

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**COUNCIL****4.30pm 28 JANUARY 2021****VIRTUAL****MINUTES**

Present: Councillors Robins (Chair), Mears (Deputy Chair), Allcock, Appich, Atkinson, Bagaean, Barnett, Bell, Brennan, Brown, Childs, Clare, Davis, Deane, Druitt, Ebel, Evans, Fishleigh, Fowler, Gibson, Grimshaw, Hamilton, Heley, Henry, Hills, Hugh-Jones, Janio, Knight, Lewry, Littman, Lloyd, Mac Cafferty, McNair, Miller, Moonan, Nemeth, Nield, O'Quinn, Osborne, Peltzer Dunn, Phillips, Pissaridou, Platts, Powell, Shanks, Simson, C Theobald, West, Wilkinson, Williams and Yates.

PART ONE**84 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 84.1 Councillor Moonan declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a landlord;
- 84.2 Councillor Hill declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a landlord and tenant;
- 84.3 Councillor Nemeth declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was a tenant and owner of a company that rented out property;
- 84.4 Councillor Brown declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a joint owner of a property that was rented out;
- 84.5 Councillor Mc Cafferty declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was a tenant;
- 84.6 Councillor Williams declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a tenant and member of Acorn;
- 84.7 Councillor Wilkinson declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was a tenant;
- 84.8 Councillor Gibson declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was a lessee of the Council;

- 84.9 Councillor Heley declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a tenant;
- 84.10 Councillor Phillips declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a landlord, in Item 95A Climate Assembly as her partner Councillor Druitt ran a bus company, and in Item 100 a Notice of Motion on COP 26 & Wellbeing of Future Generations as she worked for the Big Issue and she worked for Lord John Bird's parliamentary office who was spearheading the Wellbeing for Future Generations Bill in Westminster;
- 84.11 Councillor Druitt declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was the partner of a landlord; in Item 95A Climate Assembly as he ran a bus company, and in Item 100 a Notice of Motion on COP 26 & Wellbeing of Future Generations as she worked for the Big Issue as his partner worked for Lord John Bird's parliamentary office who was spearheading the Wellbeing for Future Generations Bill in Westminster;
- 84.12 Councillor Osborne declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was a tenant and member of Acorn;
- 84.13 Councillor Peltzer Dunn declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as he was a landlord and said that he would not take part in the debate or in the vote;
- 84.14 Councillor Platts declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a member of Acorn;
- 84.15 Councillor Brennan declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a tenant and a member of Acorn;
- 84.16 Councillor Childs declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 97, a Notice of Motion on Save the Union Learning Fund;
- 84.1 Councillor Davis declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a tenant;
- 84.2 Councillor Pissaridou declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a member of Acorn;
- 84.3 Councillor Powell declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 97, a Notice of Motion on Save the Union Learning Fund as she was a member of Unison;
- 84.4 Councillor Knight declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a member of Acorn;
- 84.5 Councillor Grimshaw declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a member of Acorn;

84.6 Councillor Ebel declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 96, a Notice of Motion on Evictions as she was a tenant;

84.7 No other declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.

85 MINUTES

85.1 The Mayor noted that there were two amendments to the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2020:

- Item 76 had revisions and a copy of those changes had been circulated in the Addendum.
- Paragraphs 70.25 and 70.26 referred to 'curb-side' fly tipping but it should read 'kerb-side'.
- Councillor Hugh-Jones noted that in paragraph 69.23 her name was incorrectly written as 'Hugh-Hugh-Jones'.

85.2 RESOLVED:

- (i) That the minutes of the last ordinary meeting held on the 17 December 2020 as amended were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings;
- (ii) That the minutes of the meeting held on the 22 January 2021 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings.

86 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

86.1 The Mayor gave the following communication:

I don't have any communications. However, a question was raised with me by Councillor Fishleigh about two public questions that were not accepted. One was asking for information held by another public authority that the Council didn't have, and the second one was making assertions that may be perceived as casting imputation on the professional integrity of officers. They were therefore disallowed under our procedures.

87 COVID-19 UPDATE

87.1 The Director of Public Health provided an oral update on Covid-19.

The information provided included:

Testing – This started in February 2020 but was mainly being undertaken in hospitals, but from May 2020 more testing was conducted outside of hospitals with a high number being conducted from December 2020. Around 10,000 tests were currently being undertaken a week. The number of positive tests on 5 January 2021 was 18% but that had fallen to 10.5% by 22 January 2021.

Positive Cases - To date there had been 12,891 positive cases in Brighton & Hove. At the beginning of December the City had a low rate of Covid, but in line with the rest of

the country that rate increased from the end of December 2020, by the beginning of January 2021 there was a peak of 805 positive cases per 100,000 people but it had reduced significantly since then. The number had dropped by 39.7% in the last seven days.

Comparison data – Out of 315 lower tier local authorities in England and Wales, Brighton & Hove were currently ranked 199.

Case rates per age group – The number of cases within every age group in the City had reduced in the last few weeks, the biggest drop was for young adults. There had been a high rate in 60+ but that has also started to come down. The age group with the lowest rate was the 0-14 yr olds. The 60+ rate in Brighton & Hove was a concern as they were the group most likely to require hospitalisation, but that number was reducing but was still above the average for the South East.

