

# **BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

## **CABINET**

**2.00pm 25 SEPTEMBER 2025**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

## **MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Sankey (Chair) Taylor (Deputy Chair), Alexander, Allen, Miller, Muten, Robins, Rowkins and Williams

**Other Members present:** Councillors Hewitt, Nann, Robinson

## **PART ONE**

### **29 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

#### **29a Declarations of interests**

29.1 There were none.

#### **29b Exclusion of the press and public**

29.2 There were no Part Two items included on the agenda.

### **30 MINUTES**

30.1 **Resolved-** That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved as the correct record.

### **31 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

31.1 The Chair provided the following Communications:

We have a busy agenda today from local government reorganisation, King Alfred redevelopment, our Business Improvement District, a corporate health well-being safety and well-being policy and the vital recommissioning of our homelessness services. But before we get into this agenda, I want to say something about the events of the past few weeks. Tommy Robinson and his ilk have nothing to offer residents in our city and our wider country. His brand of hate and division has no place here. He knows nothing about building up communities, investing in people, creating opportunities. He peddles hate and division and often violence. I know that some of our residents are feeling fearful as a result of his actions and the demonstration that he led in London. I want to reassure everyone in this city that we will always be a place of welcome.

I am proud that people have come from all over the world to make Brighton & Hove their home. They are our neighbours, they are our friends, they are our colleagues here at the

Council. They work in our hospitals, they run our businesses, they build up our communities, create opportunities and build people together. Your Labour Council and your Labour Government are on your side, investing in this place and our people. And today I'm really pleased to say that our government has announced that part of Brighton will be included in its Pride in Place initiative, meaning millions of pounds of funding is coming to Whitehawk in Brighton to invest in our people and our place.

Today's agenda includes this Council's proposal for Local Government Reorganisation here in Sussex. I am proud and confident in our proposal for a 5 unitary option for Sussex, which we'll discuss in detail today.

In our proposal, each authority would serve between 300,000 and 400,000 residents. We believe our option aligns strongly with the government's criteria and, crucially, balances protecting and respecting local identity and combining with the ability for each potential new authority to deliver high quality and sustainable services.

Our proposal would allow our region to enjoy the full benefits of devolution and ensure all of our communities can be celebrated, empowered and given equal access to the services, investment and funding that they deserve. It also has the potential to unlock £52.4 million worth in annual net benefits for the region. Money, which can be reinvested in local infrastructure and services at a time when local authorities are under pressure. We believe it's a sensible and considered response to a request from central government and one which we believe is the best option for our whole region.

Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation are coming, and they will provide huge benefits to the people of Brighton and Hove and our neighbours throughout Sussex.

Elsewhere on the agenda, I'm delighted to see a proposal to support the renewal of our Business Improvement District. Our bid, which is known as Brilliant Brighton, is a fantastic example of what can be achieved when the local authority, local business and other stakeholders work together. Brilliant Brighton encompasses 517 retail and hospitality businesses stretching from Western Road to the North Laine. It was formed to create a thriving, safe clean and vibrant city centre, and together, we've achieved so much, but there is still more to do. Growing our economy, improving the look and feel of our city and ensuring that Brighton and Hove remains a welcoming, bustling and attractive destination is vital and a renewed bid has a key part to play in this.

This Council is committed to continuing to invest, and so I'm really pleased to see further developments for the King Alfred Leisure Centre regeneration come before us today, and while we're incredibly excited about developments like King Alfred, this agenda today also reminds us of the very serious responsibility that we have to support people experiencing challenges, such as financial hardship, housing insecurity and other barriers. Today we're discussing the recommissioning of our street outreach service, and I cannot overstate how important this is, how vital this work is, and how committed we are to providing the service as a Council.

Each November, a snapshot of the number of people sleeping rough on a single night is collected throughout the UK. It isn't a perfect method for estimating the number of people who are part of our street homeless community, but it does provide a sobering estimate and here in Brighton and Hove our figure was 76. We know our rough sleeping rate is significantly higher than the average for the southeast. Indeed, we recently ranked 19th highest for our sleeping rates across England. Our street outreach service is our primary frontline response and support service. It's responsible for identifying new people who are who are experiencing rough sleeping and supporting existing ones.

