

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

TOURISM, DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE

4.00pm 8 MARCH 2018

HOVE TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBER - HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor; Robins (Chair), Cattell (Deputy Chair), Nemeth (Opposition Spokesperson), Druitt (Group Spokesperson), Allen, Mac Cafferty, Morris, O'Quinn, C Theobald and Peltzer Dunn

PART ONE

51 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

51(a) Declarations of substitutes

51.1 Councillor Peltzer Dunn declared that he was in attendance for Councillor Mears.

51(b) Declaration of interests

51.2 There were none.

51(c) Exclusion of the press and public

51.3 There were no Part Two items on the agenda.

52 MINUTES

52.1 **Resolved:** That the Committee agreed that the minutes were a correct record of the previous meeting.

53 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

53.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that it was International Women's Day.

53.2 "Arts - Brighton Festival"

I spoke at the launch of this year's Brighton Festival, at the Dome on 15th February, drawing attention to the importance of the festival to the city, in raising our national and international reputation as a city and attracting visitors through home grown and international arts of the highest quality. I welcomed the fact that the Festival is making even more commitment to our local communities. 'Your Place' is back for a second year

in Hangleton and East Brighton, building on last year's success and Without Walls is also returning to East Hill Park. In addition, 'pay it forward' (which was generously supported by 1500 people in 2017) is returning this year, and this is a model which I know has real potential to make a difference to people who would find accessing the festival difficult and there is a commitment to developing it further in the emerging Cultural Framework. The continued support of Arts Council England, our key stakeholder partner in funding cultural activities across the city, is vital to enabling the festival to happen and I was joined on the stage by their Area Director, Hedley Swain, who made reference to Brighton & Hove's high level of cultural engagement amongst residents. The event was well attended, with many people keen to hear about the plans of David Shrigley, who is this year's Guest Director - an internationally renowned artist who has made his home here. I am really looking forward to attending as much as possible of the festival, and I hope I will see many of the members of the committee at the events.

53.3 **Tourism**

In the last 3 months Visit Brighton and its partners have:

- Hosted journalists that has resulted in coverage in: Olive; i News; Good Things; The Gentleman's Journal and Vegetarian Living.
- Hosted 20 press trips for journalists notably including: Olive Magazine (UK), West Jet Airline (Canada); Marie Claire (UK); Scandinavian Influencers Group and National Geographic (China)

Visit Brighton has seen 300,000 page views to visitbrighton.com and engaged with 58k followers on Twitter, 24.5k friends on Facebook and 10k followers on Instagram Since the start of the financial year, VisitBrighton Convention Bureau handled 165 conference enquiries, confirming 54 enquiries, estimated to generate £39m in economic benefit. These include:

- National HIV Nurses Assoc Annual Congress – Oct 2018 – 400 delegates
- Institute of Translating and Interpreting Annual Conference – May 2019 – 400 delegates
- British Society of Immunology Annual Conference – Dec 2020 -100 delegates
- British Medical Association Annual Conference –June 2020 – 800 delegates
- SOLACE Summit - October 2018 – 400 delegates

Looking ahead to English Tourism Week, 17-25 March 2018, this will start in dramatic fashion with a charity abseil down the i360, in aid of Rockinghorse, for the neo-natal baby unit. Our partners will be promoting a range of events during the week, including the opening of the new Palm Court Restaurant on the Palace Pier, and the week will conclude with events on Madeira Drive.”

54 **CALL OVER**

54.1 All items were reserved for discussion.

55 **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

55.1 The Chair invited Diane Montgomery to ask a question on behalf of the Living Rent Campaign:

“The Living Rent Campaign asks why so many new private housing developments are given planning permission without meeting the council 40% quota of affordable housing, and notes that new developments in the city are aimed at the luxury market and do little to address the serious housing crisis in the area.

We also note that 80% of market rent is unrealistic for ordinary people. We suggest that the council develop affordable rented guidance based on 60% of the local market rents to define affordable (and the figure should be no more than the LHA), and that the council gives priority to allocate new affordable social housing to the council as opposed to housing associations, many of which are now no longer addressing real social need.”

