

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**POLICY, RESOURCES & GROWTH COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 19 JANUARY 2017**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD, HOVE, BN3 3BQ**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Morgan (Chair), Hamilton (Deputy Chair), G Theobald (Opposition Spokesperson), Mac Cafferty (Group Spokesperson), Gibson, Janio, Mitchell, A Norman, Meadows and Wealls

**PART ONE**

**97 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**(a) Declarations of Substitutes**

97.1 Councillor Gison was present in substitution for Councillor Sykes.

**(b) Declarations of Interest**

97.2 There were no declarations of interests in matters listed on the agenda.

**(c) Exclusion of Press and Public**

97.3 The Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any of the items listed on the agenda.

97.4 **RESOLVED:** That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the items contained in part two of the agenda.

**98 MINUTES**

98.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 December 2016 as a correct report.

**99 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

99.1 The Chair noted there were no communications.

**100 CALL OVER**

100.1 The following items were called for discussion:

Item 106 – Life Events Fees and Charges 2017/18

Item 107 – Adoption of The East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan

Item 108 – Royal Pavilion & Museums

Item 109 – New Homes for Neighbourhoods - Housing Co-Op Pilot

Item 111 – Land at Plumpton Hill and Poynings

- 100.2 The Democratic Services Manager confirmed that the items listed above had been reserved for discussion, and that the following reports of the agenda, with the recommendations therein had been agreed and adopted.

Item 103 – Council Tax Base 2017/18

Item 104 – Business Rates Retention Forecast 2017/18

Item 105 – Provision of Financial Services to South Downs National Park Authority

Item 110 – Policy Review Panel - City Council's Urban and Rural Estates

## 101 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### a) Petitions

- 101.1 The Chair noted there was one petition referred from Council on 15 December 2016 in relation to Memorial for the Battle of Boar's Head. The Chair read the following response:

“Following the petition presented by Ms A. Scales presented at full Council on 15 December 2016, which received unanimous backing from all parties, I am proposing that we take the action requested in the petition. Having spoken to the petitioner I have established that she has an agreed design and an estimate of £2500 for the supply and manufacture of the memorial by a local artist.

I believe it is right that the city recognises the sacrifice of those men from Brighton & Hove who gave their lives in this action a hundred years ago, the day before the Battle of the Somme. Therefore I propose we give Officers delegated authority to proceed with this project, with a contribution of up to £2000, with a contribution from fundraising organised by the petitioner of at least £500.

- 101.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee authorise Officers to proceed with the project, and a contribution of up to £2000 be made, on the basis that the petitioner fundraise at least £500.

### b) Public Questions

- 101.3 The Chair noted there were four public questions; he asked Elijah Peart to put her question to the Committee.
- 101.4 Elijah Peart asked: “The proposed cuts to the youth collective target specialised services which exist for young people who may have more complicated or demanding needs than others. The help and understanding provided by these specialist youth workers is often vital in preparing these young people for adult life, with many young people quoting the Youth Collective as invaluable in their efforts to find work. How will

you reconcile the fact that many young people cannot find work without the help of these professionals with Labour's manifesto pledge to eradicate youth unemployment in the city?"

