

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**TOURISM, EQUALITIES, COMMUNITIES & CULTURE COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 11 MARCH 2021**

**VIRTUAL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Powell (Joint Chair), Osborne (Joint Chair), Ebel (Joint Deputy Chair), Evans (Opposition Spokesperson), Nemeth (Group Spokesperson), Grimshaw, Mac Cafferty, Mears, O'Quinn and Simson

**Other Members present:** Joanna Martindale, Lola Banjoko, Nick May and Stephanie Prior.

**PART ONE**

**69 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**69 (a) Declarations of substitutes**

69.1 There were no declarations of substitutes.

**69 (b) Declarations of interest**

69.2 Councillor Powell declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in the matters on the agenda as she was employed by Sussex Police. She also stated that in relation to the matters concerning RISE, her partner consulted with and worked with Rise during 2017-18 but not on the upcoming work included in the agenda.

69.3 Councillor MacCafferty declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in Item 80 as a members of the Dome and Pavilion.

69.4 Councillor O'Quinn declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in Item 80 as she held a trusteeship of the Brighton Dome Festival.

**69 (c) Exclusion of press and public**

69.5 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

69.6 **RESOLVED:** That the public be not excluded during consideration of any item of business on the agenda.

## 70 MINUTES

70.1 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

70.2 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on the 19<sup>th</sup> November be amended.

## 71 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

71.1 The Chair gave the following communications, the new Business and IP Centre based in Jubilee Library has been operating online during lockdown, working with the Brighton Chamber to deliver support to local businesses. In February they held 18 online events and had 86 people attend them. These events included:

- Reset. Restart: workshops, individual and networking sessions\*
- Business Information Clinics
- Workshops on how to use business databases

The Reset. Restart programme is for established companies, sole traders and micro businesses and start-ups less than three years old. It is designed to give people the skills they need to help get their business back on its feet. The Reset. Restart programme is being extended and the Business and IP Centre staff in Jubilee Library are working with the Brighton Chamber to re-run the workshops throughout April and May.

## 72 CALL OVER

72.1 The following items were reserved for discussion:

- Item 75 Prevent (preventing terrorism and extremism)
- Item 76 Oxford Court PSPO Review (Gating Scheme)
- Item 77 Update on Anti-Racism Work
- Item 78 Libraries Strategy Procedures for Consultation and Engagement
- Item 79 City of Sanctuary Re-accreditation
- Item 80 Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust – Plan 2021/22
- Item 81 Brighton Dome Brighton Festival Report 2020-2021
- Item 83 Christmas Market
- Item 84 Commissioning of Domestic Violence and Abuse Services

72.2 The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that following item listed on the agenda had been approved:

- Item 82 Review Assessment for City Plan Part One.

## 73 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### (a) Petitions

#### (i) Save Hove and Portslade Seafront

- 73.1 The Chair thanked Andrea for the petition and stated that the council fully appreciated the important role it had to influence the well-being of residents and visitors across the wide-range of services that it provided from social care to waste collection as well as infrastructure improvement projects. Significant investment takes place in infrastructure projects which has included in recent years on the Seafront the restoration of the Shelter Hall and the West Pier Arches. However, with regards to the Seafront the age of the Victorian seafront infrastructure created a particular challenge.

The council was responsible for maintenance across 13km of seafront which stretched from Hove Lagoon to Saltdean. The maintenance of assets was not divided by geographical area but was prioritised by factors such as health and safety risk, condition and level of urgency. The planned maintenance of the seafront railings and seafront furniture falls under the Corporate Planned Maintenance budget. This budget stands at £3,003,603 in 2020-21 and covers planned maintenance works as well as statutory compliance works to all civic, operational and historic council buildings across our City. The latter covers around £1m of the total allocation and relates to fabric maintenance arrangements, such as clearance of roofs and gutters, graffiti removal, mechanical and electrical testing, boiler and lift servicing and legionella controls. Furthermore, there is £700k ring-fenced to support the maintenance of historic buildings held in two lease Trust arrangements.

The remaining budget is prioritised in consultation with service Client officers to address the highest critical and most essential maintenance works using a works prioritisation matrix. Allocation is across the City as a whole and not divided between any specific geographic areas within. The aim is to ensure that statutory compliance works and higher risk Health and Safety issues are addressed. Essential maintenance includes works of a structural nature and those that keep our buildings watertight.

Like most local authorities, the council faces a backlog in its required planned maintenance, extreme budget challenges and our small and limited maintenance budgets are inadequate for the need. Financial controls applied over a number of years have meant substantial cuts in what can be achieved within the annual programme. That in turn increases our prioritised volumes of required maintenance with associated risk.

The seafront allocation for 2020-21 stands at £363,800. For holding structural repairs and health and safety works Madeira Terrace has been allocated £151,500. There is £100k for railing redecoration in Hove, £50k for shelter and bench repairs and an allocation of £37k for the Volk's Railway.

Financial Year	Location	Amount spent/allocated from Planned Maintenance Budget	Contractor
2020/21	Hove Promenade - seafront railings & shelters	£150,000 allocated	PH Beck Ltd
2019/20	Brighton Kings Rd, Madeira Drive & Marine Parade – Seafront railings	£246,345	PH Beck Ltd
2018/19	Hove Promenade - 2 x shelter refurbishment	£163,651	JG&JR Lanridges
2017/18	Hove Promenade – Hove Lagoon – Peace Statue seafront railings & shelters	£239,472	Ellis Building Contractors
2016/17	Brighton – Sections of Madeira Drive, Kings Road, Marine Parade.	£166,100	Ellis Building Contractors

The work is tendered to professional building contractors and decorators and overseen by council Building Surveyors – see above.

It is necessary for expenditure to be prioritised due to the pressures on council budgets across the services that are provided. If residents wished to crowdfund to support maintenance of a specific restoration project agreed with the council, then such assistance would be welcome.”

73.2 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted.

**(b) Written Questions**

73.3 Mr Jay Butler asked the following question, I have designed and now seek permission to install a Covid Memorial set into existing concrete on the undercliff at Ovingdean. This would require incising the design approximately 4cm into the surface then infilling with white concrete incorporating shells from the local beach. I am consulting with local community leaders, including our local vicar, who is in favour. This would be a community project requiring no material, installation or ongoing maintenance costs on the part of the council. Further I intend full consultation on Risk Assessment/ Health & Safety with the relevant authority for the installation period approximately four days.”

