

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

4.00pm 17 JUNE 2021

HOVE TOWN HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBER

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Powell (Joint Chair), Grimshaw (Opposition Spokesperson) and Simson (Group Spokesperson)

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

(a) Declarations of Substitutes

1.1 There were no declarations of substitutes.

(b) Declarations of Interest

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

(c) Exclusion of the Press and Public

1.3 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.

1.4 **RESOLVED:** That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business listed on the agenda.

2 MINUTES

2.1 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the last meeting held on the 11 March 2021 be approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

3 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 3.1 The Chair gave the following communications, there has been a change on the make-up of the TECC committee. Councillor Nemeth has left TECC. He has been on this committee in its different various guises and titles over the years, and I'd like to thank him for all his work as the Conservative Group spokesperson. So, I'd like to welcome Councillor Brown instead to the committee. From the Labour Group we are being joined by Councillor Childs so welcome and on the Green benches we welcome back Councillor Rainey, and welcome Councillor Littman.

We have a big agenda today, and a number of public questions, including a number on RISE. Councillor Grimshaw and I were very pleased to receive the 30k-strong petition supporting RISE earlier in the year. We pay tribute to the campaigners, some of whom will be meeting later when it comes to public questions.

At the last TECC we agreed to establish a Member Working Group to look further at the commissioning of domestic abuse services in the city in, and to focus on how we could avoid another similar situation arising whereby a very well respected and trusted partner in the city such as Rise has lost funding. The first scoping meeting is scheduled for 5th July. In the meantime, much work and discussion has been ongoing to bring forward the proposals detailed in today's MHCLG funding paper, later in the agenda.

This month marks the start of Pride celebrations across the globe, marking the anniversary of the Stonewall Riots. Sadly, again there is to be no Pride in the city this year, meaning not just huge financial loss to the city's hospitality and LGBTQ sector, but also a loss in visibility to our communities. Trans Pride has also been suspended, which is the UK's longest running, biggest Trans event, attracting many thousands of people. To show solidarity with the city's LGBTQ+ communities and to mark the anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, we are looking to fly the new inclusive pride flag from Hove town hall for the 3 days, showing solidarity to our LGBTQ+ employees and communities, being proud allies and supporting visibility across the city.

We have also recently had the results from a citywide impact survey carried out by LGBT Switchboard to gauge the impacts of Covid & lockdowns on our LGBTQ communities, business and health outcomes. This will be shared with in the next couple of months.

I would like to draw committee Members and the public's attention to a new fund totalling 300k specifically aim at supporting the work of Black and Minority Ethnic, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, disability and women's community and voluntary groups in recognition of the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on these residents. Deadline for applications is 31st July. More information is available on the council website.

The Srebrenica Memorial week takes place from 4th to 11th July, when we commemorate the more than 8000 Muslim men and boys who were murdered during the genocide. It is a time to pay tribute to those who lost their lives, and to say never again, reaffirming our commitment to stand against all form of hate in our City and elsewhere. We will be looking to honour the victims and survivors by holding a minute's silence at the next Full Council meeting in July, and throughout out the week

raising awareness on our social media. We continue to work with the Upstanders Network which brings diverse communities together to tackle hate and encourage all hate incidents to be reported to our Community Safety Team, or to the police.

This is Refugee Week which happens every year in the run-up to World Refugee Day on 20th June. The city council is marking the week with a news story about our work with unaccompanied asylum seeking children, acknowledging the hard work of foster carers and publicising the need for more foster carers to work with young people who have arrived in the UK, having fled war and persecution in their home countries. As members are aware, the city council has recently recommitted to being a City of Sanctuary and continues to participate in the government's UK resettlement programme. Officers are, as ever, more than happy to talk to private landlords interested in supporting us in this rewarding project.

Despite the national delay in Step 4 of the roadmap, Libraries will be able to reopen more fully from Monday 21st June although certain restrictions must remain in place. The opening hours are changing so that Jubilee Library will be open 7 days a week and Hove Library 6 days a week. Eleven of the community libraries will open for between one and three staffed days, with Libraries Extra unstaffed access in most of them on the other days of the week. For the time being, all libraries will close at 5pm each day and details are on the website.

As part of a NHS initiative, from Monday 21st June there will be an award winning HIV/STI Vending machine in the foyer at Jubilee Library for HIV/STI self-tests. The machine will be a good alternative for people who don't want a kit turning-up at their home address, or who just see the machine and think it's a good idea to screen.

