

**DRAFT EXTRACT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CENTRAL SERVICES
CABINET MEMBER MEETING HELD ON THE 18 JANUARY 2010**

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

CENTRAL SERVICES CABINET MEMBER MEETING

4.30pm, 18 JANUARY 2010

COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL

Present: Councillor Fallon-Khan (Cabinet Member).

Also in attendance: Councillor Hamilton (Opposition Spokesperson, Labour).

Other Members present: Councillors Young, Harmer-Strange and Smart.

PART ONE

DRAFT MINUTES

47. HANGLETON BOTTOM - UPDATE

- 47.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Finance & Resources which sought permission to test the market and explore the options available to the council through the development of an informal planning brief and marketing exercise for the site (for copy see minute book).
- 47.2 The Cabinet Member noted that the site had been identified in the Local Plan and Waste Local Plan for community use as well as the provision of waste facilities and that following expressions of interest there was an opportunity to have a mixed-use development. He also noted that any such mixed-use development would need to take account of the highest and latest standards of technological application in terms of the treatment and disposal of waste to ensure it benefitted the community as a whole.
- 47.3 The Opposition Spokesperson expressed concern over the fact that the report was not shown as a key decision and referred to the item listed in the Forward Plan as being deferred and due for consideration in April by the Cabinet. He asked for clarification as he felt that insufficient notice of the item had been given and that the report referred only to North Portslade whereas the item on the Forward Plan listed that all wards would be affected. He suggested that the item should be deferred to the April meeting in accordance with the Forward Plan.
- 47.4 The Head of Law explained that for a matter to be on the Forward plan, it had to satisfy one of the following criteria: (i) that it had a significant impact on two or more wards and (ii) expenditure/savings exceeded £500K. He stated that it was his understanding that the report being considered today was proposing preparatory and preliminary work in relation to the marketing of the site, in order to find out about its potential use. A further report would then be referred to the Cabinet for consideration.

- 47.5 The Head of Law further noted that the recommendations contained in the current report did not commit the council to anything and, therefore, it was his view that the item was not a key decision item at this stage and advised that the Cabinet Member could continue and make a decision on the proposals.
- 47.6 The Assistant Director, Property & Design, concurred with the points made by the Head of Law. She stated that once officers had undertaken the preliminary market testing and had the results of that process, they would have more substantial information to formulate a report for the Cabinet's consideration.
- 47.7 The Opposition Spokesperson noted the clarification provided. He referred back, however, to the published forward plan and noted that the title proposed in the deferred item was very similar to the one in the report recommendations being considered today. He was concerned that the information given in this way was wrong and, therefore, incorrect. He also noted that the report indicated that ward councillors had been advised of the report; however, he had not been consulted about it.
- 47.8 The Head of Law stated that although the titles appeared the same, when looking at the specific information in the report, all that was being proposed was some initial preparatory work. He stated that if no interest was shown from the market testing, the proposal could be abandoned; if interest was shown, it could be taken forward, but that would be a matter for further on in the process. He reiterated that the proposals before the Cabinet Member were not binding the council to anything and, therefore, the item was not considered to be a key decision at this stage.
- 47.9 The Opposition Spokesperson stated that it was a green site and as such he was not happy with the proposed use for commercial and domestic waste and would pursue the matter further.
- 47.10 The Cabinet Member noted the Opposition Spokesperson concerns and comments. However, he believed that there was an obligation to look at the site's potential and explore its possible use. He accepted the clarification given by the Head of Law and noted that the recommendations did not commit the council to any action and therefore did not meet the criteria of key decision and the need to be included on the Forward Plan.
- 47.11 **RESOLVED** – That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the approach to marketing and creating an informal planning brief for this council owned site as set out in the report be approved; and
 - (2) That it be noted that, following market testing on the basis of an informal planning and development brief, a further report would be prepared setting out the results and future potential options for the redevelopment of the site for the Cabinet's consideration.