73.4 The Chair thanked Mr Butler and replied, your suggestion sounds very interesting and I'm glad to hear you're working on this with the local community. In terms of any consents you might need – I am advised you may need planning permission. I would suggest you send the details to the planning service and officers will provide you with informal advice. The email address for this will be sent to you after the meeting.

Given the potential for causing long term maintenance problems by drilling or removing significant depths of concrete from the seawall and associated structures on the undercliff, the Council's Coast Protection Manager would need to be satisfied by the design and installation specification. He will be happy to make contact.

- 73.5 Mr Butler asked a supplementary question and enquired if Councillor Mears could forward the design to Members of the Committee for further information.
- 73.6 The Chair stated that the designs should be sent to officers in Planning, however he welcomed Councillor Mears' extra details and asked that they be sent to the relevant officers.
- 73.7 Mr Roy Pennington asked the following question, TECC 19/11/2020 will be changed to reassure and respect tenants with indefinite agreements (see item 40 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT (b) Written Questions (i) Beach Chalets Report Removal) and that the qualified decision made 14 January 2021 was thus made on inadequate and misleading data and must still require legal advice before implementation, how could the committee make such a wholly unreasonable and irrational decision to evict tenants with indefinite agreements without not revisiting the matter properly?
- 73.8 The Chair replied, thank you Mr Pennington for your question and for bringing the matter to our attention. There was an error in the minutes of TECC on 19 November 2020 when they were presented for approval on 14 January 2021. Your question related to the failure to record the comment from the Chair, when it was said that there would be a report to the January TECC Committee. The Chair's comment was 'we will listen to your concerns and the many valuable points made by people with indefinite licences.'

When the committee on the 14 January was asked to approve the minutes of the November meeting, Councillor Amanda Evans raised the issue on behalf of Mr Pennington, who had emailed her, that there was an inaccuracy in the minutes and the Democratic Services Officer agreed to review the minutes. It was therefore clear to the Committee on the 14 January that the minutes were not accurate in one area.

The committee did reconsider the matter in January and made a decision based on the officer report presented to them. The decision on the 14 January 2021 was not made with inadequate and misleading data. Our legal advisor has considered Mr Pennington's question and has no concerns about the decision made by the committee on this date.

- 73.9 Mr Pennington asked a supplementary question and enquired if the Committee had taken expert Counsel's opinion and if so when the public would be informed.
- 73.10 The Chair noted the question and requested that the Legal Advisor provide a written response.
- 73.11 Mr Christopher Hawtree asked the following question, over two years ago I was told at this Committee, in a reply to a supplementary, that there would be a report on the current system of selection and allocation of book stock in our libraries. About a year ago I asked at this Committee when this report would appear but did not receive a reply. Can the Chair please tell us about securing this report forthwith, what with the failure of wholesalers Bertrams?

73.12 The Chair thanked Mr Hawtree for his question and stated that the issue of selection and allocation of book stock will link to our wider Libraries Strategy. Consultation and development of the strategy was halted last year because of the Covid pandemic but as outlined elsewhere on the agenda, it is recommended that this process now restarts . If the recommendations are agreed, the Libraries Stock Policy will be considered alongside the Libraries Strategy at the November TECC committee.

The council procures library stock and bibliographic services through the Jubilee Library PFI contract and this contract is unaffected by Bertrams going into administration. The council's PFI partners have secured alternative suppliers to replace the sub-contract they had with Bertrams.

It is worth noting that the council's library staff already retain the responsibility for book selection and carry out this role in several ways. This includes creating purchasing profiles for obvious book-buying such as getting the latest publications from top-selling authors, as well as selecting some of the more esoteric or locally focused stock themselves.

73.13 Mr Hawtree asked a supplementary question and noted the emphasis on top selling authors and esoteric books over the importance of books that reflected the interests of communities and requested that the libraries report being authored due in November be brought forward.

73.14 The Chair stated that this could not be brought forward as consultation was to be undertaken over the coming months.

73.15 Ms Imogen Casebourne asked the following question, Does the Council agree that the document entitled Land Contamination: Risk Management, mentioned by the Council Leader in his reply to the deputation of 22/10/20, does not give details of safe remediation techniques?"

73.16 The Chair thanked Ms Casebourne for her question and stated that as the Gas Works site is contaminated and requires remediation work - any future planning application on the Gas Works site will require detailed information to be submitted in accordance with national guidance called: Land contamination: risk management.

The Chair further qualified that the document was new and that "Remediation is highly technical, regulated and is licensed and overseen by the Health and Safety Executive" In terms of your question about the Land Contamination: Risk Management (LCRM) guidance, no we don't agree. It does give details of safe remediation techniques.

He noted that the document was recently revised by the Environment Agency and published on 8th October 2020. The council must refer to this guidance, issued and agreed by central government, when considering contaminated sites. The revised guidance fully details options and steps to be carried out to ensure there is effective remediation proposed for contaminated sites.

73.16 Ms Casebourne asked a supplementary question and requested a follow up meeting to look at how land risk management had been undertaken on sites.

73.17 The Chair stated that a meeting with officers could be arranged.

73.18 Mr Stephen White asked the following question, in the interests of democracy, the council rightly encourages developers to engage with local communities concerning their planning applications prior to submission. But what happens when a developer fails to provide plans that are clear and sufficiently finalised for residents to be able to assess the full potential impact of the development on their own lives and on their neighbourhood and what effect, if any, might such a failure to provide a proper public consultation have on the council's attitude to the developer's planning application?

73.19 The Chair thanked Mr White for his question and stated that he had been advised that the proposal for the Gas Works is at pre-application stage and this is the early stage at which we ask developers to engage with residents on big schemes like the Gas Works. For this reason, however, often the detail of the scheme hasn't been fully worked up yet – particularly where the developer is still in early discussions with our planning officers. I understand this is the case in this instance.

I appreciate this can be frustrating – but what it means is that some of the early comments received from residents can still help to shape the final proposals. I'm advised the planning application is due in the summer and I can assure you that residents will be consulted once it is received. The full details will be available, and you'll be given time to look at these and make your comments.