Deaths – There had been a significant number of deaths both nationally and locally. Since April 2020 there had been 279 deaths in the City where Covid had been listed on the death certificate. In the week leading up to the 15th January 2021 there had been 27 deaths.

Summary of Current situation – The all-age case rate and percentage of positive tests had fallen rapidly, however the level of infection remained high. Case rate in those aged 60+ had reduced more slowly and remained above the south east average. There had been significant challenges in health and care services. Deaths were still increasing and were likely to remain high for the next few weeks.

88 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.

- 88.1 The Mayor invited the submission of petitions from councillors and members of the public. He reminded the Council that petitions would be referred to the appropriate decision-making body without debate and the person presenting the petition would be invited to attend the meeting to which the petition was referred.
- 88.2 The Mayor noted that one petition had been submitted regarding Hove and Portslade Seafront and invited Ms Andrea Lewis to present the petition.
- 88.3 The Mayor thanked Ms Lewis for presenting the petition and noted that it would be referred to the Policy & Tourism, Equalities, Communities & Culture Committee for consideration.

89 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 89.1 The Mayor reported that 6 written questions had been received from members of the public and invited Mr. Noble to address the council.
- 89.2 Mr Noble asked the following question; Nuclear weapons are not in the councils' mandate, competency or power. Therefore, allowing such debates and wasting the councils' time, makes a large group of residence view it as a joke, when considering the critical role, the council should play in building Brighton & Hove's resilience to COVID-19 (isn't this is more important?).

I therefore ask the Mayor, should such debates be allowed in future and was it correct for this one to proceed in the first place? I note under the rules and procedures that every motion shall be relevant to a matter in relation to which the councillor has duties and power.

- 89.3 The Mayor replied; Thank you for your question Mr Noble. Under the Local Government Act 2000, the Council's functions include anything that affects the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area of Brighton & Hove. They are not limited to services provided by the Council. The powers of the local authority were further extended by the Localism Act 2011 when local authorities were given the general power of competence. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and the risk they carry do potentially affect the wellbeing of people everywhere, including the people of Brighton & Hove. It was therefore within the Council's powers to debate the issue.

I know that there are passionately held views on both sides of the argument. As we have seen in social media and local press, some people agree, and others disagree, about the merits or otherwise of using Council time to debate nuclear weapons. As Mayor, my role is to preside at Council meetings in accordance with the Constitution and not to allow or disallow items just because I like or dislike them. In procedural terms (which is what I am responsible for) there was nothing improper in the Notice of Motion being tabled and debated by full Council. It was therefore perfectly proper to have allowed the item to be debated.

I would also point out that Brighton & Hove is not the only local authority to have discussed the risk of nuclear weapons and passed resolutions. If people agree or disagree with that, that is their right.

- 89.4 Mr Noble asked the following supplementary question; This is not an isolated point nuclear weapons is just one example and I note how long these meetings go on wasting money, offices time well into the night. I understand that councillors do not have confidence in their MPs to represent them and bring forward their national issues however, the disappointment in the national representatives doesn't mean you should turn the council into a national policy talking shop. The council has extremely important things to focus on that affect the daily lives of our residents. Given the public outcry and the length that these meetings can go to will the Mayor use his powers under the Constitution to ensure that the business discussed is relevant to council business in the future?
- 89.5 The Mayor replied; I think you have asked the same question twice and I did give you a full answer to the first question. I can send you a copy of my answer.
- 89.6 The Mayor thanked Mr Noble for his questions and invited Ms Holley to come forward and address the council.
- 89.7 Ms Holley asked the following question; My question is regarding the temporary cycle lanes which went up 8 months ago, particularly along the Old Shoreham Road between the Sackville Road traffic lights and Hangleton Road traffic lights. It was a worthy experiment but is one that has failed as it is not used, there are probably 2 or 3 cyclists per hour and it is causing a great deal of congestion and it is having rather unwelcome, unintended consequences, increased emissions from standing traffic

where people have to wait for two changes of lights instead of one and also people finding ways round using the Old Shoreham Road. I live in Weald Avenue and we notice people coming down our road. What date will this 'Temporary' cycle lane be removed please?

89.8 Councillor Heley replied; A lot of the information you have said is not true and we can send you the data to prove that. The temporary cycle lane on the Old Shoreham Road was put in to provide active travel options for those that wished to exercise and get to work without using Public Transport or the car, which is now, again, incredibly important during this third lock down. A full consultation on a number of active travel measures, including the Old Shoreham Road is about to start and a decision on the cycle lane will then be made at a later committee meeting.

89.9 Ms Holley asked the following supplementary question; I am concerned at what was just said then, that some of the things I have said are not true. Emissions have definitely increased; I can send you information about standing traffic causes higher emissions. The usage is not great it is as I have just stated, there were two petitions about this one for, one against and they came out fairly equally but they were held a very long time ago, but the number of people who signed on behalf of cyclists are just not using it, they are obviously people who don't live in this part of the city.

Can Councillor Heley tell me please why there is not far better signage at the major traffic lights at Hangleton Road where it comes down to Portslade? There are two lanes going up the hill and people don't realise that they are suddenly going to go into one lane and that has actually caused several minor accidents and a great deal of confusion?

89.10 Councillor Heley replied; That is the first I have heard of a complaint about signage, so I am happy to take that away and look into it.