- 101.5 The Chair replied: "The services provided by the Youth Collective and by the more targeted in-house youth service have been much valued and given the options of not having to reduce our spending by £23 million in the coming year we would not have proposed the funding reductions to these services. This is a consequence of large cuts to our central government grants. There are a large number of services that we have to provide according to rules set out by government. There are also huge demands on our budget for example children and adult social care and temporary housing that we have to meet. Much of the youth service is not statutory and we find ourselves in the unfortunate position of not being able to afford to run such a wide ranging service anymore. There will however continue to be a number of services still available for young people who have additional needs. You ask in particular about our pledge to eradicate youth unemployment. You may not be aware that the staff who provide employment service at youth centres are part of the Youth Employability Service and there are no proposed reductions to this service which has been very successful in tackling youth unemployment. The latest data for November 2016 showed that in Brighton & Hove that just 3.6% of young people were not in education or employment compared to a South East average of 8% and a West Sussex average of 11%. In addition the most recent data for apprenticeships shows that we have had an increase in 20% in apprenticeships and there is lots of work taking place at the moment to support the city pledge of 1000 apprenticeships in 1000 days. Finally I am very pleased that the East Sussex Learning Network has just secured funding from the HEFCE to support young people from the most disadvantaged areas city get into higher education and training and they'll be looking to us and to voluntary sector to co create programmes and opportunities."
- 101.6 By way of a supplementary question Elijah Peart asked: "You mentioned that there are other services that will be able to pick up the slack left by the reduction to services. Youth Employability Services sees about 300 young people currently and the services being cut see up to 3000 people. If even 10% of that user base ends up going to the Youth Employability Service that is already double the number of young people who are using those services. That's unsustainable and with future cuts more than likely to come from central government how is the increased demand going to be mitigated?"
- 101.7 The Chair replied: "As I say we are not proposing any cuts to the Youth Employability Service but obviously we are facing cuts to our youth service as a whole which are not ones we would have chosen. The blame does lie with central government we would be investing in those youth services not cutting them if the Government were not taking tens of millions of pounds out of our funding each year. As I have said before the budget is always changing and we will always continue to work on how we can continue to fund and support youth services in the short and medium term with the aim of them becoming self-sustaining. The consultation launched this week will help us do that and I hope that you and the other young people present and elsewhere will contribute to that. We don't fund services as a council that don't have value, that don't deliver some long term benefit or offset future costs as you say. I'd say that the Government do need to listen not just to politicians like me but to young people like you who are going to be effected by the cuts they are passing down to us. So today I'm

inviting you and the other young people here today to come with me and Peter Kyle MP to 10 Downing Street in early February to deliver that message direct to government.”

- 101.8 The Chair asked Max Cole-Morley to put his question to the Committee.
- 101.9 Max Cole-Morley asked: “Research has suggested that the voluntary youth services which will lose 80% of their funding actually save the council £5.56 for every £1 spent by the council. If there isn't enough money available for preventative youth work, where will the money be coming from for the necessary crisis management after services are cut?”
- 101.10 The Chair replied: “As I said to the previous question we very much value the work that the voluntary sector has provided for young people and as a previous long-term trustee of the Crew Club, I’m really aware of the value that those services bring. Although we’re proposing a service cut here we’re anticipating that a substantial amount of the work will continue as the sector receives money from a variety of different sources. There will continue to be preventative work done to support young people who are facing difficulties by schools and colleges and the community and voluntary sector many of whom do this already without financial support from the council and via council services such as the Youth Employability Service, ‘Are You OK’ our substance misuse service, our adolescent service and our youth offending service.”
- 101.11 By way of a supplementary question Max Cole-Morley asked: “What seems clear is that when it is viewed as necessary the council can find money from somewhere this is illustrated by the fact that Brighton & Hove City Council executive team earn almost £1.5 million/ year. This means that a reduction of approximately 30% in yearly executive wages would create enough money to fund the youth service at risk of an 80% cut. How can it be that our council’s think it’s acceptable to have a Chief Executive who earns more than the Prime Minister while slashing the budgets of services which ensure the wellbeing of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged members of our community?”
- 101.12 The Chair replied. “Obviously we have a very large budget to manage and our salaries are set very much in-line with other salaries around the country with similar authorities we are not out of step in-fact we’re slightly below. There are always suggestions that we get and if you look at our budget pages there is reasoning behind why we can’t make some savings that people always approach me about. Youth services are not statutory services a lot of authorities have long since stepped out of providing and funding youth services. As I’ve said before we’re committed to continuing to help and provide what transitional funding we can and I know my colleague Councillor Dan Chapman will be talking about that next week. It is very difficult and as I said in response to the previous question we wouldn’t be choosing to make these cuts if we weren’t facing £23 million in savings because cuts from this Government and the huge pressure in social care which we’ve got. It’s a very difficult situation with very difficult choices that we have to make. I would hope that as I said in response to the previous question that you will join us in coming to London to make the case to Government.”
- 101.13 The Chair asked Seb Royle to put his question to the Committee.