I must say that it has been great to welcome culture back into the city after a year away. We have already put extra funding into cleaning-up the city and investing in Green priorities to enhance the look and feel of the city and make it the best welcome possible.

The Brighton Festival was the first festival to proceed coming out of lockdown in the UK and a great success with over 100 events over the 4 weeks with 20,000 ticketed attendees and 300 freelance artists and technicians employed to deliver it. A huge thanks to Andrew Comben and guest director Lemm Sissay for kicking things off.

The Brighton Fringe this year will be the biggest fringe in the UK. All TECC members were invited by the director, Julian Caddy, to tour around the venues and see the amount of work that goes into managing these events. It was a great tour and really eye-opening to see just what goes into it.

The Royal Pavilion and a selection of our museums, now managed by the Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust, are open again and we still have items from the royal collection on loan from Buckingham Palace as well as The David Bowie exhibition to enjoy.

We were looking forward to welcoming back the Park Runs in the city. However, with the delay in getting to step 4 of reopening, Park Run have decided to push this back

until the 24th July. In addition, the Brighton Half-marathon, which was scheduled to take place at the weekend will now be taking place later this year on 10th October.

I know that it has been disappointment that the Prince Regent Swimming Pool has remained closed since it's flooding. Freedom Leisure and the council have been working hard to get this reopened. There was significant damage caused and there has had to be a large-scale refit of the electronics and reopening is now scheduled for Monday 12th July. This demonstrates the need for further investment in our sports facilities and we've been working on the report for the sports facility's investment plan over the past months. Ordinarily this would have been presented to TECC Committee for endorsement but due to the COVID restrictions and in order to avoid duplication of debate, we've passed this directly onto P&R for a decision. Co-chair Councillor Osborne is hoping to be involved in the board which we are recommending is set-up to take forward actions on this with urgency.

And last month we were able to look forward to next year's women's Euros and to launch our legacy programme with our partners. On top of the 3 games which will be hosted at the Amex, including one England game, we are hoping to use the opportunity to inspire change and build a new generation of players, coaches, referees and fans.

4 CALL OVER

- 4.1 The following items were reserved for discussion:

Item 8 Tourism Recovery Plan
Item 9 MCHLG funding Award
Item 10 CIL Governance & S106 Member Protocol
Item 11 Beach Chalet Feasibility Study and Letting Policy
Item 13 Volk's Railway Potential Improvements

- 4.2 The Head of Democratic Services noted that item 14 on the agenda, New Events Requests 2021 listed as to follow had been deferred and that the following items had been approved:

Item 7 Anti-Racism Pledge Update.
Item 12 Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document (UDF SPD)

5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Public Questions

- 5.1 The Chair welcomed Mr Crowhurst to the meeting and invited him to put his question.
- 5.2 Mr Crowhurst asked the following question, On 12 June 2020, this committee claimed on the Council website that Georgian Brighton and Hove was '*built on the sugar trade and enslavement*'. At the last meeting of this committee a report was submitted saying that the *city's wealth has connections to the slave trade*. Neither I, nor Dr Sue Berry, who has researched Brighton's early history, and is the author of the seminal book on 'Georgian Brighton', have discovered any evidence to substantiate the notion that this

city was built on slave money. What credible historical evidence does the Council have to support these claims?

- 5.3 The Chair thanked Mr Crowhurst and stated that history takes place in a contested space; with academics offering differing views in their findings and conclusions. Where council work touches on issues of racism and exploitation which will resonate with members of our community and who may trace their heritage to those who suffered through enslavement and colonialism, we are bound to a greater sense of measure and sensitivity.

While there are conflicting accounts of our colonial heritage and its impact on our city, we will not ignore or erase our link with this horrific past. It is important that any actions taken now stem from the fullest understanding of that past. To this end, the council has started discussions with the Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust around commissioning new research exploring these issues. And as we develop the scope of our approach with the Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust, we will seek to identify stakeholders able to contribute to that process. This will of course seek to include numerous and diverse sources of knowledge, lived experience and expertise, so that we can all learn more.

- 5.4 Mr Crowhurst asked a supplementary question, it would appear that the review body and decisions are being made behind closed doors in relation to the issue of heritage, even though there is no credible evidence. My last letter to the Executive Director remains unanswered and I ask that you give a commitment to answering questions and to not changing our heritage without consultation?

- 5.5 The Chair stated that she would ensure that all the points raised were considered and that she would be happy to continue to speaking to Mr Crowhurst outside of the meeting.