73.20 Mr White asked a supplementary question and enquired what could be done to deter developers from using the public consultation period as nothing more than a tick box exercise.

73.21 The Head of Planning assured Mr White that while it was very difficult for developers to provide details, BHCC would push to provide as much information as possible. It was further noted that there was still an opportunity to influence and change proposals.

73.22 Mr Pip Tyler asked the following question, the City Plan Part One was adopted in March 2016 and Policy DA2 covered major development in East Brighton. The gasworks site was designated for 2,000 sqm of workspace and a minimum of 85 residential units. Providing a mix of dwelling type, tenure and size the design should positively contribute to the character of existing buildings in the area, creating an attractive urban environment.

The current proposal is for around 700 dwellings - nearly 10X that in the City Plan – where did the changes to the Plan happen to encourage developers to think in this scale and mass?

73.23 The Chair thanked Mr Tyler for his question and stated that the number of residential units allocated in the City Plan is expressed as a minimum. The reason for this is that there is a significant shortfall in meeting housing needs in Brighton & Hove. In terms of the proposal, it is the decision of a developer as to what they propose in their planning application, but they will be required to respond to all policies in the City Plan. These include design, sustainability, amenity and transport policies. Planning Officers with

scrutinise the proposals once the planning application is submitted. It is expected to be received in the summer and residents will be consulted.

- 73.24 Mr Tyler asked a supplementary question and enquired if residents will have a chance to have input on building plans in the city.
- 73.25 The Chair confirmed that there would be opportunities for residents to submit their input to consultations that would be undertaken in future.
- 73.26 Ms Ali Ceesay asked the following question on behalf of Ms Jean Calder, recent decisions regarding RISE suggest Council officers may have less of an understanding than they once had of the discrimination, harassment and violence suffered by the city's women and girls and the legal protections that exist to protect their sex based rights. This creates a de facto equalities 'pecking order' which leaves the city's females languishing near the bottom. What will councillors do to ensure that institutional sexism within the council is identified and challenge and that council personnel (and wherever possible partner agencies) are adequately trained and equipped to protect the sex based legal rights of women and girls?
- 73.27 The Chair thanked Ms Ceesay for her question and stated that at Brighton & Hove City Council our commitment to equality and inclusion is unwavering. Our vision is for a more equal city where no one is left behind. We are proud to support the rights of women and girls in the work that we do.

It is our shared priority to end domestic and sexual violence and abuse across the county and keep people safe. To support our work in this area we co-produced the Pan-Sussex Strategic Framework for Domestic and Sexual Violence and Abuse 2020-24. This sets out our vision for Brighton & Hove and East Sussex and aims for a future where everyone can live safe lives, without the threat or experience of domestic and sexual violence and abuse.

Alongside our partners across Sussex we are working together to break down barriers between sectors and services, in neighbourhoods and communities, recognising that Domestic and Sexual Violence is everyone's business; and that responsibility for tackling the issue is truly shared.

The Council undertakes Equality Impact Assessments when designing or redesigning services which explores impacts on every protected characteristic, including sex. We believe in both meeting and going beyond the legal minimum set by the Equality Act to champion truly inclusive and intersectional practice.

We took a leading role in supporting residents and communities in our city in the context of COVID-19 crisis – recognising the disproportionate impact on women and girls. Throughout the pandemic we have responded to local and national gender-based research and are working in partnership with our Community and Voluntary Sector and to ensure that issues impacting women and girls are understood and addressed throughout the crisis. We have also taken huge steps to support children and families – including creating new food banks and giving direct individual support.

The council also commissions and provides focused activities and events for women and girls in the city in areas where women are underrepresented, such as in sport. 58% of council staff are women, not including school's staff. We have a higher representation of women in senior positions. 61% of staff being paid at the upper pay band are women. As a result, our gender pay gap is the opposite of the national gender pay gap, with on average women being paid more than men across our workforce.

Women may be attracted to the council due to our generous flexible working opportunities and support. We deliver workshops and development opportunities to support women – such as 'support during the menopause' and 'active bystander' training.

We also have a range of policies in place to support and educate staff including 'Support for Employees experiencing Domestic Violence & Abuse or Sexual Violence' and guidance on addressing domestic violence abuse, sexual violence and other violence against women and girls crime types in commissioning and procurement activity.

Finally, we also celebrate women with annual events as part of International Women's Day. This year we asked council staff to challenge and call out gender bias and inequality and actively celebrate women's achievements. Our fantastic Women's Network put on a day of activities for women focused on self-care and have provided peer to peer support for women throughout the pandemic. Our Women's network provides a place for staff to seek support and ensure we're able to consider the needs of women in everything that we do."

73.28 Ms Ceesay asked a supplementary question and requested that the Committee considered all survivors as relevant stakeholders in all issues going forward.

73.29 The Chair agreed that it was vital for survivors to be involved in issues and that efforts were being undertaken to look at service user involvement.

73.30 Ms Farnell asked the following question, When the current commission for Domestic Abuse services in the city started, six years ago, RISE were asked to set up The Portal as a very important central referral point for everyone who needs to access support. Now that this website is up and running, why has the council decided to scrap it and replace it with a 'Victim Hub'?

73.31 The Chair thanked Ms Farnell for her question and stated that there will be a single point of contact telephone number for the commissioned community-based domestic abuse service provided by Victim Support from 1st April. This will be promoted in advance of the contract going live. The Victim Hub is a multi-agency team based in the MASH (Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub) for ease of liaison with specialist safeguarding teams, incorporating Sussex Police, IDVAs (Independent Domestic Abuse Advisors), ISVAs (Independent Sexual Violence Advisors) and Stalking and Harassment Support Workers. The Victims Hub model has been co-designed with cross-sector partners involved in risk assessment, referral and initial assessment, to improve victim experience and outcomes through focus on service pathways and being trauma informed. The more we can reduce the number of times a victim has to tell their story, the more likely they are to remain engaged with both support and criminal justice services.