- 101.14 Seb Royle asked: “Services for young people have already been massively depleted over the past 6 years, with the proposed 80% cut in funding sounding the death knell for voluntary youth work in our city. With £45 million of cuts still to come in the next three years, will there be anything left for young people in 2020?”
- 101.15 The Chair replied: “As I said in response to the previous question we certainly hope so and other authorities have made sure that youth services do continue even where they’ve reduced or removed their funding altogether. It’s a process which I think we should have started a number of years ago in transitioning more of youth services out to the community and voluntary sector and it’s a great shame that we are at this point where we have to propose these reductions. We are committed to ensuring young people who are facing difficulties are able to receive support to help them. The services that I’ve referred to in my previous responses will continue to operate across the city and as I say we will continue to work with you and youth organisations across the city to keep as much as we can going.”
- 101.16 By way of a supplementary question Seb Royle asked: “Statutory services will continue to exist however the cuts proposed to non-statutory services will lead to a vast rise in demand for already underfunded and overwhelmed such as CAMHS and Are You OK as the 100s if not 1000s of young people who rely on youth services search for it elsewhere. There is every possibility that this lack of support will lead to increase suicide attempts by young people as well as rising drug abuse and gang violence. As a politician I think that it’s important that you should seek the support of young people, how can any young people support a party –any party- which has played a part in taking the safety net away from their futures?”
- 101.17 The Chair replied. “The points you made about suicide prevention and drug misuse, those services are statutory and those service are ones which we are continuing to fund. I absolutely agree with you that these services are of value and we wouldn’t be cutting them if we had the choice and if you’re looking to lay the blame anyway the blame lies in Westminster with the current government and again I’m hoping that you will join me us to taking the protest to the Conservative Government in a couple of weeks’ time and making sure they understand just the impact that their cuts are having.”
- 101.18 The Chair asked Boudicca Pepper to put her question to the Committee.
- 101.19 Boudicca asked: “The council seems to expect existing statutory services, such as CAMHS, as well as schools and colleges, to pick up the slack once the youth services are cut. How does the council expect these services to cope with the inevitable rise in demand caused by cuts to youth services without increased funding?”
- 101.20 The Chair replied: “We are in discussion with our partners about how we can redesign our services in the context of reduced funding in order to continue to provide support for our children and young people and as I say that is an active and ongoing process as we go up to the budget. You mention CAMHS, we’ve been working very closely with health commissioners to make sure we can provide support for young people with emotional and mental health needs. We want to move away from a clinic based service which many people decide to no longer access to early support in schools and in communities. To achieve this last year we started to work in three of our secondary

schools with mental health workers being based in schools. This has been successful and has led to a reduction CAMHS referrals so we are at the moment rolling this out across all of our secondary schools. This will not cost more money but it will reach more young people.”

101.21 By way of a supplementary question Boudicca Pepper asked: “What about the young people who have had a referral and who’ve taken the help from the schools and are still on a waiting list. What do you suggest they do in the meantime if there isn’t a parent or a youth worker or somewhere they can go?”

101.22 The Chair replied. “I’m happy to set up a meeting between yourself and Councillor Caroline Penn who you may know is our lead member for mental health services and who is also now stepping up to become deputy chair of the Children and Young People’s Committee. Councillor Penn can go into this in more detail, explaining exactly what the service is and what we are doing to improve the service.”

101.23 The Chair noted there were no more items listed under Public involvement.

## **102 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **Member Questions**

110.1 Councillor Mac Cafferty asked: “Can the Chair of this committee please outline where the Labour administration is in making clear what non-core designations are in relation to Downland?”