- 5.6 Ms Andrews asked the following question, as I am sure every councillor and officer is now aware. Sussex Ice Rink has submitted a detailed pre-proposal requesting consent of use of the unused land next to the King Alfred. The King Alfred site belongs to the public and all we have is a clandestine King Alfred project board making executive decisions with little or no public involvement. The time for playing email pinball between departments is over and we demand positive transparent action and for the project to be judged on its own merit and in the spirit, it was intended.

What objections are there to this temporary facility testing the demand for an ice-skating industry in the city, on unused public land, and putting the feasibility argument to bed with a real time tangible pilot scheme once and for all. Has the council got anything to lose?

- 5.7 The Chair thanked Ms Andrews for her question and stated that the council's Sports Facilities Investment Plan is to be considered at the Policy & Resources Committee meeting on 1st July. The Plan, if approved, will provide the overarching strategy for the development of the council's sports facilities across the city. Also recommended is the establishment of a new cross-party Member Working Group to lead its implementation. The provision within each of the sports facilities is yet to be finalised and would be subject to further analysis.

The site in question is not unused land, but the roof of a vacant, ageing building and as such is not a suitable location for a temporary ice rink. It would not be appropriate for further consideration to be given to the proposal, until the council has decided the way forward on providing new sports facilities in the city.

The King Alfred cross-party Project Board, like other such Boards and Member Working Groups, performs an important advisory role. The Board has provided strategic management and oversight, but it is non-decision making and it is through the Board that reports are referred to appropriate committee meetings, at which the decisions are made.

5.8 Ms Andrews noted that in 2016 the Council had promised that an ice-rink would be provided in the city and noted that to date this had not been carried out and questioned whether there was any desire for such a facility and asked if the Chair would prove otherwise?

5.9 The Chair stated that she would need to review the decision taken in 2016 and would then respond to Ms Andrews in writing.

5.10 Mr Pennington asked the following question, the Beach Chalet report, appendix 4 (page 195 survey results) omits and redacted the information-box on Question 4 (which gives respondents opportunity to make comments).

Why did officers not summarise those comments or many letters sent?

5.11 The Chair thanked Mr Pennington for his question and noted that the comments provided to the survey have been included in an additional appendix to the report. The comments have been redacted to remove information which might be considered able to identify a living individual.

5.12 Mr Pennington stated that he had still not has a reply to his FOI query and asked why the Committee was so keen on having long-term tenancies?

5.13 The Chair noted the question and stated that matters would appear to have gone round in circles and that it would be helpful to wait for the consideration of the item later on the agenda.

5.14 Ms Slater-Bennison asked the following question, regarding the new duties of local authorities under Domestic Abuse Bill, the government has said “local authorities should use the expertise and knowledge of local and national specialist domestic abuse services to support in identifying and understanding the level and types of needs” and “Services commissioned under the new duty should meet Government and the domestic abuse sector quality standards – which include a commitment that support in safe accommodation should be provided in single-gender settings. This means providing specific services for women.”

Can Brighton & Hove Council guarantee and show they are making full use of specialist expertise available in the city?

- 5.15 The Chair thanked Ms Slater-Bennison, the City Council along with the Pan Sussex Partnership is undertaking a needs assessment to identify gaps in service provision and where we need to target the additional funding provided by the MHCLG. As part of that needs assessment, we will be working closely with the providers of domestic abuse services in the City, including those in the third sector, to ensure that we gather the views of those with the specialist expertise in this field. We will continue to provide specific services for women and women's only refuge as part of our commissioned services.
- 5.16 Ms Slater-Bennison asked a supplementary question, there are incredibly short time frames for spending this money. Councillors will be keenly aware of the time it takes to bring new staff up to speed. Bearing in mind the requirements in the Domestic Abuse Bill of using local expertise which I outlined in my first question, would the Council consider spending the £25,000 they have allocated from MHCLG funds, on seconding an existing RISE worker, able to 'hit the ground running' and with comprehensive knowledge of the local sector?
- 5.17 The Chair suggested that it would help to wait for the consideration of the item on the agenda and stated that she was happy to continue a dialogue on the matter outside of the meeting if that would help.
- 5.18 Ms Ceesay asked the following question, in point 3.4 the OSPCC was allocated £50,000 by MHCLG (November 2020) for a variety of tasks including a needs assessment. In recommendation 2.2 a further £25,000 requested for extra resource in BHCC for oversight.

The multimillion £ recommissioning of was October (2020).

In MHCLG terms the requirement for needs assessments and strategies review is every 3 years. This contract must have been awarded with a needs assessment and strategy. Will the Council use this recent information and offer no further delay to the survivors in the city?

