volunteered to take more child refugees if the government provides adequate funding.**
- For the *Our Turn* campaign to succeed in securing an ambitious commitment to resettle 10,000 children over 10 years, it is essential that the government is sent a clear message that councils are willing to resettle more children, providing adequate support is there.
- Every place that a council pledges will help the *Our Turn* campaign show the government that the willingness to help is there.
- 10,000 children over 10 years equates to just 3 children per local authority per year. However, we are asking councils who can to pledge more than 3 places to ensure enough places are offered. We have already had commitments from councils in cities and rural areas ranging from 20 to 100 places.

### Why is it *Our Turn*?

- **This year is the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the start of the Kindertransport, a rescue operation launched by the UK government and Jewish groups that saved 10,000 child refugees from Nazi Europe. A new commitment to resettle child refugees will continue the UK's proud history of offering sanctuary to vulnerable children.**
- Britain's existing resettlement commitments (the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme and Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme) are due to expire in 2020. The Dubs scheme resettling vulnerable children from within Europe is due to end after 480 children are resettled.
- With the current routes to safety threatened, Britain has an urgent responsibility to live up to the Kindertransport legacy by establishing a new and lasting legal commitment to ensure child refugees can access safe passage.

### What will the new Children at Risk scheme look like?

<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/63435>

- UNHCR figures show that across the world, over half a million children need urgent resettlement. In 2017 alone, nearly 32,963 refugee and migrant children arrived in Europe. Over 60% of these were unaccompanied or separated, compared to 34% in 2016<sup>1</sup>.
- The new Children at Risk scheme will extend the current VCRS to incorporate the principles of the Dubs scheme, enabling both unaccompanied and vulnerable children with family to benefit. It would also be available to vulnerable refugee children both within Europe and other regions globally.

The scheme will be flexible to meet the changing need from year-to-year. Eligibility will be determined by vulnerability and the best interests of the child rather than location or nationality.

- **The *Our Turn* campaign is calling on central government to fund the scheme to at least the rate of the existing VCRS and Section 67 Schemes** - currently up to £114 per day for unaccompanied children and £25,020 over five years for accompanied children. There is also limited additional funding available via the Controlling Migration Fund and the possibility for councils in England to draw on extra support for healthcare and English language provision<sup>2</sup>.
- The Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration's 2018 report on the VPRS<sup>3</sup> found that local authorities were generally positive about the amount they received to cover the costs of the first year of a VPRS resettlement of accompanied minors (which is the same as that for VCRS). However, in their joint response to the UASC funding review, the ADCS and LGA have made clear that the current rate of funding for unaccompanied minors remains inadequate and requires a significant uplift<sup>4</sup>.
- **The *Our Turn* campaign believes that if the new Children at Risk scheme is to be fit for purpose, the government must take the concerns of local authorities on board and allocate adequate funding for the new Children at Risk scheme.**

### Publicly thanking pledging councils at a Kindertransport Commemoration

- On 15<sup>th</sup> November, 1,000 *Our Turn* supporters, including Kindertransport survivors, child refugees, senior public figures, charities and civil society will come together in a major national event to commemorate the Kindertransport and celebrate the role communities have played in assisting child refugees to reach protection both then and now.
- Local authorities who make pledges will be invited to attend this very special commemoration event, to be publicly thanked for their commitment to helping child refugees today.
- The campaign hopes to announce pledges for at least 1,000 'Children at Risk' places from councils at the commemoration and to call on the government to fund the new scheme.