110.2 The Chair provided the following written answer: “The report on this agenda titled “Policy Review Panel – City Council’s Urban and Rural estates” addresses this question through the NoM presented to December PRG by the Conservative and Green groups. This requested a Policy Review Panel to look at governance and policy with respect to the City’s urban and rural estates and will include a review of the respective sections of the Corporate Property Strategy & Asset Management Plan 2014-18 (AMP) agreed by December Policy, Resources & Growth Committee as they concern Downland asset definition and disposal.

This clarification will be addressed through the Policy Review Panel and the PRG report explains how the Policy Review Panel is proposed to be set up and it is proposed that this aspect will be part of the scoping exercise and terms of reference to be agreed at the first meeting of the cross party Policy Review Panel.”

### **Notices of Motion**

110.3 Councillor G. Theobald noted that the whole area of asset management needed Member oversight, he hoped that a formal Asset Management Panel would be set up, but noted that this could be one of the recommendations from the policy review panel.

110.4 Councillor Mitchell noted, it her expectation, that the policy panel would undertake a task and finish scoping exercise which would inform a new permanent Asset Management Panel.

110.5 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note both Notices of Motion.

**103 COUNCIL TAX BASE 2017/18**

103.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Approves this report for the calculation of the council's tax base for the year 2017/18.
- 2) Approves the collection rate increase of 0.05% to 98.33%
- 3) Agrees that in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amounts calculated by Brighton & Hove City Council as its council tax base for the year 2017/18 shall be as follows:-
  - a) Brighton and Hove in whole – 87,388.8 (as detailed in appendix 1)
  - b) Royal Crescent Enclosure Committee – 29.0 (as detailed in appendix 2)
  - c) Hanover Crescent Enclosure Committee – 41.6 (as detailed in appendix 2)
  - d) Marine Square Enclosure Committee – 72.5 (as detailed in appendix 2)
  - e) Parish of Rottingdean – 1,545.2 (as detailed in appendix 2)
- 4) Agrees that for the purposes of Section 35(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the expenses of meeting the special levies issued to the council by the Enclosure Committees shall be its special expenses.
- 5) Agrees that the Enclosure Committees and Rottingdean Parish are paid the required council tax reduction grant of c£5,000 in total, to ensure they are no better or no worse off as a result of the introduction of the council tax reduction scheme for the reasons set out in paragraph 3.7.

**104 BUSINESS RATES RETENTION FORECAST 2017/18**

104.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee:

- 1) Notes that the amount forecast to be received by the council in 2017/18 from its share of local business rates and section 31 (Local Government Act 2003) compensation grants is £59.284m, based on the latest data. This is £0.994m above the forecast used in the December 2016 budget update report.
- 2) Delegates the submission of the final business rates forecast and the NNDR1 2017/18 form to the Executive Director of Finance & Resources following consultation with the Chair of this Committee for the reasons given in paragraph 1.2.

**105 PROVISION OF FINANCIAL SERVICES TO SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

105.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee Authorises the Executive Director of Finance & Resources to enter into a 3-year contract, with a possible 2-year extension, for the continued provision of Corporate Financial Services to the South Downs National Park Authority from 1 April 2017.

**106 LIFE EVENTS FEES AND CHARGES 2017/18**

106.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Lead Officer for Strategy, Governance & Law in relation to Life Events Fees and Charges 2017/18. The report set out the proposed fees and charges for the financial year 2017/18 for Bereavement Services, Registration Services and Local Land Charges within Life Events, in Strategy Governance & Law (SGL).

106.2 In response to Councillor Wealls it was clarified that benchmarking had been undertaken against the same group of authorities, to assist in setting the fees in recent years, usually this was neighbouring authorities; however, an agreed methodology for selecting benchmarking authorities could be agreed for future years.

106.3 In relation to Councillor Mac Cafferty's specific questions about Bereavement Services fees and charges, it was agreed that the full responses would be provided after the meeting.

106.4 Councillor A. Norman commended the excellent service in Bereavement Services, and she noted that the staff were very caring. She welcomed the reference in the report that proposed no charges be introduced for burial or cremation of children.