- 5.19 The Chair thanked Ms Ceesay and stated the contract that was awarded in April 2021 was for commissioned services to provide refuge and a casework service and is separate from the additional funding that has since been awarded by the MHCLG for safe accommodation.

The MHCLG has been clear that a needs assessment is a requirement of this new funding which will also be used to define the strategy and to identify what we should use this new funding for, and we are also expected to show evidence of this needs assessment to satisfy the conditions of the grant.

- 5.20 Ms Ceesay asked a supplementary question; can I just draw attention to the timelines and time frame. October 2020 - Pan Sussex recommissioning I assume there was a thorough and comprehensive needs assessment for this?

November 2020 MHCLG give £50k to OSPCC for work including a needs assessment.

March 2021 £606,000 from MHCLG to BHCC for DV Housing support with strategy and needs assessment by August 21st 2021.

June 2021 BHCC asked to allocate a further £25,000 for oversight and promise a needs assessment by July 2021.

The £606,000 needs to be spent by 31st March 2022.

I assume from this that the needs assessment for the Pan Sussex contract is not adequate to use and that the OSPCC haven't produced the work they've been paid to do.

Is there any reason why RISE and other expert local providers can't be asked to submit 'oven-ready' proposals with a short start date, and can the Committee confirm that the MHCLG have categorically insisted on a needs assessment and strategy first?

5.21 The Chair stated that she would need to consult with officers and would then provide a full written response.

5.22 Ms Benge asked the following question, in March 2021, 17 RISE DV workers supported survivors in our city, supplemented by RISE funded in-house services in an accessible building in Central Brighton. The service was significantly oversubscribed.

From April 1st, 2021, I understand 9 remote Victim Support workers with no building or facilities were employed doing the exact same tasks.

Can the Council confirm they are confident the new provider has sufficient experienced staff to provide the level of expert service we need in the city?

5.23 The Chair thanked Ms Benge and stated that Councillors have been informed that the Council is confident that the new provider has sufficient staff to provide the level of expert service in the City required.

Some staff have transferred from RISE to Victim Support under TUPE arrangements and further staff are being recruited. As part of on-going contract monitoring meetings, officers are ensuring that adequate provision continues to be offered including staffing.

5.24 Ms Benge asked a supplementary question; I understand that this means BHCC feel that only nine workers with VS can do more work and with fewer resources than the previous figure of 17 staff members. If this is true, could you clarify how this is possible to deliver VAWG services across the city without undercutting service users?

5.25 The Chair stated that she would provide Ms Benge with a written reply.

5.26 Ms Boss asked the following question, in this report reference 4.3 a possibility is raised of exploring future alternatives to the current Pan Sussex arrangement.

Given recent issues including a public petition and the Council's implicit acknowledgement of the urgent need for local oversight indicated by the £25,000 resource requested,/ Will the Council commit to actively exploring this alternative option?

5.27 The Chair thanked Ms Boss and stated that as you will be aware the parameters of this commission was drawn-up in a process separate to councillors and was agreed many

years ago and prior to the existing administration. This arrangement has been in place for several years now.

So I confirm that as stated in the report today, subject to member agreement, we have asked that a further report to come to this committee setting out options for the allocation of MHCLG funds to meet the new domestic abuse act duties placed on the local authority. As part of that report, options will be put before councillors regarding the commissioning process, including whether the city council works alone or with partners across Sussex. So absolutely we are actively exploring this as an option, with members being able to review this properly in due course.

- 5.28 Ms Bos asked a supplementary question; continuing on the theme of oversight and responsibility. Can I just make a declaration of interest? Until 2018 I worked for RISE as the Communications Officer. I was closely involved in setting up the Sussex Portal and hold a lot of institutional memory of those times. The first pan-Sussex agreement in 2015 transformed the East Sussex domestic abuse provision, more than doubling the size of the team. RISE also supported them in building in house expertise and specialism and helped them attain Safe Lives accreditation. This was when BHCC was in charge of commissioning and RISE was contract lead. In the latest commissioning the decision making has sat with East Sussex and our city's domestic violence service has been chopped to pieces. On top of this the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner is mentioned many times in the report before council today. Fingers and pies. Cooks/broth. My question is: The MHCLG money is specifically for housing support in Brighton & Hove. The Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner doesn't have housing in her remit - can the Council find out why her office is so involved in Brighton & Hove City Council business?
- 5.29 The Chair stated that the Working Group would be looking at these issues and meetings would be open to the public.
- 5.30 Mr Tancred asked the following question, following a spate of break-ins, vandalism, graffiti, violence, anti-social behaviour and flouting of the Covid-19 regulations, is it possible that solar-powered security lighting and CCTV cameras on lamp-posts could be installed adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the beach chalet blocks at Saltdean, Rottingdean, Ovingdean, Madeira Drive & Hove Esplanade to make these dark areas safer at night for the chalet tenants and the public in general?