The team engages with residents rapidly assessing the needs of those living on the streets and provides appropriate support to help individuals access accommodation support or

to relocate. It's not a service that we take for granted, and while we're doing all we can to increase the supply of quality, security and affordable local housing.

As part of our homes for everyone strategy that we must be aware that there can be, unfortunately, always those who find themselves in acute need for urgent help- the street outreach service provides this. While much of the work will go unseen by many in this city. We'd like to thank everyone involved in our street outreach service for their tireless efforts and reassure those residents at risk of homelessness or experiencing homelessness or insecure housing that this Council will always be there to support those who need it most.

## **32 CALL OVER**

32.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 37: Local Government Reorganisation
- Item 38: The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project
- Item 40: Brilliant Brighton Business Improvement District- New Ballot
- Item 41: Corporate Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy
- Item 42: Rough Sleeping and Single Homeless Services Commissioning

32.2 The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that the items listed above had been reserved for discussion and that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

- Item 39: Admission of New Member to the Greater Brighton Economic Board

## **33 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **1) Extend public toilet opening times**

33.1 Cabinet considered a petition signed by 410 people requesting public toilet opening times be extended.

33.2 Councillor Rowkins provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your petition. First, I hope you will have seen how important we believe public toilets are for our city. Since being elected in 2023, we've reopened 12, refurbished 9 (including the seafront) and changed the opening hours so that some sites that were previously closed over the winter are now open year-round. We've also done a great deal of work on providing accessible facilities, including raising the entire level of the facility at Goldstone Villas from it's previous subterranean configuration.

Brighton & Hove's beach culture is vibrant and active beyond the current operating hours, and of course we'd like our facilities need to reflect that reality as far as possible.

We are actively exploring two practical approaches to make that happen. First, we're consulting with staff about amending the summer rota to allow for later closing times. This is timely, as we're also recruiting additional staff to support the reopening of the toilet at Victoria Park – the thirteenth we've reopened - and other facilities in the west of the city, which should give us more flexibility in how we manage resources.

Second, we are investigating the feasibility of installing automated door mechanisms—systems that allow for remote-controlled or timed opening and locking. That would potentially enable earlier opening and later closing, while also addressing safety and cleaning logistics. We're mindful of previous concerns about people potentially being locked in, so any solution will be carefully assessed to ensure it's safe, reliable, and practical.

Thank you for bringing your petition today, and I can certainly assure you that we view the city's public toilets as crucial to our residents and visitors".

33.3 **Resolved-** That Cabinet note the petition.

## 2) **Objection to Withdean Indoor Tennis Court Conversion**

33.4 Cabinet considered a petition signed by 864 people requesting that plans for the conversion of Indoor Tennis Courts at Withdean Sports Complex be paused for further consultation.

33.5 Councillor Robins provided the following reply:

"The plans to convert the two indoor tennis courts into four indoor padel courts and one pickleball court has been halted at Withdean Sports Complex. Along with Freedom Leisure and the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) Officers will be reviewing padel opportunities and tennis delivery at both Withdean and across the city. This will include speaking with other stakeholders, working with the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) on a padel and tennis strategy and then implementing wider consultation – which is likely to be through a Your Voice survey".

33.6 **Resolved-** That Cabinet note the petition.

## 34 **ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS**

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

34.1 A copy of the questions received was circulated ahead of the meeting. Responses provided both at the meeting and in writing are as follows:

#### 1. **Councillor Meadows- The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

What's the predicted car parking numbers and revenue? Will the car park be smaller or larger than current provision?

#### **Response: Cllr Robins**

The outline designs for the new facility incorporate an undercroft car park which offers a similar level of capacity to the current surface car park and adjacent on-street parking (c.120 spaces). The undercroft also incorporates secure parking for cycles.

For the purposes of the Cabinet paper, the same level of car parking revenue has been assumed which is a net income of £0.400m per annum.

The proposals for parking are explained in more detail in section 4 of the cabinet paper.