55.2 The Chair responded:

“The City Plan is seeking to secure 40% affordable housing on all schemes of more than 15 homes. The Plan also seeks a mix of affordable housing types to meet local needs but definitions for affordable housing are set out in national planning guidance (the NPPF). This defines affordable housing to include affordable rent (no more than 80% of local market rent); social rented housing and intermediate housing for sale or rent (e.g. shared ownership). In many cases, the council has been successful in securing affordable housing with rents capped at LHA levels (around 60% market rents)

“This Committee is not able to influence the affordability of housing developments that are brought forward by private developers in the city centre or elsewhere, other than by seeking affordable housing provision through policies in our adopted City Plan.

“It is acknowledged that affordable housing delivery in the city has proven more challenging in recent years due to changes in the way that affordable housing is funded and viability factors in scheme delivery. The government’s NPPF allows a developer to make a case for less affordable housing to be delivered when it can be shown that delivering more would impact upon the overall viability of the development. This Committee recently agreed a move to an “open book” approach on viability assessments. Where planning applications are not offering 40% quotas, viability statements will have to be presented at the time of application, and follow a standard methodology in terms of scope and type of information supplied, This will increase accountability and transparency where applications fall under the 40% quota.

“The challenge of meeting affordable housing need in the city is also being addressed through a range of initiatives that go beyond planning policy. Examples include the council’s £118m Joint Venture which will deliver 500 homes for rent for working Brighton & Hove residents on low incomes, and 500 shared ownership homes affordable to buy for Brighton & Hove residents on average incomes. The council’s New Homes for Neighbourhood programme is delivering council owned rented accommodation on council sites and the Hidden Homes initiative converting unused space in existing blocks to create additional affordable rented housing.

“Allocations to all new affordable rented properties are through the council’s Homemove system based on the council’s adopted allocations policy. The council is already

exploring the viability of the council becoming the registered provider for affordable housing elements within new developments.”

- 55.3 Diane Montgomery stated that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that affordable rents were up to 80% of market rates which left leeway to demand under 60% of market rates She asked if the council had achieved under 60% rents and if there any evidence could be provided.
- 55.4 The Chair asked the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture to respond.
- 55.5 The Executive Director stated that in many cases the council had been successful in securing rates lower than 80% and the aims was to achieve 60% of market rates. The Executive Director stated that did not have exact figures to hand but could provide a more detailed answer through the Chair.

56 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

- 56.1 The Chair noted that eight questions from Members had been received and that the formal responses to the questions had been published in the addendum and invited supplementary questions.

(i) Royal Pavilion – Councillor Nemeth

- 56.2 Councillor Nemeth thanked the Chair for his response and states he appreciated how difficult it had been to convey the risks to the Pavilion’s future and to win the support of staff. He encouraged the Chair to persevere with a cross party approach.

(ii) King Alfred – Councillor Nemeth

- 56.3 Councillor Nemeth asked why no contract had yet been signed despite approval to commence with the development being given over two years ago.
- 56.4 On behalf of the Chair officers responded that terms of the contract where being clarified. It was expected that a final contract would be agreed in April 2018.

(iii) Notice to Beach Hut owners of increased fees – Councillor Nemeth

- 56.5 Councillor Nemeth stated that he was pleased that the annual fee for Beach Huts had now been dropped and asked if the increased transfer fee should have been considered as an increased fee when the committee considered the fees and charges report in January 2018 as this had increased from an £82 administration fee to a £2,500 transfer fee.
- 56.7 On behalf of the Chair the Legal Adviser to the Committee stated that she would provide a written response to the question.

(iv) Marlborough House – Councillor Nemeth

- 56.8 Councillor Nemeth asked that the Chair update the committee on any progress at the next meeting.

56.9 The Chair agreed to update the committee through his Chair's Communications.

(v) Sculpture Trail – Councillor Nemeth

56.10 Councillor Nemeth asked if the Chair would meet with himself and Councillor Peltzer Dunn as Wish Ward Councillors and the Chair of Hove Civic Society to provide an update on progress.

56.11 The Chair stated that he would be happy to meet with the Councillors and the Chair of Hove Civic Society to discuss the sculpture trail.