When instances are reported to the police, they say there is very little they can do because of the lack of lighting in the area and it makes it difficult to monitor. With modern low-cost technology, it is now possible to install these essential security items in prime positions to prevent and discourage these illegal acts and make the whole area feel safer.

A feasibility study and implementation would be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

- 5.31 The Chair thanked Mr Tancred and stated that the beach on Madeira Drive and the Undercliff are not classified as public highways and therefore do not have existing street lighting or power supplies. As this is where most of the beach chalets are located, it is therefore not possible to locate CCTV cameras or lighting in these areas. Where power supplies and Wi-Fi capabilities exist, the initial cost of camera installation

is not necessarily prohibitive in itself. However, there is no budget identified to provide a resource to monitor further the cameras.

In addition, the areas identified are not considered to be areas of the city which have particularly high levels of crime associated with them in comparison to the impact of crime in other areas of the city, and as you know there are resource implications here, and we are also mindful of any considerations for police colleagues

Though I appreciate your concerns, there are also no resources identified for a feasibility study, therefore given all of the above, it is not considered beneficial to try to resource a feasibility study.

- 5.32 Mr Tancred asked whether solar powered lighting could be used and whether the recent vandalism of beach chalets in Saltdean would be resolved?
- 5.33 The Chair stated that she would need to investigate and would then provide a written reply.
- 5.34 Mr Tancred asked the following question on behalf of Ms Francis, the whole idea of making the change of policy was so the chalets would be better used if offered and rented to local Brighton & Hove City residents only. But there is an anomaly, where several residents are now being kicked out when no mention of a residency boundary was on their contract.

Is it possible that the boundary for inclusion could be extended by 1 mile to include the whole of the BN2 postcodes and thereby avoid any embarrassment for BHCC and the unfairness of the change of policy amended to take account of residents' circumstances?

- 5.35 The Chair thanked Mr Tancred and stated that I am very sorry to hear of the distress that has been caused by having to vacate one of the council's beach chalets. At TECC Committee in January this year the decision was made to bring to an end all beach chalet tenancies where the tenant lives outside of Brighton and Hove. The response from the public consultation on this particular matter was overwhelming in favour of this proposal. It was felt that as a council amenity, beach chalets should be available to residents of the city who pay council tax to Brighton & Hove.

Unfortunately, there will always be some cases which are on the margins and some individuals may feel the policy is unfair. However, with all decisions it is necessary to be consistent and draw a line somewhere. In this instance, that line is the boundary of Brighton & Hove which will not be extended for the purposes of the beach chalet letting policy.

- 5.36 Mr Tancred asked a supplementary question, has the Committee taken into account the impact of the decision on those chalet owners affected and was it willing to bear the responsibility of its actions?

- 5.37 The Chair stated that the report had been considered and the further report was due to be debated later on in the meeting. A decision would be taken having taken on board all considerations.
- 5.38 Ms Aherns asked the following question on behalf of Ms Farnell, The section on Sex in the Equalities Impact Assessment for Lot 5 (refuge provision) of the ‘Invitation to tender’ also says “Commissioned providers to be required to proactively target recruitment to communities that are under-represented in the staff profile, and to have an inclusive employment statement on all jobs being advertised, unless they can clearly demonstrate that there is there is a Genuine Occupational Requirement for the jobseeker to hold certain Protected Characteristics; this must be agreed in advance with commissioners.”

Does this mean that the council is intending to encourage the new refuge provider to employ male as well as female workers in the refuge?

Can the Council give a guarantee that male workers will not be targeted for recruitment and also that the deliberate use of male counsellors, such as the new Refuge provider, Stonewater, write about using in their Asian women’s refuge (in Hampshire), will not be considered appropriate support for women surviving domestic abuse?

- 5.39 The Chair thanked Ms Aherns for asking the question and stated that the council recognises the importance of women-only space and has no intention of encouraging the new refuge provider to employ male workers in the women-only refuge.