### Making a Children at Risk pledge

- If you are ready to pledge to help child refugees, the *Our Turn* campaign can add your commitment to our online record of pledging councils – please let us know if you would like us to include photos or a message of support. We can then work with your Press Office to publicise the commitment.
- To discuss the campaign further, please contact Rosie Rooney, Press and Public Affairs Manager [Rosie.rooney@safepassage.org.uk](mailto:Rosie.rooney@safepassage.org.uk) - 07517805753 or Alistair Rooms, Campaigns Organiser on [Alistair.rooms@safepassage.org.uk](mailto:Alistair.rooms@safepassage.org.uk) - 07398504371

<sup>2</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/722154/Combined\\_local\\_authority\\_funding\\_instruction\\_2018-2019\\_v2.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/722154/Combined_local_authority_funding_instruction_2018-2019_v2.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/705155/VPRS\\_Final\\_Artwork\\_revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705155/VPRS_Final_Artwork_revised.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> [http://adcs.org.uk/assets/documentation/ADCS\\_LGA\\_Joint\\_response\\_to\\_UASC\\_Funding\\_Review.pdf](http://adcs.org.uk/assets/documentation/ADCS_LGA_Joint_response_to_UASC_Funding_Review.pdf)

**(2) Deputation concerning IHRA Definition**  
**Summary of deputation to the meeting of the City Council on 18 October 2018**

***The IHRA Definition of Antisemitism***

On October 18th 2018, Councillors will debate a proposal to 'adopt' a definition of antisemitism framed by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA). **On behalf of numerous civil society organisations in the City – working to combat racism in all its forms – we urge Councillors to vote *against* this proposal.**

Charges of antisemitism have recently been levelled at many groups and individuals, including some politicians and campaigners. With the issue of antisemitism prominent in the media, the IHRA definition appears to offer local councils an opportunity to signal clearly their repudiation of this odious form of race hatred.

There are several reasons to reject the proposal to 'adopt' the IHRA definition. First, the City Council's existing policies already make clear its unambiguous opposition to racism. Moreover, we understand that the Council will consider adopting an even stronger anti-racist policy at its October meeting, and we naturally applaud this. We feel that to single out antisemitism for special or additional treatment will send the wrong message to other members of our community who also face racism. Antisemitism is a pernicious form of race hatred, which undoubtedly exists in the city. But it is no more and no less pernicious than other forms of race hatred. If the Council's anti-racism policies are adequate for some parts of our community, they are surely adequate for *all* parts of our community. And if the Council's policies are inadequate for some parts of our community, they must be strengthened for *all* parts of our community.

Second, the IHRA definition goes far beyond a definition of anti-Jewish hatred and discrimination. It explicitly links antisemitism to criticism of the Israeli government. We are profoundly concerned by this attempt to position legitimate *political* criticism as *religious* or *ethnic* discrimination or stereotyping. The effect of adopting the IHRA definition would be to silence legitimate criticism of Israel by labelling it as antisemitism. (\*see supporting information)

Third, Brighton and Hove City Council has a responsibility to uphold the provisions of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, including the right to freedom of expression for all its citizens. This freedom of expression must include the right to condemn Israel's repeated violations of international humanitarian law, UN resolutions, and the Fourth Geneva Convention. The IHRA definition, in conflating antisemitism with criticism of Israel, risks being seen in law to limit such freedom. There are therefore profound civil liberties implications in adopting the IHRA definition.

Finally, we state again our unwavering opposition to all forms of racism, and applaud the City Council for its resolve on this issue. We strongly urge City Councillors to resist the pressure to adopt the IHRA definition of antisemitism – not in a negative spirit, but in the positive spirit of standing together against racism.

**Spokesperson Nadia Edmond**

Supporting Information:

\*On this point, we particularly draw Councillors' attention to two recent public statements. The first was issued in July by over 40 Jewish groups in 15 countries, co-ordinated by Jewish Voice for Peace (\*), condemning attempts to use the IHRA definition to stifle criticism of Israel with false accusations of antisemitism. These Jewish groups explicitly state their opposition to 'Israel's policies and system of occupation and apartheid' – a description that is deemed to be antisemitic under the IHRA definition. The other statement was issued last month by over 100 Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic organisations, writing as the 'Our History-Our Place' coalition (\*). The groups argue that the IHRA definition of antisemitism could lead to a silencing of public discussion about past and current injustices suffered by the Palestinian people, and about the racism underlying those injustices.