89.11 The Mayor thanked Ms Holley for her questions and invited Mr Kimberley to come forward and address the council.

89.12 Mr Kimberley asked the following question; Last month Councillor Fishleigh asked if new signs could be erected at the access points onto the undercliff so that everyone knows that it is against the law to ride e-scooters down there. A highly unsatisfactory answer was given by the Chair of the Transport committee that e-scooters are a police issue and additional signing would be counterproductive and increase clutter to what is a very scenic environment.

E-scooters are a serious safety issue on the undercliff. What measures will the council take to ensure that the undercliff is a secure place for everyone to use?

89.13 Councillor Heley replied; E-scooters are illegal in the UK on the public highway except on private land or in licensed trials where Local authorities are working with hire operators. The council is not taking part in these at the moment precisely because of their potential for misuse in areas where they are prohibited as well as concerns around safety, access, street clutter and sustainability. Misuse of e-scooters is a matter for Sussex Police, who will prioritise enforcement activity according to available resources as they see fit.

There is already a lot of signage on the undercliff which has been installed at Ward Councillors' requests at various times. Some people say they want more signage and we also get complaints about there being too much signage. If there is still strong local support for some more signs, I would urge ward councillors to get in touch with officers again to discuss this further.

- 89.14 Mr Kimberley asked the following supplementary question; Just really to point out that accidents on the undercliff are most likely to be caused by e-scooters and speeding cyclists. Does the councillor agree that B&H Council should do what it can to protect pedestrians of all ages, all sizes and indeed, all abilities from accidents on the undercliff?
- 89.15 Councillor Heley replied; Yes, of course I agree and we do work with the police quite a lot and this is definitely a matter for them as well.
- 89.16 The Mayor thanked Mr Kimberley for his questions and invited Mr Harris to come forward and address the council.
- 89.17 Mr Harris asked the following question; The appointment of an openly gay leader to the council seemed like a promise of hope to the LGBT community. However, when at last week's housing committee, I made the committee aware of the alarming statistics around LGBT Youth Homelessness, specifically 1 in 4 are affected. This is of grave concern, the answer neither described any existing commitment nor made a new commitment to address the problem. It seems therefore that the housing committee has no interest in developing solutions that address the specific needs of the LGBT community.

Can you tell me if this is the general policy of the Administration in other areas as well?

- 89.18 Councillor Gibson replied; I am addressing you primarily as the Housing Committee representative and I do assure you that we have an interest. In developing the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020-2025 the council carried out a full city-wide consultation with a large number of groups including the LGBT community to seek their views. The housing service will continue to engage with members of the LGBT community in the development of this strategy. Input from community groups will be key to its success. The strategy introduces a new governing structure which includes a member led Homelessness Reduction Board (HRB) which reports to the Housing Committee. Sitting beneath the HRB is a new Homelessness Reduction Operational Board (HROB), at present a lot of the of the work of the HRB has been focused on the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic. As we move into recovery, we will be establishing the HROB and inviting representation from community interest groups including those representing the LGBT community and also from those representing young people. Accurate equalities data relating to homelessness in the city is limited but the Albert Kennedy Trust which works with LGBT young people aged 16-25 at risk of homelessness suggests that nationally 24% of homeless young people identify as LGBT. The council's intention is to look at inequalities in the round when considering those at risk of homelessness. Provision of housing is governed by legislation and statutory guidance which takes into account equalities duties and in particular the definitions of vulnerabilities where they are linked to housing need.

We are committed to ensuring that our service is accessible and that we work in an inclusive and empathetic and solution focused way for anyone accessing housing services. We are, as always, open to suggestions of how we can do that better.

89.19 Mr Harris asked the following supplementary question; I am mindful that we have also got members here today from the Equalities Committee and a few years back I did an FOI and that looked at homelessness *decisions (?unclear in recording)* as well as those accepted as homeless, I was shocked at the statistics provided by this council. If you identify as heterosexual 35% of those presented were accepted as homeless, if you were a gay man this figure was just 23%, lesbians were about 24%. So, if you are heterosexual this means you are 44% more likely to be accepted as homeless as if you were a gay man. I ask councillors who identify as LGBT+ and our allies to please check your proof list. Can I please ask do you think those figures equate to fairness and equality and if not, what can we do to rectify this?

89.20 Councillor Gibson replied; Those figures are alarming and obviously need a proper exploration and investigation and certainly that exploration needs to take place with LGBT people experiencing homelessness and with the community. We are committed to trying to move towards more co.. ? of service which means working together much more to review how well our service works and this is an area that the HROB may well be looking at. I really appreciate you highlighting the issues and that statistic is something that we really must investigate and get back to you on. We also need to look closely at prevention because we don't want anyone, but particularly a high proportion of a particular equalities group to end up being homeless so we need to focus on how well we prevent homelessness and then we need to look at the housing provision once people have become homeless.

All of these things is a lot and I would be being disingenuous if I were to pretend to you we will do it next week, we are in the middle of a pandemic we have got 800 people in emergency accommodation and the priority is to try and house these people sustainably. But I promise you we will work on it and we will work with you and you know how to get in touch with me.