106.5 The Chair put the recommendations to the vote.

106.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee:

- 1) Approves a general inflationary increase of 2% on all Life Events fees and Charges for the financial year 2017/18 save for the exceptions set out at 2.2 below;.
- 2) Approves a proposal to increase Bereavement Services burial charges by 5%, Registration Services fees and charges by 5%, and a proposed increase of £5.00 on each Local Land Charges search fee for the financial year 2017/18 as detailed in Appendices 1 - 3.

**107 ADOPTION OF THE EAST SUSSEX, SOUTH DOWNS AND BRIGHTON & HOVE WASTE AND MINERALS SITES PLAN**

107.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture in relation to Adoption of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan. The purpose of the report is to inform the Committee and Council of the outcome of the Public Examination of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (WMSP), and seek approval for the formal adoption of the Plan.



- 107.2 In response to Councillor Mac Cafferty, in relation to the reconciliation of imports, it was explained that the only feasible site was on the East Sussex/Kent boarder, a review would needed to be conducted once the policy was adopted to ensure compliance.
- 107.3 Councillor Janio highlighted his view that Hangleton Bottom was not an appropriate site for commercial waste transfer as identified in the plan; he proposed an amendment to remove the references to Hangleton Bottom in the report. He invited Councillor Hamilton to second the amendment as the site was close to the Ward he represented.
- 107.4 The Monitoring Officer highlighted that as the plan was a joint plan it had to be unilaterally agreed; were Brighton & Hove to amend it, it would mean that the plan would have to go back to a drafting stage as it should be approved as recommended by the Inspector.
- 107.5 Councillor Hamilton noted that he would not second or support the amendment as residents were happy with the current situation at the site.
- 107.6 Councillor G. Theobald formally seconded the amendment, he noted that the Conservative Group had voted against the inclusion of the site of many occasions and he argued that residents would prefer the site to be used for housing.
- 107.7 The Chair put the proposed amendment to the vote. This was **not carried** with 4 in support and 6 against.
- 107.8 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote. These were **carried** with 6 in support and 4 against.
- 107.9 **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND – That Council:**
- 1) Note the responses to the consultation on main modifications to the WMSP and contents of the Inspector's Report with his conclusion that the WMSP is legally compliant and 'sound';
  - 2) Adopt the WMSP, incorporating the Main Modifications and minor modifications, as part of the Development Plan for the City, subject to the Head of City Planning agreeing any further minor non-material changes to the text of the Waste and Minerals Plan with East Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.

## 108 ROYAL PAVILION & MUSEUMS

- 108.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture in relation to Royal Pavilion & Museums. The purpose of the report was to update members on work to establish a new governance model for the Royal Pavilion & Museums (RPM) and seek approval to begin the process to move the Royal Pavilion & Museums into a newly established charitable trust for culture in Brighton & Hove.

- 108.2 The Chair thanked all Officers that had worked on this project to date; the Pavilion was the city's most famous asset and the decision before the Committee was of hugely importance significance, but would ensure the Royal Pavilion and Museums were preserved for years to come.
- 108.3 Councillor G. Theobald welcomed the report, in response to queries it was explained that the next steps included establishing the role profiles for the trustees, then undertaking advertising to make appointments; the final appointments would then be signed off at Leaders' Group.
- 108.4 In response to Councillor Wealls it was confirmed that the Council would seek to achieve the best solution for the transfer of staff to the trust. In response to further questions it was confirmed that the savings for this financial year had already been taking into account and delivered, and there had been agreement made by the Committee in a previous report to put future savings on hold as part of investment in the future model – across the whole first five years it was envisaged the trust would generate a surplus.
- 108.5 Councillor Janio noted he was very supportive of the report and congratulated the current and previous Administration's for their work on this. In relation to the governance it was confirmed that the board would be 9 or 12 members, with elected Councillors being in a minority.
- 108.6 In response to Councillor Mac Cafferty it was explained that rules and regulations in relation to the governance of collections would be written into agreements with the board; lending on a national and international level would continue to assist in raising the profile of the Royal Pavilion and Museums.
- 108.7 The Chair put the recommendations to the vote.
- 108.8 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee
- 1) Approve the establishment of a charitable trust for arts and culture in Brighton & Hove into which the Royal Pavilion & Museums will move in April 2018.
  - 2) Agree that a shadow/interim board of Trustees is established from April 2017, which will include Member appointments to be agreed by the Council.
  - 3) Grant delegated authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture, Executive Lead Officer Strategy, Governance & Law, and Executive Director Finance & Resources to work with the shadow board to prepare all documents required in order to:
    - Establish the new charitable trust for arts and culture in Brighton & Hove;
    - Agree a 25 year funding agreement with the trust, reviewable every 5 years;
    - Agree for the Royal Pavilion & Museums portfolio buildings to be leased to the trust for a period of 25 years, with the City Council retaining the freehold ownership of all buildings;
    - Transfer the operational management services into the new trust;