Each City Councillor has been sent a copy of a legal opinion produced last year by Hugh Tomlinson QC. Tomlinson's opinion is a considered and dispassionate analysis of the IHRA definition, and provides sound reasons for the City Council to decline to adopt the IHRA definition. Indeed a decision to adopt it would create division and confusion.

Councillors may know that the original drafter of the IHRA definition of antisemitism, Kenneth Stern, has publicly stated that there are already signs the IHRA definition will be used to 'encourage punishments of legitimate expressions of political opinion' – a use for which it was never designed.

It is also important for Councillors to note that many public bodies have declared their opposition to the IHRA definition, including universities and colleges, trade unions, faith groups and local councils.



**(3) Deputation concerning Transparency, Accountability & Community Involvement**

It is 12 months since the Brighton and Hove Housing Coalition was launched and the Committee is aware of questions and deputations submitted over this period together with wider activity on the housing crisis generally and within our City in particular.

There is no doubt that issues of importance have been raised, the political agenda influenced, and interesting information made available. Examples of specific areas of concern raised by the Coalition are noted below as background information.

However, we must express our concern at the absence of meaningful responses to many questions, “Yes Minister” turgid replies, and a generally defensive attitude to proposals, new ideas, and open informed discussion. The current procedure appears to prevent involvement of the committee as a whole and does little to encourage community involvement. The Chairperson reading a prepared response and, usually, being unable to answer any supplementary question is not constructive.

The style and length of the committee agenda together with the time allowed for public scrutiny is not conducive to accountability and transparency.

We must also highlight the abysmal record of the Housing Department in relation to Freedom of Information requests and the underlying impression of the department’s desire to withhold information rather than share it. Initial viewing of data shows B&HCC to have one of the worst records in the country for refusals, time taken to respond, and non-compliance with FOI legislation.

The Coalition requests the Committee initiates a review of its procedures dealing with questions, deputations, petitions and FOI requests with the objective of establishing an example of good practice that highlights transparency, accountability and community participation.

Further, the Coalition urges the Committee to hold a special meeting in May 2019 on this issue to discuss detailed proposals for change.

We suggest BHC submits a detailed document to the Committee by 3 May based upon information, advice, and ideas from the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO), mySociety, the Campaign for Freedom of Information, and community based groups throughout Brighton & Hove. The Coalition also seeks to involve a representative from each group on the Council to work with the team drawing up the submission.

**Spokesperson Steve Parry**



Supporting Information:

**Brighton & Hove Housing Coalition  
Background information for Deputation on  
Transparency, Accountability & Community Involvement**



The Coalition was launched on 19 August 2017. Keynote Speakers included Lloyd Russell-Moyle MP, Caroline Lucas MP, Larissa Reed, B&HCC Executive Director for Neighbourhoods, Communities and Housing, and housing activists from throughout Brighton & Hove.

**One of the key objectives of the constitution is to to examine all matters discussed by the B&HCC Housing Committee to ensure robust analysis of B&HCC policies and their implementation.**

**Holding the Housing Department to account**

During 2017/18 The Coalition has coordinated questions and deputations, as well as publishing detailed briefings;

**Committee meeting 15.11.17:** Questions covered S20 notices, Hereford House, temporary accommodation, B&B 'accommodation', night shelter, rough sleepers, the former Oxford Street office, Universal Credit, supported housing, SWEP, and a deputation regarding legal action being taken by BHCC against leaseholders on the Bristol Estate

A deputation on a "Pledge" to end street homelessness was refused despite it being signed by the Green councillors on the committee and one Labour member.

**Committee meeting 17.1.18:** Issues covered included night shelter, legal action against leaseholders, Mears, Knightguard Security Ltd, children in B&B accommodation, SWEP, short term homelessness accommodation, Housing First, and the HRA Energy Strategy

The Chairperson refused to accept questions on St Mungo's and Discretionary Housing Payments, a statement by the Chairperson on Housing Benefit payments, and a DCLG/DWP report on "supported housing".