- 73.32 As a supplementary Ms Farnell noted that the vast majority of users didn't see themselves as victims and sought contact details regarding victim hubs.
- 73.33 The Chair offered to provide a written response.
- 73.34 Ms Alice Strutt addressed the panel and gave the following question:  
"The UN's Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women recommended in 2017 that "States should allocate adequate financial and human resources for the adequate implementation of integrated policies, measures and programmes to prevent and combat gender-based violence against women, including appropriate financial and human resources for the establishment and running of shelters, including those operated by non-governmental organizations." Does the committee think that services for survivors of domestic abuse in Brighton & Hove are more, or less likely to be integrated after April 1st, given there are to be three organisations delivering them instead of one?"
- 73.35 The Chair thanked Ms Strutt and stated that with Victim Support also taking on the higher risk referrals from 1<sup>st</sup> April, we expect the pathways into services to become even more integrated for victim/ survivors. As part of our social value evaluation of tender submissions, successful bidders were required to set out their approach to working collaboratively across the system, and in that spirit, Stonewater Ltd and Victim Support are already working closely to ensure that pathways into and out of refuge provision are integrated.
- 73.36 As a supplementary Ms Strutt enquired why the cross-party working group had not been set up previously and noted that the post for Commissioner had been filled by 2 people and was in the process of rehiring. A written response was further requested.
- 73.37 The Chair affirmed commitment to setting up a Working Group to consider this issue and agreed to provide a written response.
- 73.38 Ms J Parnwell addressed the Committee and gave the following question, The Brighton & Hove City Council Social Value Framework states that "Every tender will have considered social value and have at least one outcome included, unless there is a legitimate reason not to". It also says, "In considering the social value outcomes, commissioners and procurement officers will need to work out the weight given to social value, which in Brighton & Hove will range from 10-30%". Please can you tell me what the social value outcomes were for Lots 1 and 5 of the procurement process for Domestic Abuse Services, how much weight these were given in the scoring process?
- 73.39 The Chair thanked Ms Parnwell for her question and stated that the tender specification and quality questions were drafted in line with the Brighton and Hove Social Value Framework and the Social Value Act. Social value was embedded in the quality questions which bidders were asked. Social value is referred to in the report which will be discussed later in the agenda. The report confirms that the Council met its obligations in relation to social value. The Member Working Group which we will discuss later in the agenda may consider the Council's approach to social value.

I am sorry I am not able to provide detailed information about the evaluation. As I said at the outset, we have to protect the council and follow the legal advice we are given so that is why I cannot give you more precise information about the evaluation.

73.40 Ms Parnwell referred to the report and enquired if BHCC would publish the equality impact assessment, tender document and evaluation documents to provide an explanation on how social value and equalities were included in this decision. Further clarity was sought on the points system used and if this was moderated by an external party.

73.41 The Chair stated that the Working Group would look at many issues, it was requested that the legal team provide a written response.

73.42 Ms A addressed the Committee and asked the following question, the Strategic Assessment of Crime and Community Safety, brought to this committee in May 2020, showed that 335 RISE clients expressed a need for housing in 2018-19, but the refuge only had capacity for 58 people. Calls to the helpline and referrals of people at high risk have increased since the start of the Covid pandemic.

Will this committee make a commitment to ringfence the £600,000 of additional government funding so that local specialist organisations can create additional refuge places provided separately from the generic contract awarded to Stonewater Ltd?

73.43 The Chair thanked Ms A for her question and stated that the council welcomed MHCLG's decision to provide additional funding to support victims of domestic abuse. We welcome the Domestic Abuse Bill which is making its way through parliament. For the first time local authorities will be under a legal obligation to provide safe refuge for vulnerable women. MHCLG have provided strict requirements for this funding which the Council will need to meet. The funding provided will be subject of a future report to this committee.

The Council will establish a fair and transparent process to determine how the funding is allocated.

73.44 Ms A referred to the corporate plan 2020 goal of buying goods services locally and requested BHCC promise to make a commitment that allocations would be in line with this and asked that a written response be provided.

73.45 The Chair noted that this was in the corporate plan and that the Member Working Group would look at this.

73.46 Ms Nicola Bengé addressed the Committee and asked the following question, A report to the NICE Committee in October 2018 said: "RISE and its subcontracted partner, Survivors Network, raise and invest significant funds in their own right to deliver services for victims and survivors outside The Portal and should be noted as key contributors to the funding landscape." If RISE is no longer the main provider of refuge and casework services, it will be much harder for them to raise these additional funds, given that many dedicated grants rely on match funding. How will the council act to prevent this decision from destabilising RISE and therefore endangering their self-funded community services?

73.47 The Chair thanked Ms Bengé for her question and stated that the Council is grateful for the service which RISE has provided. The Council has allocated additional funding to support the organisation and many members of the council have met with RISE. I would like to take this opportunity to thank RISE for working with new providers to ensure a smooth and safe transition so that services for very vulnerable users are not disrupted. Staff are having TUPE meetings, premises will be transferred.

We would also like to take this opportunity to express support for the incoming providers.

73.48 As a supplementary, Ms Bengé noted that Rise was at the heart of the community of survivors who also provided serious and vital contributions and enquired no audit had been conducted into this issue.

73.49 The Chair requested that Legal Team provide a written response.

73.50 Ms Emily West addressed the Committee and asked the following question, how will the voice of service users be heard as part of the monitoring, evaluation and review of the new Domestic Abuse contracts?

73.51 The Chair thanked Ms West for her question and stated that the contracts will be monitored against a suite of outcome key performance indicators. These KPIs included:

90% feel safe from external risks whilst living in the refuge  
90% leave feeling safer.

In relation to the community-based services:

80% report increased resilience and ability to cope.

73.52 Ms West enquired if BHCC would commit to setting up an ongoing service user panel so that users were given a voice.

73.53 The Chair stated that the Members Working Group would consider this and that this may need a report in future due to resource implications.

73.54 Councillor Nemeth requested that all written responses be included and provided to members as a single document.

73.55 The Chair agreed.

### **(c) Deputations**

73.56 Mr Tancred presented his deputation.

73.57 The Chair thanked Mr. Tancred and replied, with regards to the matters that you raise:

- 1) Beach huts and beach chalets are different entities and therefore it is appropriate that the policies are specific to the requirements of beach huts and beach chalets separately. The beach huts are owned by local residents who pay a licence fee to

place their hut on Council land. Beach huts are bought and sold on the open market. The beach chalets are owned by the Council and are let to local residents under a Chalet Licence Agreement.