- Loan the Royal Pavilion & Museums' collections to the trust and for any new acquisitions to be held by the trust.
- 4) To note that a further report will be brought to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee, expected early 2018, which will outline the final heads of terms of the legal and commercial agreements and to seek final approval to establish the new charitable trust.
  - 5) To note that formal consultation will be undertaken with affected staff and unions regarding the details of the proposed transfer to the trust, and with funding partners including Arts Council England.
  - 6) To note that a roadmap will be prepared with Brighton Dome and Festival Ltd to consider the merger of the two trusts to establish a single 'cultural trust' for the city within 4 years of the charitable trust being established.

### 109 NEW HOMES FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS - HOUSING CO-OP PILOT

- 109.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing in relation to New Homes for Neighbourhoods - Housing Co-op Pilot. The Chair also noted that the report had been considered by the Housing & New Homes Committee on 18 January 2017; as set in the associated extract. This report now sought approval to lease the Plumpton Road former garage site to Bunker Housing Co-operative in order to self-build two family homes for rent, which will be let within affordable rent levels to applicants from the Homemove register and to which the council will be able to nominate future tenants.
- 109.2 Councillor Gibson highlighted the credentials of the scheme, and noted that the rents were as low as 75% of the local housing allowance. There was no cost in terms of borrowing, and the model was worth exploring as a means to bring down costs at other locations. He hoped the Committee would support the report.
- 109.3 Councillor G. Theobald welcomed the report and felt the work was very positive.
- 109.4 Councillor Meadows, as Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee, noted that Officers had been able to learn a lot about housing co-ops through this work. She noted that this report met recommendations from the Fairness Commission, and offered alternative affordable housing in the city at zero cost to the Council. She hoped the Committee would support the report in full.
- 109.5 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote.
- 109.6 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee take note and approve the recommendations as set out below, as recommended for approval by Housing and New Homes Committee, that:
- a) The land at Plumpton Road, Brighton BN2 9YL be made available for leasing.
  - b) There be delegated authority to the Executive Directors for Economy, Environment & Culture, Finance and Resources and Neighbourhoods,

Communities & Housing (in consultation with each other) to enter into the necessary contracts with Bunker Housing Co-operative Limited to lease the former council housing garage site at Plumpton Road, Brighton BN2 9YL, to secure the building of two new homes for rental by the co-op. The granting of the lease is subject to Bunker obtaining planning consent, funding and entering into a nominations agreement with the council.

## **110 POLICY REVIEW PANEL - CITY COUNCIL'S URBAN AND RURAL ESTATES**

110.1 **RESOLVED** - That a Policy Review Panel is set up to consider the governance and policy with respect to the city's urban and rural estates as set out in 1.2 above and that an outcome report is brought back to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee aiming for late Spring once the review has been completed.