89.21 The Mayor thanked Mr Harris for his questions and invited Mr Hutley to come forward and address the council.

89.22 Mr Hutley asked the following question; The Council is about to eradicate all the Tamarisks growing along the Dukes Mound and replace them with grasses. Up until recently I lived in that area and I must say I appreciated them in the winter as a windbreak and during the summer providing much needed shade. They say it will improve visibility. Do we need more visibility along all of the seafront? Making the naturist beach more visible? If anything, Brighton and Hove need more trees along the seafront. Aren't we creating more of a concrete jungle at a time when the world is crying out for more vegetation to counteract the effects of global warming? Shouldn't we be planting more trees before we destroy the few trees that are there already?

89.23 Councillor Heley replied; The purpose of the Scheme at Black Rock is to finally prepare the Black Rock Area for new development. As future development will most likely result in a change of footfall and other wider effects as more visitors are drawn to the area this is being addressed by the inclusion of measures to protect the created habitats,

including provision of board walks, fencing, signage, monitoring and most importantly a strategy for improving the wider bio-diversity in the area. This was included within the planning application approved in June 2020 and an Ecological Impact Assessment was part of the condition of this approval.

Consultation has been undertaken with Dr Kate Cole, the county ecologist and has focussed on the Black Rock Local Wildlife site which will be affected as a result of this scheme and which the wider ecology strategy is designed to compensate for. It will also deliver many other benefits in the wider area to benefit native species and improve the public realm.

Consultation has also been undertaken during public engagement in late 2019, and more recently with regular users of the Dukes Mound area via our community safety team and the outreach team at Terence Higgins Trust. This was to discuss the impacts of a partial reduction of some of the tamarisk and how best to take this forward. Visibility, windbreaks, safety, accessibility and lighting were all discussed. As work continues, we will continue to ensure people are kept informed and impact is kept to a minimum.

I have more to say but in the interest of time and I am happy to email this to you.

- 89.24 Mr Hutley asked the following supplementary question; You said that partial removal of the Tamarisks, it is quite an extensive area and as a habitat has taken decades to develop. So, I would like your confirmation that the habitat as a whole is being safeguarded?
- 89.25 Councillor Heley replied; I can send some more detailed information from the local ecologist, that I referenced, but you have my confirmation that we are really taking into consideration all of the local biodiversity.
- 89.26 The Mayor thanked Mr Hutley for his questions and invited Mr Rees to come forward and address the council.
- 89.27 Mr Rees asked the following question; Given the importance of the Hospitality Sector both to Brighton's economy and intrinsic identity, can the Council please tell us what they are doing to prioritise the payment of the lump sums for (a) the current lockdown and (b) the December payment for wet led pubs whose food sales were less than 50% of turnover. Many of these businesses face going to the wall if they don't get these funds soon, and this will have a potentially catastrophic impact on Brighton's economy and its ability to sell itself as a tourist destination?
- 89.28 Councillor Druitt replied; Firstly, I want to acknowledge just how important the hospitality sector is to Brighton's economy. It is part of the fabric of what makes our city a great place to live and visit and is part of our diverse and vibrant economy and is a significant creator of jobs. I am also very conscious how challenging the last year has been as the sector has responded to various national lockdowns and other restrictions as a result of the pandemic.

The council agrees that issuing grants to businesses is a priority and appreciates local businesses are anxious to receive payments as soon as possible. The rapidly

changing situation between lockdowns and different tiers, the associated announcement of six different business grant schemes and changes to rules relating to those schemes has been administratively complex for the council and difficult for businesses to follow. The council has prioritised getting the maximum number and amount of payments out to businesses. The main lockdown grant, the local restriction support grant has the most recipients and generates the highest awards, so this has been prioritised. Apart from cases with outstanding requests for information, all closed grants have been assessed for the second lockdown 5 November to 1 December 2020. As at 26 January 2021, 2550 businesses have received a payment and a further 516 have received an additional discretionary restriction grant payment. £5.1million has been paid for this period so far. On 14 January 2021 a further payment of £3.9million closed grant was made to 2335 businesses for the period of 26 December 2020 to 22 January 2021, covering a short period of Tier 4 and the current period of lockdown. On 21 January 2021 another payment of £3.4million was made to 2329 businesses for the period 23 January to 15 February 2021 covering the remainder of the current lockdown period up to the stated review date. Today 28 January 2021 the council has paid £12.5million in closed business restriction payments of either £4k, £6k or £9k per business depending on their size to over 2400 businesses. The vast number of hospitality business who have successfully applied for assistance will have been in receipt of these payments. Furthermore they will be eligible for local restriction support grant for the period 2 December to 26 December. We have begun assessing and awarding grants for this period with a target of completing payments by 15 February 2021.

A small number of businesses, we estimate 160 will also benefit from an extra £1k Christmas support payment for wet pubs, these awards are being assessed and paid alongside the payments for 2 – 26 December 2020.

Finally, on a personal note, I would like to add that I run a business too in the city and understand how difficult it is for businesses at the moment.

As a ward councillor I am also in regular contact with a number of businesses who are struggling, recently the Leader of the council and myself met with senior council officers and with representatives of the business community to look for ways we can accelerate grant support, improve communication and better support the business community throughout this difficult time.

- 89.29 Mr Rees asked the following supplementary question; The Government has provided local authorities, we understand, with an additional lump sum totalling £500million across the board which my professional body, the Institute of In Keepers, tells us should be used to provide discretionary grants to help the industry meet additional costs, items such as PPE, creating Covid secure venues which costs a lot of us huge sums of money and we then weren't able to trade to recover our money, and other items such as new soft and hardware to be able to deliver on government requirements. What stats is the city council taking to establish an application procedure for grants from this discretionary pot?
- 89.30 Councillor Druitt replied; It is probably best if I send Mr Rees the full answer that I read out, for information, and also an answer to the supplementary.