(vi) Hippodrome – Councillor Nemeth

56.12 Councillor Nemeth asked that given the prominence of the Hippodrome and the current owner's neglect did the Chair share his surprise that tougher enforcement action has not been taken.

56.13 The Chair responded that the council was currently in the process of contacting the owner which it had to do before enforcement action could go ahead.

(vii) Planning Enforcement – Councillor Nemeth

56.14 Councillor Nemeth asked that the number of pending planning enforcement cases could be sent to him as these were not present in the answer.

56.15 The Chair confirmed that they would be.

56.16 Councillor Nemeth asked what had caused the number of cases solved per month to fall over the last six months.

56.17 Officers responded that there were peaks and troughs throughout the year and that these were caused by a number of factors.

(viii) The Big Screen – Councillor Mears

56.18 Councillor Peltzer Dunn on behalf of Councillor Mears asked if a timetable of the consultation process which was detailed in the written response could be provided.

56.19 The Chair responded that a written answer would be sent to Councillor Mears.

57 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE AND DRAFT REGULATION 123 LIST

57.1 Officers introduced the report. Responses to the consultation which stated that the proposed charges were either too high or manageable had been received in equal numbers. Two changes had been made to the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy

(CIL) scheme following consultation; a reduced rate for purpose built student accommodation and a nil rate for strategic sites.

- 57.2 The Chair noted that the Conservative Group had submitted an amendment to the recommendations and asked Councillor Nemeth to move the amendment.
- 57.3 Councillor Nemeth stated that he had proposed the amendment as he felt that designating King Alfred as a strategic site and charging a nil rate CIL was not justified by abnormal costs however after discussion with Officers he had decided to withdraw the amendment. Councillor Nemeth stated that while he was not fully convinced of the abnormal costs associated with King Alfred he was satisfied that the Developer would still be required to make a Section 106 contribution.
- 57.4 Councillor Druitt asked what the value of the lost CIL was for the strategic sites if they were charged a nil rate and if Officers had given any consideration to redrawing the boundaries of the charging zones so that the site fell into a lower rate area.
- 57.5 Officers responded that the nil rate had been included in the charging schedule because of the significant abnormal costs associated with some sites and to recognise the significant positive externalities generated by development on these sites. All the strategic sites identified were in zone 1 which had the highest rates and where there was a lot of significant development so redrawing the zone 1 boundary without excluding other development would not have been possible. Officers stated that charging the lowest rate on the schedule would still impact the King Alfred development to the point that it would not be viable.
- 57.6 In response to Councillor Mac Cafferty, Officers stated that water fountains would be covered by the 123 list and that an annual report would be published detailing how CIL income had been spent.
- 57.7 Councillor Mac Cafferty asked if Officers had considered CIL with an open book approach to viability assessments.
- 57.8 Officers stated that the viability assessment undertaken was in line with best practice.
- 57.9 Councillor Theobald stated that she was surprised at the low response rate to the consultation and asked how Local Authorities which had adopted CIL had found the process.
- 57.10 Officers responded that other authorities had provided positive feedback on CIL as its expenditure was less restricted than Section 106 and CIL could be levied across a greater range of developments.
- 57.11 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that Dixon Searle Partnership had recommended charging at £250/m² for purpose built student accommodation in the viability assessment they had provided for the council. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked why the proposed rate had been reduced.
- 57.12 Officers stated that Dixon Searle Partnership's viability assessment had recommended a range for the CIL rate for purpose built student accommodation. The preliminary

charging schedule was at the top of this range. Following responses from Brighton University and Select Property (a student accommodation provider) further viability work was carried out. This further work found that that the rate should be reduced to the lower end of the range.

57.13 Officers also clarified that additional appendixes had not been included in the agenda due to their size but had been published online at the same time as the agenda.