**2. Councillor Meadows- The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

How much will it cost residents and visitors to use the King Alfred facilities?

**Response: Cllr Robins**

We are still in the early stages of development so operational details such as costs and memberships will come much later in the process.

**3. Councillor Meadows- The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

How confident are you that your borrowing costs vs your projected income will match or could this be another i360?

**Response: Cllr Robins**

Officers have updated the financial modelling from the original business case to ensure that the future cost of the facility is understood. This has included commissioning two new land valuations, and two new reports on projected future income generation for the new facility.

The scenario set out in the cabinet paper (4.19) shows that the net annual cost of servicing the borrowing proposed larger-scale £65m project (£0.89m) is less than the net borrowing costs for the £47.4m project set out in the July 2024 cabinet paper (£1.06m). The cabinet paper includes a range of measures that could reduce the net cost of borrowing further, including re-prioritising income streams within Leisure Services, making use of new agency regulations to recover previously unrecoverable VAT, securing Homes England Grant Funding, and reprioritising the capital investment programme to direct more funding to the new King Alfred facility.

**4. Councillor Hill- Local Government Reorganisation**

Could you explain how the administration came to the figure of £52.4m in annual net benefits from your Local Government Reorganisation proposal? What was the total cost of reorganisation before factoring financial benefits? Other analysis by the County Councils Network suggested that Councils needed to be at least half a million to make any savings so I'm keen to understand where this disparity comes from.

**Response: Cllr Hewitt**

The figure of £52.4m comes from the financial modelling undertaken for us by Ignite. Their method is set out in the appendices to our proposal. It used published financial data for every council in Sussex, with common assumptions applied across all options so that results can be compared on a like-for-like basis.

The model works in three stages. First, it set out the baseline financial pressures if nothing changes. Second, it applied the recurring savings from reorganisation. Third, it added the one-off costs of transition.

The £52.4m annual benefit is the net result once steady state is reached. The breakdown is:

- £20.2m from removing duplication in services
- £26.0m from running people services at the right scale (the “sweet spot” of 300k–400k residents referenced in PeopleToo research)
- £4.8m from senior management consolidation
- £2.1m from member and election costs
- offset by –£9.8m disaggregation disbenefits

The one-off costs for the five unitary option are estimated at £168m–£197m.

Government policy is that these costs are funded through eligible capital receipts, not through day-to-day service budgets.

On the comparison with the County Councils Network. Their analysis was national and used broad population thresholds of around 500k. Our modelling is Sussex-specific, uses local data, and applies more recent evidence. PeopleToo’s work shows efficiency benefits at the 300k–400k level, which is the scale our proposal uses. The Essex proposal published this month also makes the same point about efficiency gains in smaller unitaries.

So the difference is method. We have been transparent about both the costs and the benefits. These will be tested further through the statutory process before any final decision is taken.

## 5. **Councillor Hill- Local Government Reorganisation**

Falmer lies in Lewes Parliamentary constituency and is being proposed to be included in the new Brighton & Hove unitary. If the purpose of bringing Peacehaven, East Saltdean &

Telscombe Cliffs into a larger Brighton & Hove City Council is to align Parliamentary constituency boundaries, then this seems contrary to that purpose. Could you explain what appears to be a contradiction in aims? There are also concerns about splitting up current district council boundaries which this does.

### **Response: Cllr Hewitt**

Our proposal was not about parliamentary boundaries. It was about lived geography and resilience.

Peacehaven, Telscombe and East Saltdean are tied into the Brighton and Hove corridor through daily life. Falmer is linked just as strongly through the universities, the Amex, the hospitals and transport. Both moves follow the same principle, which is to align councils to where people actually live their lives.

On splitting districts. Whole district options left us with councils that were either too big or too fragile. The Government invitation allows refinements where justified, and using them gives us five balanced councils of around 300,000 to 400,000 residents. That balance is what makes the structure sustainable for the long term.

## 6. **Councillor Shanks- The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

Can we be assured that the Administration will achieve affordable and social housing on the site?