- 2) Consultation – the council wishes to listen to the views of residents and therefore an on-line consultation portal has been developed to enable that to be achieved as easily as possible. The council has limited resources and it is acknowledged that any consultation exercise can only be as accurate as the information submitted by consultees.
- 3) Allocations of beach chalets – Beach chalets are allocated according to waiting lists and an individual is allocated to that waiting list if it is open to new applicants.

As you will be aware the committee have agreed to a further report on the feasibility of providing new Beach Chalets, which will be considered at a future meeting of the committee.”

73.58 **RESOLVED:** That the deputation be noted.

## **74 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **(a) Member Questions**

#### **(i) Sea Swimming**

74.1 Councillor Nemeth asked the following question, “Given the increase in the number of sea swimmers in recent years, and given the prevalence of troubling safety incidents in West Hove, would the Chair support my call for a new lifeguard station, with associated safety flags and facilities, in Wish Ward?”

74.2 The Chair replied, it is the council’s intention for summer 2021 to provide beach lifeguard cover which replicates, as far as is feasible, the pre-Covid lifeguard service. This means that lifeguards would operate on the beach in West Hove over a 6 week period for the traditional school summer holiday. However, there are significant caveats to this which centre on the ability to recruit a sufficient number of qualified beach lifeguards to cover these posts, as well as compliance with whatever Covid restrictions and operating protocols may be in place at the time.

During the pandemic beach lifeguard training and assessment courses have not been able to run and it is not clear when this restriction may be lifted. On a national level this has significantly reduced the number of qualified beach lifeguards from which beach operators can select their seasonal staff. The issue faced by the council is centred on the availability of appropriately qualified staff. The council is aware that the number of sea swimmers and water users has grown exponentially in the past year. This has been due in part to the prolonged period of warm weather we experienced, but principally due to the lack of alternative leisure opportunities and the number of resident and visitors who enjoyed staycations as a result of Covid-19 restrictions. However, this sudden increase in sea users has affected all of our coastline, not just the beaches in Wish Ward. Whilst we appreciate the number of people using the beaches in Wish Ward may

have increased last year, when compared with other council operated beaches the physical, behavioural and environmental risk factors have not increased in parallel.”

74.3 Councillor Nemeth requested that the Chair keep an open mind on this matter.

74.4 The Chair confirmed that he always kept an open mind on matters.

### **(ii) West Pier**

74.5 Councillor Nemeth asked the following question, “What is the Administration’s position on the future of the West Pier; a much-photographed tourist asset which is of course privately-owned but liable to collapse/deterioration?”

74.6 The Chair replied, “The West Pier Trust as owners of the freehold of the original west pier, have consulted their members on the future of the pier. It has been agreed that while a new contemporary West Pier remains a long term aim it is not achievable in the short to medium term. The West Pier Trust have chosen to focus their fundraising efforts instead, on a restoration of one of the original old West Pier kiosks which would be placed at a designated site on the new landscaping to the east of i360 and would be used as a community and education centre. It is also worth noting that two extremely beautifully replicated tollbooths from the West Pier also form part of the Brighton i360 building and in this sense keep the spirit of the old pier very much alive on the current site.

The council do not own the West Pier, or the landward end. The owner, the West Pier Trust is a charitable trust. The council’s key role therefore has been to ensure the Section 106 obligations within the planning obligations are carried out in relation to the existing sea wreckage between the shore and the "sea island" (the remaining frame of the original pier head pavilion) . Part of the wreckage was removed during the build of the i360 and the columns were relocated as part of the landscaping works. The area between the shoreline and the sea island is inspected regularly by the Trust and where wreckage appears and is a potential danger to swimmers or small craft arrangements are made for its removal.”

74.7 Councillor Nemeth requested the Chair push the West Pier Trust to make sure there was a plan in place.

74.8 The Chair stated it was important to keep an open mind and suggested Councillors and himself look at the feasibility of meeting with West Pier Trust.

### **(iii) King Alfred**

74.9 Councillor Nemeth asked the following question, “The last two King Alfred Leisure Centre development attempts collapse through proposals not being financially viable with the principal non-sport related net cost being ‘Affordable’ housing. What representations has the Chair of this committee made, in her capacity as head of sports for the City, to ensure that housing development dreams do not trump sports provision once again?”

74.10 The Chair replied, “Replacing the ageing and deteriorating King Alfred Leisure Centre is a longstanding priority, the need for which increases year on year. The projects primary objective is to deliver improved, extended, and modern sports facilities, whether on the existing site or elsewhere in the west of the city. This forms a key element of the city-wide Sports Facilities Investment Plan that is nearing completion, and which is scheduled to be reported to this committee in June.

When terminating the previous project in October 2019, the Policy & Resources Committee agreed that, in formulating the next project, it must address financial viability. This has been a fundamental consideration in the development of the revised project. Whilst the delivery and financing arrangements are yet to be determined, an enabling development, predominantly much needed new homes, will be an essential part of the package. The number of homes and the level of affordable housing will be considered at the appropriate time and with due regard to financial viability.

As chair of this committee I am in regular discussion with Councillor MacCafferty, Leader of the Council and Chair of the King Alfred Project Board, and we will continue to explore all ways possible to get the most we can from the site so it is of maximum benefit to local people”

#### **(iv) Urgent Call to Address Crime**

74.11 Councillor Childs asked the following question, “Given the intolerable level of harassment, drug crime and anti-social behaviour outside and around the Coop Supermarket on St James St, what urgent action will be taken by the Council and Sussex Police to prevent the lives of residents, Coop employees and customers being further blighted?”

74.12 The Chair replied, “Thank you for the question Cllr Childs. I am aware that there have been two meetings with yourself and council officers, police colleagues and other partners to explore the issues regarding St James St and the issues around the Co-op. Partners are working together to identify people of particular concern so that engagement can take place with them and appropriate support packages can be explored B&H Police regularly patrol the area and will continue to do so. A day of action was carried out by police on 2<sup>nd</sup> March in various spots across the city. One of which was St James’s Street with focus on the area at the back of the Co-Op. Letter drops were completed, whereby officers were knocking on doors of local residents to encourage reporting of crimes to the police, as well as obtaining any info from them, and listening to their concerns. It is vital that residents report instances of ASB and crime so that resources can be targeted where it is most appropriate to do so.