89.31 The Mayor thanked Mr Rees for his questions and noted that concluded the public questions.

90 DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

90.1 The Mayor reported that two deputations had been received from members of the public and that he would invite the spokespersons to introduce their deputation and for the relevant Chair to respond. He noted that 15 minutes were set aside for the consideration of deputations.

90.2 The Mayor invited Mr Luke Simanowitz as the spokesperson for the first deputation to come forward and address the council. The deputation related to Fossil Fuels and Climate Change and Brighton & Hove City Council's Lack of Representation on the East Sussex Pension Committee.

90.3 Mr Simanowitz spoke on the deputation relating to global warming and the climate change emergency. He said that the East Sussex County Council pension scheme invested heavily in the large fuel companies who were driving the climate crisis. Brighton and Hove City Council were a major contributor to the East Sussex Pension Fund and had previously passed motions calling on East Sussex County Council to stop investing in those companies. However, Brighton & Hove City Council had no representation on the East Sussex Pension Committee, the ultimate decision-making body for the Fund and the deputation called on this Council to demand adequate representation on the East Sussex Pension Committee to ensure that those climate-destroying investments could finally be eliminated from the East Sussex Pension Fund.

90.4 Councillor Druitt thanked Mr Simanowitz for the deputation and agreed that it was a shame that Brighton & Hove residents did not have any representation on the East Sussex Pensions Committee where important decisions on investments were made. He noted that in 2016 Waltham Forest Council had declared that they were going to divest all of their investments in fossil fuel and were now on target to complete that divestment. That Council had set the bar and it was now up to us to achieve that as well, but that couldn't be done unless the City had representation on the Pension Committee, and as a Member of the Pensions Board he would raise that at the next meeting.

90.5 The Mayor thanked Mr Simanowitz for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the deputation. He explained that the points had been noted and the deputation would be referred to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration. The persons forming the deputation would be invited to attend the meeting and would be informed subsequently of any action to be taken or proposed in relation to the matter set out in the deputation.

90.6 **RESOLVED:** That the deputation be noted and referred to the Policy & Resources Committee.

90.7 The Mayor then invited Dr Carlie Goldsmith as the spokesperson for the second deputation to come forward and address the council. Dr Goldsmith said that she was presenting the deputation on behalf of the Class Divide campaign, which were a politically independent group of people working together to bring attention to the educational attainment gap between young people from communities in Whitehawk,

Manor Farm and the Bristol Estate compared to their counterparts in the rest of the city. Brighton was known as a fair and inclusive city but there were inequalities in the educational attainment of children. A Freedom of Information request showed that in 2019 there was a 32% basic grades gap in Maths and English GCSE between children in Whitehawk, Manor Farm and Bristol Estate and the rest of the city, but there was currently no dedicated transparent plan by the Council to address the disparity. The deputation set out five things they wanted the Council to address.

- 90.8 Councillor Clare thanked Dr Goldsmith for raising this important issue. The Green Administration has made it clear that improving the lives of disadvantaged young people in our city is a priority – one that has for too long not progressed as far as it should have. It is clear to me that the outcomes for young people from the communities of Whitehawk, Manor Farm and Bristol Estate have for too long been left unaddressed – or that attempts to address them haven't tackled the issue. We must review the actions we've taken previously so we don't repeat the same mistakes. I have only been Chair of the Children, Young People and Skills committee for six months, but I believe that there is an apology to be made. It's one that's on all of our heads. All Councillors should be willing to admit the truth – that only 37% of young people from Whitehawk, Manor Farm and the Bristol Estate achieve A-C equivalent in English and Maths, compared to 69% across the city. That is a 32% gap. And a gap that needs to be addressed. All Councillors should be willing to admit that it is unacceptable that action has not been taken. All Councillors should be willing to apologise for any part we have played in this. For my part, I say to your community that I am sorry. And I hope I can speak for everyone else too. I hope that our commitment to do something about this now will begin to repair the mistrust and hurt your community has. But ultimately, I believe that what will truly repair that hurt is by making concrete action. In doing this, we are fully committed to working together and co-producing our response to this challenge with communities, schools and other partners to narrow the gap in achievement for young people from these communities. We will do this for young people living in all deprived areas of the city – which includes Whitehawk. I therefore can't, and don't wish to address the aims of your deputation in full yet – because I want the council to work with you on our plans to address the problem you have highlighted. I firmly believe, as I think you do too, that this issue goes wider than education. To improve education outcomes, we need to look wider at the causes of poverty and their impact on families. Looking at the wider picture is an approach I hope we can take as our plans progress. Right now because of the scale and importance of the project, we have delayed the production of a disadvantaged strategy while the recruitment of our Executive Director of Families, Children and Learning is ongoing. This recruitment should conclude in the next few weeks and once the new director is in post, we will be resuming this work with them as a top priority. Finally, I feel it is also important to note that the negative impact of poverty on educational outcomes is a national issue. The council and schools are limited by insufficient funding it receives from central Government to address poverty and addressing disadvantaged outcomes. From inadequate planning to support schools with remote learning, to needing a footballer to challenge them into providing meals over the holidays, this Government needs to wake up to the reality of child poverty in Britain today – rather than slamming charities who step in to help it, like UNICEF. We will continue to lobby Government where their support is inadequate, recognizing that local councils are best placed to take this action – but we cannot do so without the financial backing to do it right.