**Response: Cllr Robins**

As detailed in the report the valuation used in the financial modelling is based on a scheme with planning compliant level of 40% affordable housing, and any application for residential development for the remainder of the site will be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan including policy CP20 which sets out the criteria for the provision of affordable housing.

**7. Councillor Shanks- The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

Will you require the Administration to present the full, combined scheme — leisure centre and housing — together, so that the public can properly understand its effect on the promenade, sea views, skyline, and seafront character before any further approvals are granted?

**Response: Cllr Robins**

One of the key lessons that was learned from the previous King Alfred projects is the importance of keeping the council-led delivery of the sport and leisure centre separate and distinct from the residential development. The aim of this is to avoid creating the complex dependencies which have prevented previous project from successfully progressing.

With that in mind, the current iteration of the project is focussed on the delivery of the sport and leisure centre. That focus has helped the current project progress further and faster than any of the previous projects. The planning application is scheduled to be submitted before the end of the year, with work to begin on site early next year. This approach also enables the council to keep the current centre open for as long as possible while the development of the new centre progresses.

The design of the new facility, and in particular its orientation on the site, has been developed to preserve sight lines out to sea from the streets leading north from Kingsway (Hove Street and Vallance Gardens).

The planning application for the residential part of the site will be considered separately. Any application for residential development will be assessed against the council's planning policies, including policy SA1 in City Plan Part 1 which sets out planning policy for the Seafront including the King Alfred site.

**8. Councillor Shanks - The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

What will be the total cost of the new leisure centre factoring in interest charges, and possibly compound interest charges for possibly 3 decades? how will this be met, will other projects need to be abandoned?

**Response: Cllr Robins**

The report sets out the financial implications of the proposed £65 million development including the estimated annual borrowing costs of £1.95 million assuming the capital receipt for the housing site is £26.4 million. The £1.95 million per annum is based on

annuity repayment which means it includes both interest and capital repayment. The £1.95 million per annum is expected to be offset by increased income from the new facility and any net costs met from the range of actions set out in paragraph 4.24 of the report.

## **9. Councillor West - Local Government Reorganisation**

LGR is proving to be a textbook example of how not to bring forward change. The case for LGR was not proven by the Government but predicated on a partial report by the County Councils Network, adopted without question into the Government's manifesto. The cabinet report states the scale of indicative savings over ten years are 'fairly marginal' compared to the growing cost pressures faced by authorities, yet transition would create colossal unfunded upfront costs; estimates of which could prove wildly understated when competing nationwide for delivery capacity resources. There seems no appetite for re-organisation amongst the public, who wish to retain local identity and democratic decentralisation, while preferring Government funding be committed to restore and expand services. Given the relevant Ministers have departed post, now is the moment to call for a moratorium of this hasty, unwelcomed, yet significant upheaval. Does the Cabinet agree?

### **Response: Cllr Hewitt**

On the foundations of the process. Government has invited councils in Sussex to bring forward proposals. This is not something that has been imposed from the County Councils Network report. Our submission has been built on financial modelling and tested against alternatives.

On costs and benefits. The report is clear that the pressures facing councils are very significant and that reorganisation alone will not resolve them. The modelling does show though that once transition is complete there would be real financial benefits worth over fifty million pounds each year. We have also been transparent about the one off costs of change. Our role has been to show what the range of costs might be, based on experience elsewhere, so that ministers can weigh these properly against the benefits.

On public appetite. It is too early to draw conclusions. There has not yet been a statutory consultation. If government chooses to move forward that is when residents across Sussex will have their say. What we have done is engage locally on Brighton and Hove's footprint so that our city has a clear voice if change is taken forward.

Finally on timing. Changes in ministers do not alter the fact that the invitation to submit proposals remains. Our role is to make sure Brighton and Hove is represented and that the interests of our residents are safeguarded whatever decisions are ultimately taken. Calling for a moratorium now would mean stepping back and leaving others to decide the future of local government in Sussex without our input. We do not think that would be right. Our approach is to put forward a credible and evidence based option and to be open about both the risks and the opportunities.

