

**LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT****COUNCIL-OWNED LAND ON THE URBAN FRINGE**

To amend the motion with the insertion of a new point 2 and additional points 3 and 4 as shown below in ***bold italics*** and deletion of the original point 2 as struck through.

This Council

1. Expresses its preference that the land on the urban fringe of Brighton & Hove which is presently owned by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), or subsequently acquired by BHCC, would not be used or disposed of (including through joint ventures) for housing development.; ~~and~~
- ~~2. That Policy & Resources Committee be requested to call for a report in order to establish such a policy to protect the urban fringe for the benefit of the City's residents.~~
2. ***Notes that the inclusion of urban fringe sites in the City Plan was expressly required by the current government's Planning Inspector, and the council's refusal to consider sites would have resulted in a failure to adopt a plan and an inability to apply local policies;***
3. ***Expresses concern that the government's planning reforms do not by default consider urban fringe sites to be "protected", provide no guarantees that the urban fringe sites which would be protected from development in the proposed City Plan Part 2 would remain so, and do not rule out development on so-called "protected sites" in any case; and***
4. ***Notes that the city's current urban fringe policies providing amenity to residents, such as increased public access, biodiversity net gain, food growing, and sustainability are at risk from the government's proposed reforms.***

Proposed by: Cllr Hill

Seconded by: Cllr Childs

**Motion if carried to read:**

This Council

1. Expresses its preference that the land on the urban fringe of Brighton & Hove which is presently owned by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), or subsequently acquired by BHCC, would not be used or disposed of (including through joint ventures) for housing development.; and

2. Notes that the inclusion of urban fringe sites in the City Plan was expressly required by the current government's Planning Inspector, and the council's refusal to consider sites would have resulted in a failure to adopt a plan and an inability to apply local policies;
3. Expresses concern that the government's planning reforms do not by default consider urban fringe sites to be "protected", provide no guarantees that the urban fringe sites which would be protected from development in the proposed City Plan Part 2 would remain so, and do not rule out development on so-called "protected sites" in any case; and
4. Notes that the city's current urban fringe policies providing amenity to residents, such as increased public access, biodiversity net gain, food growing, and sustainability are at risk from the government's proposed reforms.