- 5.40 Ms Aherns asked a supplementary question, Karen Ingala Smith, the CEO of NIA and founder of Counting Dead Women and the Femicide Census, wrote a short blog post last summer, entitled ‘Trauma-Informed Services for Women Subjected to Men’s Violence Must be Single-Sex Services’ It is a clear, scientifically referenced explanation of how a trauma response can develop in response to incidents of sexual abuse and violence in the lives of too many women and girls. The piece concludes: “women-only spaces in Rape Crisis Centres, refuges, women’s centres or women-only buildings or events, etc are spaces where women are not required to make all the mental self-adjustments to function in the presence of men. Women survivors and feminists (many of us both) created these spaces because we know how important this is. Somewhere we can function and feel OK, safe, maybe even relaxed and with our defences down and our vigilance switch turned low. Women who have been subjected to men’s violence deserve this down time, this head space. Women-only space for women who have been subjected to men’s violence and abuse is something that must be protected by those of us who don’t need it, for those of us who do.”

Please will officers and councillors read this piece before making any decisions on employing male as well as female workers at the refuge?

- 5.41 The Chair asked for a copy of the article and that she would provide a written reply.
- 5.42 Ms Waldon asked the following question, At the last meeting of this committee, the Chair said “The Council undertakes Equality Impact Assessments when designing or redesigning services which explores impacts on every protected characteristic, including sex.”

Despite acknowledging the disproportionate impact of domestic abuse on women and girls, why did the Equality Impact Assessment for Lot 5 of the new Domestic Abuse contract suggest that the new refuge provider would be required to redirect resources away from single-sex services for women and girls and, I quote, “from year three to provide equal access to refuge provision for all victims experiencing domestic abuse regardless of their protected characteristics?”

- 5.43 The Chair thanked Ms Waldon and stated that the commission of refuge in the City will continue to provide single sex services for women.
From year three additional resource has been made available to explore whether or not additional refuge provision is made available for all victims/survivors regardless of their protected characteristics. I have sought reassurance that this will not remove the single-sex provision for women currently provided.
- 5.44 Ms Waldon asked a supplementary question, there is just one Refuge in Brighton & Hove and it serves a very wide area, for a large number of women and children. There are only a very limited number of units available. On average there are 6 applications for every refuge vacancy. As a result of this shortage of dedicated provision, can you commit to continuing city-wide single sex provision in a refuge in this city from 2021 onwards?
- 5.45 The Chair stated that the matter was due to be considered later in the meeting and she believed that a Needs Assessment would help but suggested Ms Waldon wait for the outcome of the consideration of the report.

(b) Deputation

- 5.46 Mr Hart presented a deputation concerning the development of the Council’s anti-racism strategy and the evidence and information referred to in its development and consideration at previous committee meetings.
- 5.47 The Chair thanked Mr Hart for the deputation and stated that as a council we believe that racism is not just the product of individual bias or prejudice, but something embedded in our systems. Institutional racism in the UK, for example in police forces, has been acknowledged, in some cases by the institutions themselves. David Lammy’s review in 2017 identified racial bias throughout the criminal justice system.

We accept that as a council we have a lot to learn and that the approval of the council’s anti-racist strategy is just a starting point, but believe that open communication about race and ethnicity, and listening to residents’ and lived experiences, is key.

Although incidents of racial violence and abuse have thankfully decreased significantly in the last 20-30 years, we know too well they do still happen in this city. I would also argue that any changes in attitudes and progress toward equality is directly linked to the tireless, incredible efforts of activists, organisations, campaigners and community groups who raise their voices to challenge prejudice, and who refuse to stay silent when told ‘but things are getting better.’ Progress towards equality is something we have to do, constantly, because we are not there yet. What’s more British Social

Attitudes survey and others tell us quite clearly that we are hardly without racism in society. The council's anti-racist strategy seeks to address these forms of racism, and the more subtle forms of prejudice that would not necessarily be reported as racist 'crimes', for example decreased employment opportunities, which have been widely discussed and acknowledged, even as part of reports and consultant reviews of our own council and listening to the views of staff. For too long issues around racism have not been discussed and therefore not addressed, and progress has been too slow – and each of us can do something about that.

The BLM movement, in response to the death of George Floyd, challenged the 'sweeping under the carpet' of the overt and subtle forms of racism already suffered by people, and triggered these being acknowledged and discussed once again. This is not the only case of a single event receiving widespread media coverage and then triggering a much broader recognition of a problem and ways to address it. For example, the link between the death of Sarah Everard, and a national discussion about women feeling unsafe on the streets on a daily basis. We are indebted to those across the world who refuse to stay silent in the push for a more equal society and call on us to go further.