90.9 The Mayor thanked Dr Goldsmith for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the deputation. He explained that the points had been noted and the deputation would be referred to the Children Young People & Skills Committee for consideration. The persons forming the deputation would be invited to attend the meeting and would be informed subsequently of any action to be taken or proposed in relation to the matter set out in the deputation.

90.10 **RESOLVED:** That the deputation be noted and referred to the Children Young People & Skills Committee.

91 PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE

91.1 The Mayor noted that the Council's Petitions Scheme provides that where a petition secures 1,250 or more signatures it can be debated at a meeting of the full Council, and said that he had been informed of one such petition for today's meeting. The Petition was 'No Confidence in Brighton & Hove Council'. He called on Mr P Harland to present the petition.

91.2 Mr Harland presented the petition which stated:

"The Greens are going to destroy this town more and more and they do not care. We as residents and people who come to the town need to put a stop to the madness happening here. I hope together we can show them what we think of their stupid ideas for our once great town.

They pretend to care about the environment and yet Brighton becoming a dive and now with all the new road layouts are causing a lot more pollution, not bad for the green party. They need to remember they are meant to represent the people but that definitely is not the case, not for me and many others that I know anyway. What they are doing will inevitably destroy local businesses and the town in general. We cannot let this happen. We have to fight this all the way. We need to try and get them to remove the old Shoreham road and the seafront cycle lanes.

I say we get as many people as we can to sign this petition and then show the council just how many people actually do not have any trust or confidence in them. I know they would not care but at least we can show them. This is something I feel needs to be done because I worry about all the people that work in and around the town and disabled people who this will also effect greatly. There are so many things this council have and will get wrong and it will be us that suffer."

91.3 The Leader of the Council said that his first job as council leader was to protect people's lives and air pollution in our city was killing people. Air pollution killed 175 people locally and 36,000 nationally. Air pollution also caused short and long-term health conditions. As we tackle Covid-19, a respiratory virus that affects our lungs, it would be completely irresponsible for me not to take action on air quality. We should also remember that just weeks ago the coroner in London ruled that for the first time, a person in the UK had had air pollution listed as a cause of death: 9-year-old girl Ella Kissi-Debrah. Giving our residents safer options to move around our city, by bike or on foot, will reduce the need for car traffic, air pollution it causes, and also create clearer roads for those who needed to drive. This petition was written in August and mentions the cycle lanes on Old Shoreham Road and the seafront. These schemes had actually been agreed prior to the

Greens becoming the Council's Leadership. We only became the Council Leadership at the end of July, mere weeks before your petition was written. It isn't quite the case that we could deliver schemes even before we ran the council. Now we are in January and Covid-19 is still with us. We are in the middle of the third national lockdown, the most deadly month yet, and the most hospitalisations yet seen in this pandemic. The situation was incredibly serious. This means we have the vital responsibility of ensuring that as many people as possible can move around our city to access essential services, safely. Not everyone can use a bus and not all can drive. So as I'm sure you'll appreciate there are a range of reasons why creating more and safer routes to travel has benefits for our city and our health. On your points on travel schemes: Back in August these initial schemes were funded through an 'emergency active travel' directive from the Conservative government. Government officials wrote to the then Labour council with the explicit instruction that the council should, and I quote, '*change the status quo,*' with cycling and walking schemes around our city. They also only gave the council six weeks to implement such changes. Since becoming the Administration, Greens have listened to communities both in favour and with concerns about these schemes. We have adapted the schemes in light of important concerns from people with disabilities. We reinstated blue badge bays and where a section of the cycle lane on the seafront didn't work, we took it out. We've reopened Madeira Drive one way. We expanded pavement space to support our traders who now desperately need outdoor space to stay open and keep their businesses alive. We've provided new safe travel corridors – and 'school streets,' schemes for children and parents who want to get to school safely by bike or on foot and socially distance. Government were clearly impressed with what the Council did over the summer, because they awarded the city one of the highest sums in the country to continue work on active travel plans. We also learned last month that the Government has responded to concerns and given councils more time to consult. Now we are developing a consultation that will take place over a six-week period starting in February. It will include questionnaires, on paper, online, surveys, leaflets posed to nearby households, and focus groups with communities including our businesses and schools. In his letter to the council about our funding award, the Government minister himself stated that consultation should not be, and I quote, '*confused with listening to only the loudest voices.*' The minister made clear that the government wants to see councils implement more travel and transport options for residents. He also referred to a 'silent majority' in favour of walking and cycling, sharing a survey by the government's own Department for Transport that found 65% of people across England support reallocating road space to walking and cycling in their local area.

Finally Brighton and Hove has now for nearly twenty years been a contested political authority and no party has overall control. Decisions have to be made collectively with the support of other parties. This has been a testing year for all of us. Covid-19 has caused long-term shifts and trauma. Changes to where we live only compound the changes we have all felt this year. I would urge all residents to take part in the consultations that the Council puts online, and engage with how the council can create a city for everyone, and a city fit for the future.