**Committee meeting 14.3.18:** Questions were put on the loss of the New Homes Bonus, SWEP, land banking, malnutrition among residents in temporary & emergency accommodation, the lack of services for those who are homeless over the weekend, "Oxford Street", Discretionary Housing Payments and the Council Tax Reduction Discretionary Scheme, the absence of an Equalities Impact Assessment of the HRA budget proposals,

temporary accommodation evictions, Homemove expenditure of £1,298,000 on homelessness, children in B&B, and emergency accommodation.

A question on “Legal Action against residents – Winning litigation at all costs” was refused less than 36 hours before the meeting with no opportunity to resubmit it in an acceptable form

**Committee meeting 13.6.18:** The struggle for transparency & accountability continued with questions on Park Court, solar panels, the Housing computer system, Mears, procurement options, “borrowing to build”, temporary accommodation evictions, malnutrition among residents in temporary & emergency accommodation, sheltered accommodation & allocations policy, and a deputation of Bristol Estate leaseholders.

Questions on MA Construction Ltd, fraud & Mears were rejected and 5 questions were referred to other committees

A number of issues have needed to be raised on more than one occasion as a result of incorrect information having been provided, questions not answered or because of the complexity of the areas of policy. Questions have been referred to other committees without a response from housing on matters central to housing policy and questions have been refused due to a lack of awareness of their significance; an example being the recently published report on financing of “supported” housing.

No information is provided to the committee as to why certain questions or deputations are rejected

**During the first year of the Coalition the Information Commissioner upheld 13 complaints covering 7 areas of housing policy. BHCC is among the worst performing local authorities with regard to implementation of Freedom of Information legislation.**

It is not unusual for the Housing department to take two or three months to respond to simple requests and there are cases of accurate information taking up to two years before it is released.

The ICO Decision Notices can be found at

<https://icosearch.ico.org.uk/s/search.html?collection=ico-meta&profile=decisions&query=&f.Date|d=d%3E20Aug2017%3C01Sep2018&calendarPicker=true&f.By+authority|publicAuthority=Brighton%20and%20Hove%20City%20Council>

**(4) Deputation concerning IHRA Definition**

I speak on behalf of Sussex Jewish Representative Council and the vast majority of the 3000 people who make up the Jewish community in Brighton, Hove and Sussex.

We fully support and encourage the adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's working definition on Antisemitism and all its examples by this Council, bringing them in line with the 141 other councils across the country.

The adoption of the IHRA definition gives my community the protection it needs against the growing tide of antisemitism we are seeing in this country. The latest hate crime figures once again show that antisemitism hate crimes have risen.

We, like all minority communities and those with protected characteristics, are fully entitled to self-define hate against us. We do not seek to tell other minorities what is or is not an attack on them. We see no reason why others feel better equipped to tell us what is or isn't antisemitism.

We stand shoulder-to-shoulder with other faith groups and minority communities against all hate, racism and bigotry.

The IHRA definition in no way limits an individual's freedom of speech and is equally clear that robust, legitimate criticism against the government of Israel is perfectly permissible. But as MP Gareth Snell so clearly stated last weekend, 'If you're not able to criticise Israel without breaching IHRA, it isn't IHRA stopping you, it's probably that you're an antisemite.'

We welcome the strong and principled stand taken by the leaders of all three parties here in Brighton and Hove in doing what is right. This in no way affects any other minority community or the people of Brighton and Hove or any causes they wish to support and champion. The decision today to adopt the IHRA without any amendments or caveats will be welcomed by the majority of our 3000 strong community. Brighton and Hove's Jewish community has thrived and contributed to this city for more than 250 years. This motion demonstrates that we are valued, heard, respected and protected by this Council in our welcoming City of Sanctuary. We are grateful for your support and solidarity.

**Spokesperson Fiona Sharpe**