The term BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic), although increasingly challenged on the basis that no umbrella term should be used, was however still a term widely used in July 2020. One of the problems with the term BAME is that it can be interpreted in different ways. As discussions about race and ethnicity have increased during the last year an alternative for the term BAME has begun to be explored, and this process is ongoing.

In answer to your more detailed questions about the sources of evidence for the original report from July 2020, we can send you a written response. However, I am committed that we do what we can to promote equality, fairness and to challenge racism.

5.48 The Chair then proposed that the deputation should be noted.

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

(c) Petitions

5.50 The Chair noted that there were not petitions to be presented to the committee at the meeting.

6 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

6.1 The Chair noted that there were no Member items for the current meeting.

7 ANTI-RACISM PLEDGE UPDATE

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

8 TOURISM RECOVERY PLAN

- 8.1 Prior to the consideration of the item, the Chair called a short adjournment to allow for a comfort break and adjourned the meeting at 17.13pm.
- 8.2 The Chair reconvened the meeting at 17.20pm and invited the Head of Tourism & Venues to introduce the report.
- 8.3 The Head of Tourism & Venues introduced the report which outlined the impacts of Covid-19 on the visitor economy and the planning for a recovery process within in the city.
- 8.4 The Committee welcomed the report and thanked officers for an excellent report. It was suggested that further consideration should be given to linking the recovery plan to the anti-racism strategy and for more collaboration with BAME and Community Groups to improve the visitor offer in the city.
- 8.5 The Head of Tourism & Venues stated that he would ensure this was taken on board as work progressed.
- 8.6 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote which were carried.

8.7 RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Brighton & Hove Tourism Recovery Plan (Appendix 1) to the report, prepared under the auspices of the city's Destination Experience Group be adopted by the City Council. This plan will become integral to the recovery of the sector; and
- (2) That the work of Visit Brighton, the city's destination management organisation, in supporting the Tourism Recovery Plan and the wider visitor economy be noted.

9 MHCLG FUNDING AWARD

- 9.1 The Head of Safer Communities introduced the report which provided an update on the work of the Pan Sussex Framework and sought approval for the expenditure of funding.
- 9.2 The Chair noted that there was a cross-party amendment and invited Councillor Simson to move the amendment.
- 9.3 Councillor Simson moved the amendment on behalf of the Conservative, Labour and Green Groups, which was jointly seconded by Councillors Grimshaw and Powell.
- 9.4 The Committee welcomed the report and raised a number of questions in relation to the proposals and a discrepancy in regard to paragraphs 3.1 and 7.1 in the report and sought clarification on the receipt and spending of the MHCLG funding.

- 9.5 The Head of Safer Communities stated that she would need to clarify the date that the Grant was received and confirmed that the £50k Capacity Building Funding had been used to establish the Project Team and to undertake the Needs Assessment which would include consultation with 3rd Sector Providers. She stated that there was an expectation that the Needs Assessment would have to be completed before any funding could then then spent but she would seek to clarify this with colleagues in the Procurement Team.
- 9.6 Members of the Committee queried whether support services were made available to those survivors of domestic abuse who were placed outside of the city and asked for further information in regard to the number of staff and recruitment and when the Domestic Violence Partnership Board would be established and meeting.
- 9.7 The Head of Safer Communities stated that she would ensure the information requested was provided to the Members of the Committee following the meeting.
- 9.8 The Chair then put the amendment to the vote which was carried and then the recommendations as amended to the vote which were carried.

9.9 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That it be noted that the Pan Sussex Partnership is undertaking a needs assessment, as required by the MHCLG funding, which will gather data and identify gaps in service provision;
- (2) That it be agreed to spend a portion of the MHCLG funding to develop an extra resource in Brighton & Hove City Council to support the development of policy, and the commissioning and oversight of services in relation to domestic violence and domestic abuse. This resource would amount to approximately £25,000 until the end of March 22;
- (3) That officers be requested to produce a report back to an urgent TECC sub-committee as soon as the needs assessment has been completed in July with the following information:
 - (i) That on completion of the needs assessment, and after consultation with relevant cross-party Members, that officers provide options for Members to discuss and decide on how the remaining, approximately £581,000, MHCLG funding will be spent in Brighton & Hove; and
 - (ii) That the carry forward of £99,962 separate MHCLG funding from the 2020/21 financial year to Rise, to cover the continued MHCLG project funding for first two quarters of 2021/22 be noted, and that the further report as detailed above in 3 (i) above will also detail the options on continuation of this funding, following the required MHCLG needs assessment exercise.