Hi vis foot patrol in the area was conducted by 2 PCSO’s and 4 PC’s. Lots of residents were happy that the patrols were taking place and appreciated the impact they have.

Reports of issues raised by the Co-op will be shared with the police via the Business Crime Reduction Partnership. Police colleagues have also been made aware of the new outreach service. There are currently ongoing discussions with the new provider to look into how they will link into partnership work to address substance misuse related begging and ASB. I understand that the police alongside yourself, will look at any environmental changes which might be implemented to improve matters in the area and

that once identified will be discussed with the store manager. The police have agreed to look at the use of community protection warnings to those individuals causing most concern.”

74.13 Councillor Childs requested a policy be brought against hard drug use in public places.

74.14 The Chair offered to consult further on this.

#### **(v) Fly-Posting on the Seafront**

74.15 Councillor Nemeth asked the following question, “Would the Chair join community groups, amenity societies and tourist businesses by making a strong and unequivocal statement against fly-posting on the Brighton & Hove seafront, and will she pledge to call on colleagues to investigate and prosecute where possible those participating in fly-posting campaigns in tourist areas?”

74.16 The Chair replied, “I agree that illegal fly-posting is a blight on the environment, whether the seafront or other areas. The legislation is very specific in relation to fly-posting in that the Fixed Penalty Notice can only be issued to the individual committing the act, not the venue or promoter relating to the event or promotion.

The seafront forms part of the Environmental Enforcement Team’s patrol route, with officers patrolling extensively during the summer months, to deter environmental crimes, including fly-posting. Officers will issue a Fixed Penalty Notice to anyone caught fly-posting.”

74.17 Councillor Nemeth stated that there should be no distinction between illegal flyposting that was attractive and that wasn’t and that this must be brought down regardless.

74.18 The Chair stated support for this and noted that the relevant department be involved in this.

#### **(vi) Funding for Memorial Plaque**

74.19 Councillor Childs asked the following question, “I was delighted that the Planning Committee agreed to the informative that I proposed to attach a plaque to the new development of the Coop Lewes Rd, in memorial to the 20 residents killed there by a Luftwaffe bomb in Sept 1940. Whilst the developers have agreed to assist with the cost, should there be a shortfall, would the Committee be prepared to consider funding given that the costs are likely to be in the hundreds of pounds only?”

74.20 The Chair replied, “I very much welcome the proposal for a Blue Plaque to commemorate this sad event. I am advised by officers that this was supported strongly by Planning Committee and was secured by an informative attached to the planning permission.

In terms of funding for this – officers would expect this to be funded by the applicant. I’m afraid there is no council funding available in these circumstances – however, I’m advised that the applicant attended committee and indicated their willingness to carry this out.”

- 74.21 Councillor Childs enquired if Committee would agree to work with Councillor Grimshaw and himself at considering alternative ways of commemorating other victims of this site.
- 74.22 The Chair agreed to arrange a meeting to set a place to commemorate and start a project on this with regard to the City's rich history.

**(vii) Communal Beach Hut**

- 74.23 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following question, "Whilst I appreciate that the council is reviewing its beach chalet and hut strategy, we have an urgent need for a communal beach hut in Saltdean which will provide a base and storage for the fast-growing Saltdean surf and swim club.

Please can we put up a wooden beach hut on the Undercliff. We will pay for everything including insurance. We are also happy to pay ground rent to the council.

It can be moved to a different location if necessary, once the beach chalet/hut strategy is agreed."

- 74.24 The Chair replied, "The seafront has become the most popular destination in the city for residents and visitors to spend their leisure time. As a result, the council's Seafront Team receive numerous requests from individuals, groups and businesses seeking to establish a presence on the seafront. It is necessary therefore, for the council to carefully manage and control what is built on the seafront in order to protect that which makes the seafront such an appealing place to be.

The addition of new buildings and facilities must follow due process and be considered within the wider strategy and policies for the seafront. It is the council's policy to tender any opportunities to build or develop land on the seafront whenever these become available. This is to ensure all new property opportunities, whether for commercial or community use, are offered in a fair and open way.

The council therefore cannot give consent to for a beach hut to be built on the Undercliff. However, if the Saltdean Surf and Swim Club are looking for temporary storage for beach specific equipment which cannot be accommodated elsewhere then officers will be pleased to link with the Club to identify whether there is any space within existing council premises."

**(b) Member Letter**

- 74.25 Councillor Powell addressed the Committee and read her letter.
- 74.26 **RESOLVED** – That the letter be noted.

**(c) Member Notices of Motion**

**(i) Register of Heritage Assets**

74.27 The Chair noted the motion and informed the committee that as requested at full Council he had asked officers to prepare a report for a future meeting of the committee.

74.28 **RESOLVED:** That the information be noted, and a report be brought back to a future meeting of the committee.

### **(ii) Commitment to Helping Those with Hidden Disabilities**

74.29 The Chair referred to the motion and stated that Brighton & Hove City is committed to helping disabled people, including those with hidden disabilities and conditions. The Council will be developing an action plan, and undertaking a programme of work in 2021, with the central aim of creating a more inclusive and accessible city for disabled people.

This work will be co-produced between the council, relevant partner organisations and disabled people. We are engaging with local Community and Voluntary Sector organisations and social enterprises that support and work with disabled people (including people with hidden disabilities and conditions) to explore the scope of this programme.

Through this process we will be focusing on a number of themes to support collective progress towards aspirations around accessibility. This will include supporting council services and local businesses to become more inclusive and accessible for disabled people.

We are keen to explore the Hidden Disabilities Sunflower scheme as part of this work, alongside other positive schemes, in partnership with disabled people. We recognise the national reach of this scheme and are happy to consider what its impact will be locally. Our aim is to drive forward and promote initiatives and schemes that will have the most impact for disabled people and positive outcomes for creating a more accessible city. Through our programme of research, engagement and collaboration we believe we will be best placed to do this effectively.

In addition to the above, Brighton & Hove City Council also continues supporting disabled residents and staff through a variety of positive initiatives and approaches. We continue to offer opportunities through our Supported Employment Programme – an employability skills programme aimed at disabled people (including those with hidden disabilities and conditions).