57.14 Resolved:

- 1) That the Committee notes the results of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule CIL Consultation 2017 Report (Appendix 4) and subsequent recommendations arising from the CIL Viability Assessment Addendum (February 2018) (Appendix 3).
- 2) That the Committee agrees to publish the Draft Charging Schedule (Appendix 1) in accordance with regulation 16 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), for six weeks formal consultation, and to authorise the Head of Planning to make any necessary minor editorial/grammatical amendments to the Draft Charging Schedule prior to consultation.
- 3) That the Committee agrees to submit this published Draft Charging Schedule for examination in accordance with regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) unless substantive modifications are required whereupon a Statement of Modifications would be produced and brought to this committee prior to publication.
- 4) That the Committee agrees to publish the draft Regulation 123 List, which sets out a framework of infrastructure which may be funded from the levy (Appendix 2), for a period of six weeks formal consultation and to authorise the Head of Planning to make any necessary minor editorial/grammatical amendments to this list prior to consultation.

58 MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE

- 58.1 Officers updated that Committee on Major Projects in the city highlighting that work had commenced on the Preston Barracks site and that the Hyde Housing/ Brighton & Hove City Council Limited Liability Partnership Board had had its first meeting.
- 58.2 Councillor Mac Cafferty asked what had caused the delay was to work at New England House. The site had been identified as a key [art of the City Deal which had been agreed in 2014.
- 58.3 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Housing responded that the key change since the City Deal had been signed was that the council was now looking at developing New England House along with the adjacent piece of land. This was progressing and the Strategic Delivery Board had been updated and a proposal would be going to Policy, Resources and Growth Committee. The adjacent land was currently used as workshops. The Executive Director stated that nearly 1000 people worked at New England House and that the council understood what an important asset it was to the city; there was no intention to demolish the building but it needed a lot of work.

- 58.4 In response to Councillor Mac Cafferty, Officers stated that while negotiations for the land acquisition for the waterfront development had gone on for some time they were hopeful of being able to bring forward the conditional land acquisition shortly.
- 58.5 In response to Councillor Peltzer Dunn, Officers stated that 'a period' generally referred to the time between reports to the Committee. Officers stated that way major project updates were reported to the Committee was evolving and this may include more detailed timelines.
- 58.6 Councillor Nemeth asked officers to clarify who the partner for the King Alfred development was and why the project completion date had come forward.
- 58.7 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture responded that the bid was a partnership between Crest Nicholson and the Starr Trust but the development contract would be with Crest Nicholson. Officers stated that they believed that expected completion date had been moved forward because of greater clarity around the project.
- 58.8 In response to Councillor Druitt, the Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture stated that there would be seven stages in the land deal for the waterfront project with investment taking place in several stages. The Executive Director stated that officers would be able to brief Members outside of Committee and put more of a focus on the development in future major projects updates.
- 58.9 In response to Councillor O'Quinn, the Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture stated that 20% of the homes being built in the Circus Street project would be affordable.
- 58.10 **Resolved:** That the Committee noted the report

59 UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT OF CITY VISITOR ECONOMY STRATEGY

- 59.1 The Arts & Culture Programme Director updated the Committee on the development of the City Visitor Economy Strategy. The Strategy was currently under development before going out to consultation.
- 59.2 Committee O'Quinn stated that she was pleased to see the strategy incorporate the national park and stated that she hoped the downland would be better utilised as a feature of the city.
- 59.3 Councillor Cattell expressed concerns that the issue of ad hoc accommodation and party houses would be exacerbated by increased visitor numbers and this would need to be addressed.
- 59.4 Officers responded that they agreed with Councillor Cattell's concerns and that some of this would be picked up through accommodation studies.
- 59.5 Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that in 2013 the previous administration established the Tourism Advisory Board with partners from across the city and suggested that it would be beneficial to establish a similar organisation now to help the council consider how Brighton & Hove is advertised as a city. The Councillor also stated that there was

currently a push to promote Local Enterprise Partnership cites such as Bristol and Bath and that Brighton & Hove risked being left behind.