## **10. Councillor West - The King Alfred Leisure Centre Regeneration Project**

Given the huge financial and service delivery uncertainties created by the Government's LGR initiative, coupled with the council's increasingly perilous financial position, would it not be prudent to pause investment in major sports facilities until we know what



communities will be being served and to see what means the council will have to meet the on-going financial commitment.

**Response: Cllr Robins**

The need to replace the current King Alfred facility is pressing and urgent. This was explained in some detail in the paper considered by Cabinet at its meeting in July 2024 and thereafter by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in August 2024. The condition of the current facility means that ongoing maintenance and running costs remain high. Furthermore, there is a continuing risk of forced closure due to the condition of the facility.

With all of that in mind, it's especially important that delivery of the project continues at pace. As shown in the Cabinet paper, the new facility offers the potential to generate much greater levels of revenue than the current facility. This in turn means that the projected revenue costs to the council to service the borrowing for the facility will be less than proposed in the Cabinet paper agreed in July of last year, as explained in the response to question 3.

**11. Councillor McLeay - Rough Sleeping & Single Homeless Services Commissioning**

Having seen Change Grow Live (CGL) in action, I've been impressed by the quality and consistency of their service. As the commissioning process opens to tender, could you outline the specific criteria that prospective providers will need to meet – not just in terms of value for money? How will you assess their ability to deliver trauma-informed, person-centred care to achieve meaningful outcomes for those rough sleeping?

**Response: Cllr Williams**

Thank you for the positive feedback about the current service.

The amended specification for the new tender has been written through a trauma informed lens, ensuring that the service user and their experience are at the centre of the work the council commissions.

The tender response will require providers to respond to standard tender questions around proposed service model, mobilisation and costings. In addition, there will be specific questions around balancing the needs of those long-term rough sleeping with those who fall in the wider rough sleeping response or having 'nowhere safe to stay'. As well as providers response to community safety issues.

In order to ensure the voice of lived experience in the service design and evaluate how the service performs in a trauma informed way there will also be a set question which will be designed and evaluated by partners with lived experience from within the voluntary and community sector.

**12. Councillor McLeay - Rough Sleeping & Single Homeless Services Commissioning**

While the recommissioning of the Street Outreach Service rightly considers financial sustainability and value for money, how will the Council ensure the quality of service? What mechanisms will be in place to ensure providers deliver a quality service, especially those with multiple compound needs?

**Response: Cllr Williams**

The new specification for the service has residents with multiple compound needs at the centre. The Street Outreach Service will form part of the Integrated Care Team response to those with MCN in partnership with NHS Sussex.

The new specification has set KPI's around reduction of rough sleeping in terms of overall numbers and specific KPI's around those experiencing long term rough sleeping, as these individuals are more likely to experience MCN. The service will be monitored through the KPI's along-side bi-annual reporting; covering topics such as, but not limited to, integration of service user feedback, collaboration and community integration and how training and best practice are embedded into the service. This sits alongside periodic contract reviews, which include service user, stakeholder and staff feedback alongside KPI performance.

**13. Councillor McLeay- Brilliant Brighton Business Improvement District (BID) – New Ballot**

Given that the Council does not have formal representation on the BID Board, how will it ensure transparency and accountability in how BID funds are spent, and priorities are set?

**Response: Cllr Taylor**

A BID is a business run and business funded entity, it is not for the council to ensure transparency and accountability in how BID funds are spent. The BID's priorities are set according to consultations undertaken by the BID with levy-paying businesses.

**14. Councillor McLeay- Brilliant Brighton Business Improvement District (BID) – New Ballot**

What role will the Council play in overseeing the ballot process and ensuring that the BID Operating Agreement reflects the interests of both levy payers and the wider community?

**Response: Cllr Taylor**

In line with regulation 6(1) of The Business Improvement Districts (England) Regulations 2004, the BID ballot is held by the Ballot Holder, who is the person the council has appointed under section 35 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 as the returning officer for elections to the council. Jess Gibbons, as Returning Officer and Ballot Holder, is therefore responsible for overseeing the ballot process.

Electoral Services, on behalf of the Ballot Holder, conducts the ballot process in line with the BID regulations.