10 CIL GOVERNANCE & S106 MEMBER PROTOCOL

- 10.1 The Service Development Manager introduced the report which sought approval to determine and agree expenditure of the Community Infrastructure Levy funds received by the Council.
- 10.2 The Committee welcomed the report and the Chair noted that both Councillors Childs and Ebel had requested that a statement from each of them be read out by their respective colleagues due to the restrictions on attendance at the meeting.
- 10.3 The Committee noted that a further report was due to come to the meeting in November and asked that it include details of the amount of underspend that currently existed in relation to S106 funds and how cross-boundary bids would be determined.
- 10.4 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote which were carried.

10.5 RESOLVED:

- (1) That the governance arrangements for planning, administering and monitoring expenditure of CIL receipts collected for the Citywide and Neighbourhood portions outlined in appendices B & C of the report be approved; and
- (2) That the draft CIL Advisory Protocol in appendix C to the report be approved for use, publication and future updating as necessary, subject to any minor alterations (grammatical, spelling or for clarity) to be agreed by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Joint Chairs of the TECC Committee.

11 BEACH CHALET FEASIBILITY STUDY AND LETTING POLICY

- 11.1 The Head of Sport & Leisure introduced the report concerning the Beach Chalet feasibility study and letting policy which had been requested at the last meeting.
- 11.2 Councillor Simson stated that she had struggled with the recommendations and asked if they could be taken individually.
- 11.3 The Chair noted that Councillor Ebel had asked for a statement to read out at the meeting as she was unable to attend due to the restriction on numbers. She also agreed to take the recommendations individually and put each of them to the vote.
- 11.4 The Chair noted that recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 were carried by 2 votes to 1 and that recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 were carried unanimously.

11.5 RESOLVED:

- (1) That the bringing of indefinite agreements for beach chalets to an end in accordance with the terms of the agreements and replace with new 8-year fixed term agreements be approved;

- (2) That it be agreed that the new 8-year fixed term agreements are on the same terms and conditions as the existing 5-year fixed term agreements, including the same lower annual licence fee;
- (3) That the feasibility study in Appendix 2 to the report on the provision of additional beach chalets or beach huts be noted and that the development of project plans for new beach chalets at the sites identified in paragraph 3.26 of the report be approved; and
- (4) That a further report be brought to a future meeting of the Committee to consider the project plans prior to implementation.

Note: Councillor Simson wished her name recorded as having voted against resolutions (1) and (2) above.

12 URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (UDF SPD)

12.1 RESOLVED:

- (1) That the consultation on the Draft Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document (Appendices 2 and 3) and the changes made to the Draft UDF SPD as a result of consultation responses (Appendix 4) to the report be noted; and
- (2) That the adoption of the Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document (Appendix 1 to the report) be adopted as part of the city's suite of planning documents subject to any minor grammatical and non-material text and illustrative alterations agreed by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Committee prior to publication.

13 VOLK'S RAILWAY POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

- 13.1 The Head of Sport & Leisure introduced the report which detailed the potential improvements for the Volks Railway as requested by the committee at its last meeting.
- 13.2 The Chair noted that there was an amendment and invited Councillor Grimshaw to move the amendment.
- 13.3 Councillor Grimshaw moved the amendment on behalf of the Labour and read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Childs who was unable to attend due to the restriction on numbers attending for committee meetings.
- 13.4 The Chair noted that the amendment had been seconded by both Councillor Simson and herself, as part of the agreed protocol on restricted numbers attending committee meetings and put it to the vote which was carried.
- 13.5 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote which was carried.

13.6 RESOLVED:

- (1) That the progression of the project to achieve a new accessible railcar, including a costed design and the identification of full funding for the project as a priority be agreed;
- (2) That £30,000 of the funding of £40,000 previously identified for signage, a new shelter and siding is instead allocated to a new accessible railcar be agreed;
- (3) That officers be requested to explore the possibility of having painted signage on pavements across the city which depicts symbols rather than words for local attractions i.e. the Volks railway carriage, the Royal Pavilion, Brighton Pier and i360 and report back to a future meeting;
- (4) That the Committee notes that consideration to extend the railway to Black Rock will be given during the development of the Eastern Seafront Masterplan;
- (5) That the Committee notes the uncertainty of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the future operation of the railway, and that the financial viability of future improvements would need to be given careful consideration to ensure the viability of the Volk's Railway is sustainable.

14 NEW EVENT REQUESTS 2021

14.1 The item had been deferred.

15 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

15.1 **RESOLVED:** That no items be referred to the full Council meeting on the 15th July 2021.

The meeting concluded at 6.28pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2021