When I became council Leader, I gave an assurance that I will leave no stone unturned in the quest to do the right thing for our citizens, our environment and our city and I repeat that now.

91.4 Councillor Peltzer Dunn proposed an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group. He said that the amendment built on the sentiments expressed within the petition. After the election in 2019 the Labour Group entered into a secret agreement with the Green Group, the largest opposition party. Last summer the Green became the Administration and the Labour Group the largest opposition party and the secret agreement continued. The Leader of the Green Administration was asked to confirm publicly the existence and details of the agreement which he failed to do until the agreement was leaked and published online. The Conservative Group or the Independent Members were not party to the agreement or able to comment upon its contents. The Labour Group had a narrow victory in local elections in 2019 followed by the Green Group taking control with a narrow margin. Although there was a change in administration due to the secret agreement nothing changed. At the last election two-thirds of the electorate did not vote for either Labour or Green. Due to the agreement the opposition was now the Conservative Group and the Independent Members. The lack of opposition had meant that matters such as the Older Shoreham Road temporary cycle lane had been forced through without proper consultation. He said that all Councillors were true democrats at heart and asked them to support the amendment.

91.5 Councillor Miller seconded the amendment.

91.6 Councillor Janio agreed with the petitioner that the Greens would destroy the city, he said the Greens said they cared about the environment, but the Brighton was becoming a dive and the new road layouts was creating more pollution. He hoped the electorate would be more careful at the next election and not vote Green. The petition called for the end of the temporary cycle lanes on the seafront and the Olde Shoreham Road which he agreed with, but due to the agreement between the parties that would not be done.

91.6 Councillor Clare said that it was not a secret agreement and had been published on the Green Group website. The Labour and Green Groups did not always vote together, and the Conservatives were so focused on claiming that Labour were not a proper opposition that they were failing to be in opposition themselves. The Green Group would not 'destroy' the city and had achieved many great things, full details of which were on the group's website. The cycle lanes were agreed under the Labour following direction from the Conservative Government.

91.7 The Mayor put the amendment to the vote and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were voting for the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was for the amendment;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting against the amendment.

100.1 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost. He asked members if they agreed to note the petition, and they did.

100.2 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted.

92 CALL OVER FOR REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

(a) Callover

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

Item 95 - Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2021/22
Item 95A – Brighton & Hove Climate Assembly

(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports

92.2 The Democratic Services Manager confirmed that Items 95 and 95A had been reserved for discussion.

(c) Oral Questions from Members

92.3 The Mayor noted that there were no oral questions relating to items not called.

93 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.

93.1 The Mayor confirmed that written questions from Members and the replies from the appropriate Councillor were taken as read by reference to the list included in the addendum which had been circulated prior to the meeting as detailed below:

(1) Councillor Yates – Parking in Coombe Road area:

93.2 Since the introduction of the residents parking scheme in the coombe road area (zone U) parking pressures have eased considerably, and residents are truly relieved. Could the Lead member please advise how residents can contribute to a review of the impact and have their proposed improvements to layout incorporated into this? These ideas include additional bays, enhanced access for motorcycles and the introduction of paid on street cycle storage facilities.

Reply from Councillor Heley, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

93.3 Thank you for your written question regarding parking in the Coombe Road area (Zone U). We are really pleased to hear that parking has eased considerably and residents are relieved. There are some small changes still to incorporate including 9 new

motorcycle parking bays which we hope will be introduced in the next few months. We are also planning to review the zone in the next 12 months, and this will give residents the opportunity to comment for any additional changes.

(2) Councillor Platts – Educational Outcomes in East Brighton:

93.4 Class Divide is a grassroots campaign fighting to draw attention to the deeply unjust educational attainment gap for young people from the communities of Whitehawk, Manor Farm and Bristol Estate in East Brighton. East Brighton is an area that is economically disadvantaged with a high level of child poverty. The campaign highlights the lower rates of attainment at GCSE's in a range of subjects including English and maths and the higher rate of exclusions and referrals to special schools. This has a negative effect on children's life chances, embedding disadvantage through to adulthood and perpetuating the cycle of poverty. Will the Council commit to meeting the five demands of the campaign? In summary:

1. An annual report to the Children, Young People and Skills Committee on the school outcomes and attainment of children living Whitehawk, Bristol Estate and Manor Farm.
2. To publish a plan that specifically addresses what actions will be taken to reduce the identified educational inequalities experienced by children, young people and adults this area.
3. To make training on the experiences of working-class children in education compulsory for all school leaders and teachers in Brighton and Hove.
4. To take action to reduce the rate of school exclusions and the placement of children in alternative schools
5. To give local people a second chance by providing local learning and training opportunities and develop advocacy support for parents struggling to keep their children in school.

Reply from Councillor Clare, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee

93.5 Thank you for raising this important issue. The Green Administration has made it clear that improving the lives of disadvantaged young people in our city is a priority – one that has for too long not progressed as far as it should have.

In doing this, we are fully committed to working together and co-producing our response to this challenge with communities, schools and other partners to narrow the gap in achievement for young people from these communities. We will do this for young people living in all deprived areas of the city – which includes Whitehawk.

We are committed to getting the very best education for all of our children and grateful to our schools for the hard work they do.

I'll be responding to this further when we look at the deputation on the agenda today.