- 59.6 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture responded that although the Tourism Advisory Board had now disbanded the council still worked closely with the Tourism Alliance and with the Hoteliers Association.
- 59.7 Councillor Morris stated that there was a need to promote different areas of the city rather than focus on the seafront and night time economy. Brighton & Hove was still lacking a gallery of modern art and the Fabrica Gallery was struggling to remain financially viable. Councillor Morris also expressed concern that the night time economy actually created relatively little real benefit for the city.
- 59.8 Councillor Druitt agreed with Councillor Morris that there was little opportunity for growth in the night time economy and that a focus on promoting it hid the variety present in the city. Visitors were often not aware of attractions in the city which may have a wider audience such as Preston Manor.
- 59.9 Councillor Druitt asked if officers knew why Brighton & Hove did so well in terms of income per visitor compared to cities like Oxford which attracted more visitors but had lower income from tourism.
- 59.10 Officers responded that visitors who stayed overnight spent a lot more in the city than day trippers as they purchased accommodation, meals etc. Officers stated that there was an initiative to try to package travel and attractions together which would encourage visitors to extend their stay and see different parts of the city. This already existed in other cities but was not something Brighton & Hove currently offered.
- 59.11 Members of the Committee stated that they felt that Queens Road created a negative first and last impression for visitors coming to the city by train. Councillor Peltzer Dunn expressed concern that the proposed strategy did not address this issue.
- 59.12 The Chair agreed that Queens Road was not the city putting its best foot forward however 9 out of 10 visitors still said they would return to the city. He also emphasised that taking a strategic view of the visitor economy was the best way to ensure progress was made and that the council did not just keep doing what it had always done.
- 59.13 Councillor Theobald stated that she felt that the number of major conferences held in the city had fallen. She asked if the disruptions to the Southern Rail service through 2017 had caused a reduction in visitor numbers.
- 59.14 Officers responded that the data for visitor numbers was only available for 2016 and the impact of rail disruptions would not be known until 2019.
- 59.15 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture responded that when Explore GB delegates had come to the city a small budget had been allocated to dress the city which had received positive feedback. A budget had been agreed by Full Council to do more to dress the city for future conferences.

- 59.15 Councillor O'Quinn stated that the council should be doing more to ensure event organisers cleared up fully after events highlighting the Pride street party and half marathon.
- 59.16 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture stated that the presentation outlined the themes of the strategy and the feedback from Members would be incorporated into the strategy. He also stated that more could be done to exploit Brighton & Hove's proximity to other destinations and the proximity of Gatwick Airport; although Brighton & Hove was already the second most popular destination for people arriving at the airport.
- 59.17 The Chair noted that there had been an officer amendment to the recommendations to correct the date of the next committee to 2018 from 2017.
- 59.18 **Resolved:** That the committee notes and comments upon the content of the presentation and the plans for consultation and the further development of the Destination Management Plan, together with the intention to bring a report to its meeting on 21 June 2018, seeing approval to adopt the strategy.

60 UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY CULTURAL FRAMEWORK

- 60.1 The Arts & Culture Programme Director updated the Committee on the development of the City Cultural Framework.
- 60.2 Councillor Mac Cafferty asked what further work had been done since the city had joined Creative England's "Film Friendly Partnership".
- 60.3 Councillor Druitt noted that Brighton & Hove had a high level of home workers and asked what the council could do to support home workers and help them grow their business.
- 60.4 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture stated that homeworkers were a key asset for the city as they diversified the city's economy and meant that the city was not reliant on a single sector providing protection from shocks. The council's Emerging Economy Strategy would address both home workers and the film industry in the city.
- 60.5 Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the city had had an ongoing issue with providing artist studio space. The council had previously pursued a gallery and has explored different funding models which had not come to fruition. He stated that the Framework should contain further discussion of how a new gallery in the city could be achieved.
- 60.6 Councillor Morris stated that he was disappointed that the updated had not shown stronger links with Brighton University as the University had a focus on media and fashion.
- 60.7 Officers responded that there were strong links with Brighton University but the majority of joint work with the universities currently had University of Sussex leads. This was due

to a number of factors including staff turnover at Brighton University and was not indicative of favouring one university over the other.

- 60.8 **Resolved:** That the committee notes and comments upon the content of the presentation and the plans for consultation and further development of the framework, together with the intention to bring a report to its meeting on 21 June 2018, seeing approval to adopt the framework and associated activities.

61 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

- 61.1 There were none.

The meeting concluded at 6.36pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