We also continue to develop our skills and understanding with a range of learning and development opportunities for staff including, Dyslexia and Neurodiversity in the Workplace, Inclusion Essentials, Inclusive Leadership, Making Reasonable Adjustments, Mental Health Awareness, Suicide Awareness, and Resilience training.

We continue to engage with and support local events including Disability Pride and What's Out There and we celebrated neurodiversity day this year with an in-house event for staff led by our Disabled Workers and Carers Network.

The council has a number of projects underway in relation to accessibility including a project on Assistive Technology, and another on responding to the new digital

accessibility laws. We will be developing guidance and a training programme to support this agenda.

Co-production is central to our approach towards equality and inclusion. We work in partnership with our Disabled Workers and Carers Network on matters around accessibility and inclusion for disabled staff. For example, through this partnership working we are developing guidance and resources for managers to support neurodiverse staff, staff well workforce surveys, and new policies.

We will continue to work with our Disabled Workers and Carers Network on shared aims around accessibility, including support for those with hidden disabilities and conditions. We will also seek their views on schemes like the Hidden Disability Sunflower scheme and explore if this would be effective for staff in the council. This will be aligned to our wider programme of work to create a more inclusive and accessible city for residents, outlined above.

74.30 Councillor Williams noted the comments and expressed the need to ensure that there was access to purchase lanyards.

74.31 **RESOLVED:** That the Notice of Motion be noted.

### **(iii) Pavilion Gardens Summer Concerts**

74.32 Councillor Mears proposed the Notice of Motion on behalf of the Conservative Group, which Was formally seconded by Councillor Nemeth.

74.34 The Chair stated that the gardens have been leased to the Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust. They have responsibility for the upkeep of the area and for any events which happen there. I realise it has been a very hard year for the Trust because of the Pandemic and they cannot afford to support the concert series in 2021. For this reason, I can confirm that the Council will provide a budget of up to £2,600 or £200 per concert in 2021/22 to cover this cost. Despite our budgets being very constrained, we know that culture plays an important part in the health and wellbeing of our residents, especially as we emerge from the Pandemic. The Council's Outdoor Events team will discuss making these funds available with the Trust. Officers will also discuss steps required to ensure the concerts comply with government regulations regarding COVID safety."

74.35 **RESOLVED:** That the Notice of Motion be noted.

## **75 PREVENT (PREVENTING TERRORISM AND EXTREMISM)**

75.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities which sought to update Members on the legislative, policy context, risks nationally and locally and actions to manage risks and achieve compliance with the Counter Terrorism and Border Security Act 2019. The report was provided by the Prevent Coordinator.

75.2 Councillors thanked officers for bringing this report to committee and noted its importance.

75.3 Stephanie Prior enquired if people, in general, were doing enough to address this issue.

75.4 The Prevent Co-ordinator stated that there were real issues of discrimination which could play into the hands of those wanting to recruit vulnerable individuals and that it was important to provide platforms and opportunities to deal with this.

75.5 **RESOLVED:**

1. That the requirements of the Prevent Duty, the actions required by partners to achieve compliance and role of the Prevent Board be noted; and
2. That it be noted that the City is identified as a Prevent Priority Area and within this context concerted partnership actions are required to reduce risks and community tensions, especially following critical incidents.

**76 OXFORD COURT PSPO REVIEW (GATING SCHEME)**

76.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities which detailed the proposed amendment to the PSPO to restrict access to the Oxford Court Alleyway.

76.2 **RESOLVED:** That the amended Oxford Court Public Space Protection Order 2021, as detailed in appendix 1 to the report be approved.

**77 UPDATE ON ANTI-RACISM WORK**

77.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities which provided an update on actions since the progress report to TECC Committee meeting 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

77.2 Councillor Grimshaw noted the discontinuation of terms such as BAME among union literature as Government guidance advised against using such terms.

77.3 The Chair seconded Councillor Grimshaw's statement and noted that a decision would need to be made on renaming the position of BME Standing invitee at TECC.

77.4 Stephanie Prior enquired which groups were involved in this.

77.5 The Head of Communities & Equality offered to have a conversation on definitions and labels.

77.6 **RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

**78 LIBRARIES STRATEGY - PROCEDURES FOR CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT**

78.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities which outlined the process for the development of a Libraries Strategy for Brighton & Hove City Council.

78.2 Councillor Ebel welcomed the report and enquired whether Brexit had caused any issues with regard to foreign language students.

78.3 The Head of Library Services noted that no problems were envisioned as a result of Brexit.

78.4 Councillor Nemeth requested that his support to improvements to Hove Library be placed on record.

**78.5 RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the general principles that will inform the development of the libraries strategy as outlined in para 3.3 of the report be agreed; and
- (2) That the process of consultation and engagement as outlined in paras 5.1 to 5.9 of the report be approved.

**79 CITY OF SANCTUARY RE-ACCREDITATION**

79.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities which informed Members about the city council's current status with the regard of the national City of Sanctuary movement and outlines the steps that need to be taken to become 're-accredited' as a city of sanctuary. The report was provided by the Community Safety Manager.

79.2 Councillor Simson expressed support for this programme.

**79.3 RESOLVED:**

- (1) That officers be instructed to progress an application to City of Sanctuary UK for the council's reaccreditation as a City of Sanctuary as per outlined in appendix 2;
- (2) That full Council be recommended to endorse the City of Sanctuary Charter (appendix 1);
- (3) That officers be instructed to work with the local city of sanctuary Group – Sanctuary on Sea – to support the group and the council's commitment to Brighton & Hove being a place of sanctuary;
- (4) That the council joining the City of Sanctuary Local Authority Network and being a member of the Network's steering group (paragraph 3.5 of the report) be approved; and
- (5) That it be noted that the City of Sanctuary application process will be carried out as part of the council's development of its Inclusive Cities Action Plan agreed at TECC committee September 2019.

**80 ROYAL PAVILION AND MUSEUMS TRUST - PLAN FOR 2021/22**

80.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture which detailed an annual plan with regard to museum buildings, collections and staff for approval.