The BID Operating Agreement is a legal document that sets out the responsibilities of the council in terms of levy collection and the baseline services already undertaken. The rationale for a BID is to operate in the interests of their levy payers and this is set out in the BID's Business Plan – sent to all levy papers with the ballot – rather than the Operating Agreement.

**15. Councillor McLeay- Brilliant Brighton Business Improvement District (BID) – New Ballot**

Will the Council publish the baseline service levels for city centre maintenance and safety, so businesses can clearly see what additional value the BID is providing?

**Response: Cllr Taylor**

The baseline service levels will form part of the Operating Agreement for the BID. It is incumbent on the BID to promote the added value that they generate for city centre businesses.

**16. Councillor McLeay– Greater Brighton Economic Board – Admission of New Member to the Board**

What specific contributions, beyond representation, will the Chamber make to the Board's work programme? What resource commitment has been proposed that the Greater Brighton Economic Board sees as adding value?

**Response: Cllr Taylor**

The main aim of the Greater Brighton Economic Board is for members to work together, and with external stakeholders, to promote and create the conditions for sustainable and inclusive economic prosperity, whilst at the same time transitioning the region towards net zero. This closely aligns with the Sussex Chamber's vision to support and drive sustainable economic growth and champion key issues in Sussex.

In accepting applications for membership, the Board is asked to consider:

- i. Does the organisation buy into the Board's agreed vision and priorities?
- ii. Do they share economic characteristics and represent the Greater Brighton functional economic area?
- iii. Do they add capacity to help the Board deliver on its agreed vision and priorities?
- iv. Will they add to the Board's reputation, in terms of legitimacy, standing and reach?
- v. Are they going to actively participate and commit resource to supporting the Board and deliver the work programme?

The admission of Sussex Chamber to the Board was agreed at the GBEB meeting of 9 July 2025.

**17. Councillor McLeay– Greater Brighton Economic Board – Admission of New Member to the Board**

How will the Board monitor whether the Sussex Chamber's representation genuinely reflects the diversity of Sussex's business community, including micro-businesses, minority-owned enterprises, and social enterprises?

**Response: Cllr Taylor**

It is not the role of GBEB to monitor the membership of Sussex Chamber of Commerce, and the Chamber is not accountable to the Board. The Chamber has a relatively diverse membership base, but this will fluctuate over time. By including the Sussex Chamber

within GBEB it provides an additional business voice to feed into city region strategic growth and development, helping to give SMEs a stronger voice.

**18. Councillor McLeay– Greater Brighton Economic Board – Admission of New Member to the Board**

What reasons did constituent authorities state for not agreeing an amendment to the Heads of Terms? It would seem their concerns were overruled. Is there a contingency plan if one or more constituent authorities later raise further objections to the amended Heads of Terms?

**Response: Cllr Taylor**

Any changes to the Heads of Terms of GBEB must be agreed by all of the local authorities on the Board, otherwise decisions of the Board will not be formally ratified. As such, each local authority must agree changes to the Heads of Terms through their relevant decision-making body. It is unclear what concerns may have been over-ruled in this process – this Cabinet report is for BHCC to formally agree the GBEB decision in the same manner that the other member local authorities will ratify the decision.

**35 MATTERS REFERRED TO THE EXECUTIVE**

35.1 There were none.

**36 REPRESENTATIONS FROM OPPOSITION MEMBERS**

36.1 Cabinet received a representation from Councillor Hill on Item 37- Local Government Reorganisation

36.2 Cabinet received a representation from Councillor McLeay on Item 40 Brilliant Brighton Business Improvement District (BID) - New Ballot.

**37 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION**

37.1 Cabinet considered a report that presented Brighton & Hove City Council's Local Government Reorganisation proposal for Sussex and sought approval for submission to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government by 26 September 2025, in line with the nationally set timetable.

37.2 Councillors Taylor, Rowkins, Miller, Muten. Allen, Robins and Sankey contributed to the debate of the report.

37.3 **Resolved-** That Cabinet

1) Agrees the Final Proposal: 'Representative Councils for a Devolved Sussex: A Five Unitary Proposal' as set out at Appendix 1 and approves its submission to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government by 26 September 2025.