## **111 LAND AT PLUMPTON HILL AND POYNINGS**

111.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture in relation to Land at Plumpton Hill and Poynings. A joint amendment was presented to December 2016 Policy, Resources & Growth (PRG) Committee by the Green and Conservative Groups requesting that an urgent report be brought to the January 2017 committee meeting detailing alternative options in relation to the approved proposed disposals that include these 2 pieces of land referred to in Policy & Resources Committee February 2016, and that options take account of any impact affecting the Stanmer Park Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) bid. This report was complemented by a separate report in Part Two of the Agenda.

111.2 In response to Councillor Janio it was confirmed that the report in July 2014 July 2016 related to the funding and refurbishment of the Home Farm traditional agricultural buildings. Councillor Janio went on to highlight to shift to consider the Council's assets in terms of social value, and noted the desire of all group to improve Stanmer Park. He noted the differing views being put forward by residents, and welcomed the policy review panel that had been agreed by the previous item. He went on to note that, given the amendments from both the Conservative & Green Groups, he felt a joint amendment could be put forward.

111.3 At this point to Committee took a short adjournment to agree the wording for the new proposed joint amendment.

111.4 Councillor Mitchell noted her concern that any amendment could undermine the HLF bid to support the wider Stanmer Park project.

111.5 Councillor G. Theobald stated his view that this would not adversely affect the HLF bid, and that an urgency sub-committee could be convened were this to the case. He went to note his concern in relation to some of the language in the report that the Council sought to raise capital from the disposal of assets, and that this could signify the first stage of a wider disposal of down land assets.

111.6 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally proposed a joint amendment on behalf of the Green and Conservative Groups.

- 111.7 Councillor G. Theobald formally seconded the amendment.
- 111.8 Councillor Hamilton highlighted sections of the Council's Asset Management Plan, and noted that this had received cross-party support at Committee. He went on to note that the sites were not farms and as such were considered 'non-core assets'; the capital value of the sites was over 100 times the annual rent. The Poynings site did not have public access. The Plumpton site had been managed by the college for over 60 years; had statutory Rights of Way access; it was protected by virtue of being within the South Downs National Park area, and the proposed sale price was low given the restricted use.
- 111.9 Councillor Gibson noted that he considered there was insufficient information in the report for the Committee to take the decision. The returns referenced in the report did not make allowances for capital growth, and he felt that the option of exploring borrowing in relation to the HLF match funding had not been properly explored given the current very low interest rates.
- 111.10 Councillor Mac Cafferty stated his view that other alternatives to selling these pieces of land had not been properly considered by the Committee in the past.
- 111.11 Councillor Janio stated that the Conservative Group wanted the land to be in the ownership whoever could best utilise it, but he felt there was not enough information before the Committee to allow them to take a pragmatic approach. There was no information in relation to the social value of the land; however, the policy panel would consider all this information as part of a full review.
- 111.12 Councillor Mitchell highlighted that the sale of the land had been brought about in a coherent way and followed agreed Council policy. She noted that the proposed amendment would make the position in relation to Stanmer Park project uncertain. The Administration were fully prepared to work with the Opposition through the policy review panel to work through the issue as quickly as possible.
- 111.13 The Chair then put the joint amendment to the vote. This was **carried** with 6 in support and 4 abstentions.
- 111.14 The Chair then put the amendment recommendations to the vote. These were **carried**.
- 111.15 **RESOLVED:**
- 1) That Committee notes the further requested information, analysis and consequences regarding these two pieces of land,
  - 2) That the two sites be referred to the policy review and the decision referred to the back to the PRG for decision.
  - 3) That with regards to the HLF Stanmer Park project, a report be brought to Committee outlining alternative options for meeting the match funding requirement.

## 112 ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

112.1 There were no items referred to Council.

**113 LAND AT PLUMPTON HILL AND POYNINGS - EXEMPT CATEGORY 3**

113.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the information contained in the Part Two report.

**114 PART TWO MINUTES**

114.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the Part Two minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 December 2016.

**115 PART TWO PROCEEDINGS**

115.1 **RESOLVED:** That the information contained Part Two, Items 113 & 114 remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 6.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of