80.2 Hadley Swain (Chief Executive Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust) addressed the committee and noted the Ice Rink would be brought back along with the Christmas Market. He also noted that there was a learning offer at the museum for schools.

**80.3 RESOLVED:**

(1) That the difficult circumstances facing the Trust as it moved forward into 2021/22 as a result of successive lockdowns and visitor restrictions over the course of the past year be noted; and

(2) That the annual service plan for 2021/22 be approved.

**81 BRIGHTON DOME BRIGHTON FESTIVAL REPORT 2020 - 2021**

81.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture which detailed the delivery of alternative actions by the organisation over the period of closure, in addition to plans for reopening in 2021/22.

81.2 Councillor O'Quinn thanked Mr Comben for youth work experience program and enquired if more would be done for children over the summer period.

81.3 Andrew Comben (Chief Executive Brighton Dome and Brighton Festival) referred to the kickstart programme and stated that the Brighton Dome was working in partnership with 20 organisations as part of a network of organisations supplying opportunities.

**81.4 RESOLVED:**

(1) That the impact of the pandemic on Brighton Dome and Brighton Festival be noted; and

(2) That it be agreed that a report on the operations and benefits for the city of this organisation be presented annually to the committee.

**82 REVIEW ASSESSMENT FOR CITY PLAN PART ONE****82.1 RESOLVED:**

(1) That the conclusions of the City Plan Part One review assessment as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be noted; and

(2) That it be agreed that officers should commence work on a full review of City Plan Part One in accordance with the timetable set out in the Local Development

Scheme approved at the November 2020 meeting of Tourism, Equalities, Communities & Culture Committee (as set out in paragraph 3.12 of the report).

### **83 CHRISTMAS MARKET 2021**

- 83.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture which sought approval for landlord's consent to stage a Christmas Market throughout Valley Gardens during the winters of 2021, 2022, 2023. The report was provided by the Assistant Director Culture, Tourism & Sport and the Events Manager.
- 83.2 Councillor Mears expressed concern with the prospect of creating a non-safe environment and of the effect on small local business traders.
- 83.3 The Assistant Director Culture, Tourism & Sport stated that the area had historically seen wide use by a variety of different events and noted that the area had the necessary utilities to support the Christmas Market. It was further noted that BHCC expected the market to bring in trade to the area.
- 83.4 Councillor O'Quinn expressed concern with the presentation of the site.
- 83.5 The Assistant Director Culture, Tourism & Sport stated that the preferred bidder was in extensive talks to ensure good practice.
- 83.6 The Sport and the Events Manager stated that the curation of stalls was vital along with operations going out to local businesses.
- 83.7 **RESOLVED:**
- (1) That consent for the staging of a Christmas Market, throughout Valley Gardens (St Peters Square, Richmond Square, Victoria Gardens North, Victoria Gardens South and Old Steine when available) in the winter months of 2021, 2022 and 2023, to E3 Events (subject to entering into formal annual licences) be agreed; and
  - (2) That the Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture be granted delegated authority to agree the terms of the annual licences.

### **84 COMMISSIONING OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE SERVICES**

- 84.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities which informed Members of the process regarding the re-commissioning of the service and recommended that the Policy & Resources Committee be requested to approve the establishment of a Member oversight working group.
- 84.2 Councillor Evans expressed support for the working group.
- 84.3 Jo Martindale noted that social value was key and requested that the working group focus on collaborative commissioning and to be more creative in developing a strategy while making sure the voluntary sector was included. Support regarding financial

assistance was expressed. It was noted that there was an opportunity to make an investment into refugees' services and to bring cohesion to these services.

- 84.4 The Head of Safer Communities stated that BHCC were committed to support organisations through the transition period.
- 84.5 The Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities stated that work was undertaken to make sure no one fell through any gaps.
- 84.6 Councillor Evans proposed an amendment on behalf of the Labour Group.
- 84.7 Councillor Grimshaw formally seconded the amendment.
- 84.8 Councillor Simson proposed an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group.
- 84.9 Councillor Nemeth formally seconded the amendment.
- 84.10 Councillor Evans clarified that the Chair of Audit & Standards did not decline a full investigation and quoted his comments at Audit & Standards to the effect that given the reports going to TECC and P& R and the proposals to set up a working group to review the Council's approach, he did not consider it necessary or proportionate to establish yet another work stream but that they would keep this under review and should issues come to light which were of legitimate interest to Audit & Standards Committee they would look at them.
- 84.11 Councillor MacCafferty thanked the survivors who attended the committee and provided a brief overview of the events leading to the issue. It was clarified that the Green Party had met with campaigners and the Chief Executive of RISE to help develop a way forward. It was stated that the focus was on working collaboratively with all parties to find answers and solutions that asserted the importance of domestic violence services.
- 84.12 Councillor Powell noted the myriad of issues highlighted by public speakers and noted that it would be the focus of the Member Working Group to scrutinise what had happened.
- 84.13 Joanna Martindale expressed support for the third sector and stated that this had occurred during NICE Committee not TECC. It was clarified that the Labour Group had decided to close the NICE committee.
- 84.14 Councillor Ebel noted concern with regard to the Labour amendment which would limit the ability for the Policy & Resources Committee to set up terms of the working group.
- 84.15 Councillor Simson noted that it was important that this be non-political.
- 84.16 The Chair then put the Labour Group amendment to the vote which was lost.
- 84.17 The Chair then put the Conservative Group Motion to the vote which was carried.
- 84.18 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote which were carried.

**84.19 RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the contents of the report be noted;
- (2) That the committee's concern be expressed that the Audit & Standards Committee has declined to carry out a thorough investigation into the events leading to changes to Domestic Abuse, Domestic Violence and Sexual Violence service arrangements over which tens of thousands of residents have petitioned the Council for action;
- (3) That the Policy & Resources Committee be recommended to establish of a cross-party Member Working Group to:
  - (i) Carry out a thorough investigation into the events leading to changes to Domestic Abuse, Domestic Violence and Sexual Violence service arrangements.
  - (ii) Review the Council's policy and practice regarding social value and community wealth-building from a commissioning and procurement perspective including the above-mentioned services.
  - (iii) Recommend any necessary changes and actions for improvement.

**85 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

85.1 No items were referred to Full Council.

The meeting concluded at 10.24pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