- 2) Delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make any final adjustments to the Final Proposal before the deadline for submission.

### **38 THE KING ALFRED LEISURE CENTRE REGENERATION PROJECT**

- 38.1 Cabinet considered a report that sought Cabinet agreement to progress the King Alfred Regeneration Project from its current concept design stage (Royal Institute of British Architects Plan of Work Stage 2 or RIBA 2) through to spatial coordination and technical design (RIBA stage 3 and 4) including submission of the planning application.
- 38.2 Councillors Allen, Robinson, Taylor, Alexander, Muten and Miller asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

#### **38.3 Resolved-**

That Cabinet:

- 1) Agrees that the design team progress further the design proposals presented at appendix 1 and delegates authority to Corporate Director, City Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries to proceed with submission of a planning application based on those designs.
- 2) Approves the indicative capital budget for the project of up to £65 million to be included in the Medium-Term Capital Investment Programme to be funded from a combination of capital receipts, government grants and council borrowing.
- 3) Approves an allocation of a further £2.3 million of these resources, in addition to the £2.7million agreed at July 2024 cabinet, for professional fees, surveys, and investigations relating to the development of the design proposals through RIBA Stage 3 (including submission of a planning application), and RIBA Stage 4 with enabling works.
- 4) Approves the demolition of redundant parts of the site (appendix 5) between the current facility and the car park so that the enabling works for the new facility and regenerated public realm can come forward.

### **39 ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBER TO THE GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD**

#### **39.1 Resolved-**

- 1) That Cabinet agrees that the Sussex Chamber of Commerce joins the Greater Brighton Economic Board as a member of the Business Partnership.
- 2) That Cabinet notes that these changes to the membership and the consequent changes to the Heads of Terms are dependent on the decision of all the local authorities represented in the Joint Committee agreeing that the new member be appointed.
- 3) That Cabinet agrees to amend the Board's Heads of Terms to include Sussex Chamber of Commerce as a member of the Board and delegates the Director of Governance and

Law to amend the Council's constitution to reflect these amendments once they have been formally approved by all the constituent authorities.

#### **40 BRILLIANT BRIGHTON BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) - NEW BALLOT**

37.1 Cabinet considered a report that sought approval from for the renewal (with a minor geographical amendment) of the existing city centre Business Improvement District (BID) in 2026.

37.2 Councillors Alexander, Allen, Muten and Miller contributed to the debate of the report.

##### **37.3 Resolved-**

- 1) That Cabinet agrees to support the renewal of the BID for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2031 on the basis outlined in Paragraphs 3.16 and 3.17.
- 2) That Cabinet agrees to delegate authority to allow the Head of Cabinet Office to oversee the BID process and enter into the renewal of the BID Operating Agreement and any associated documents, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Regeneration.
- 3) That Cabinet agrees to post a Notice of Ballot by 16 October pursuant to the Business Improvement District (England) Regulations 2004.

#### **41 CORPORATE HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING POLICY**

37.1 Cabinet considered a report that sought approval for the new refreshed Corporate Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy within the Council.

37.2 Councillors Williams, Muten, Robinson and Sankey contributed to the debate of the report.

##### **37.3 Resolved-**

- 1) That Cabinet approves the new corporate health, safety and wellbeing policy.

#### **42 ROUGH SLEEPING & SINGLE HOMELESS SERVICES COMMISSIONING**

42.1 Cabinet considered a report that sought approval to recommission the city's core Street Outreach Service (SOS), which is due to end in March 2026.

42.2 Councillors Muten, Millet, Taylor, Nann and Sankey asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

##### **42.3 Resolved-**

- 1) Cabinet agrees to recommission the SOS ending 31 March 2026, for 3-years, with a possible extension of up-to 4-years (2+ 2+ years) with an estimated value of £1,635,000 over three years.

- 2) Cabinet delegates authority to Corporate Director – Homes and Adult Social Care to procure and award the new contract commencing April 2026, in consultation with Cabinet Member for Homes.

The meeting concluded at 4.35pm