(3) Councillor Platts – Safety on Madeira Drive:

- 93.6 Since the latest lockdown, Madeira Drive has once again become unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists, especially those with small children. The re-opening of Madeira Drive with one-way traffic has led to cars speeding between the Sea Life Centre, Duke's Mound and Black Rock. Drivers have used this space to speed even when the five lanes on Marine Parade have been clear of traffic. On the weekend of 9th and 10th January, a combination of lockdown and sunny weather saw hundreds of people circulating in this area to get some fresh air and exercise after a week indoors. The volume of people was such that pedestrians were walking in the road to socially distance and were taken by surprise by vehicles. Some drivers were aggressive in trying to get through the crowds and the area was unsafe. Will the Council take urgent action to ensure there is sufficient space for people by either dedicating the area between the Sea Life Centre and Duke's Mound or Duke's Mound and Black Rock to pedestrians and cyclists whilst lockdown continues? From the Council's own figures produced in response to my previous written question, Black Rock car park is little used during the winter months.

Reply from Councillor Heley, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

- 93.7 Madeira Drive was initially closed between Dukes Mound and the Palace Pier Roundabout to facilitate walking and cycling for local residents during the very first lockdown. Although the closure was generally supported there were concerns from traders and blue badge holders as access was limited to changing places facilities and the beach, there were also safety concerns as some vehicles were authorised to access the route without requisite enforcement powers being available to the Police to enforce speeding, conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians or other traffic violations under the closure Traffic Order..

At the 29th September ETS committee, last year, approval was granted to commence detailed-design and the Traffic Regulation Order process to re-open Madeira Drive one-way eastbound, to improve Blue Badge access and parking capacity and to relocate the cycle track from the footway promenade onto the carriageway, therefore safely segregating cyclists from pedestrians, to improve both cycle capacity and pedestrian provision.

The first stage in this implementation has seen the re-opening of Madeira Drive one-way to address access issues for traders and blue badge holder as well as some of the immediate safety and access concerns while working towards the ETS approved design.

If the road was to be closed again this could lead to more confusion and be viewed as a knee jerk reaction that will likely be required to be reopened again in the short to medium term leading to uncertainty about the status of the road and footway creating an unsafe environment. We would encounter strong criticism from our stakeholders, including blue badge users and businesses, who again would be affected by the access restrictions and have worked with us anticipating the introduction of the ETS approved design.

- 93.8 We would also need to consider the implications of a further legal process required to close the road under another Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) shortly after two previously

TROs that could invalidate a final TRO required to implement a permanent solution. This could lead to subsequent legal challenge that could invalidate future attempts to re-design the road layout and delay eventual re-opening of Madeira Drive.

Finally, a further temporary road closure will incur further expensive stewarding costs required to maintain the closure. There are benefits of advancing the design proposals for Madeira Drive as opposed to closing the road altogether. Not least to honour the commitments made at ETS but also as it has attached funding from the Department for Transport's Active Travel Fund, Tranche 2 and support from stakeholders.

The agreed scheme will provide a clearly dedicated two-way, accessible cycle facility on the southside of the carriageway with reallocated parking and better pedestrian facilities enhancing social distancing opportunities. This will include clear signing and lining to ensure there are clear and designated cycle facilities, separated pedestrian areas and vehicle running lanes.

The scheme can be implemented imminently and to further address immediate social distancing requirements additional signage will be provided to remind users of the need to maintain distances. The scheme construction will take into account the current lockdown situation and will be phased to reduce disruption as much as possible. Social media and communication channels will also be used to inform the public of which areas will be available or limited for use during construction.

- 93.9 On balance the most advantageous solution would be to deliver the ETS Committee approved scheme that has been developed with stakeholder engagement, equality of access and safety at its core. We will support delivery of the scheme with Citywide messaging to discourage visitors during national lockdown and similar situations combined with higher profile Police enforcement to encourage social distancing generally. This will provide a longer term purpose build solution to support the needs of local residents, Blue Badge users and businesses though the current Covid lockdown and beyond.

(4) Councillor Platts – Food Supplies in the City:

- 93.10 Can the Council confirm the dates on which they have written to supermarket managers in our City asking them to take action to prevent panic buying since the start of the pandemic?

Reply from Councillor Mac Cafferty, Leader of the Council

- 93.11 On 18th March last year the then leader of the Council wrote to all local supermarkets requesting that they implement measures to ensure that their customers who are vulnerable members of the community have equal access to stock which might be subject to hoarding. This was then followed up by Regulatory Services linking in with the national supermarkets on a local, regional and national level with regular dialogue.

This work has continued through the residual and ongoing risks associated with the Covid pandemic. After initial issues associated with limiting customer capacity and reduced stock was overcome during the course of the first lockdown, the focus is continuing on Covid control measures to protect staff, customers and the wider public. It

is important to note that often local branches do not have any discretion to implement different systems at a local level, but instead have to follow head office guidance.

To ensure then that there is ongoing liaison and support with supermarkets, and moving beyond a letter, Environmental Health Teams and Covid Information Officers are in daily contact with local supermarkets. This provides greater and real-time feedback on the issues and means we can engage directly.

Covid Information Officers are currently partway through a programme of visiting all the major supermarkets and the smaller local national supermarket outlets in the city to assess the implementation of the control measures against company policies and good practice. They are then RAG rating what they find, Red being of concern, advice given and follow up visit, Amber being minor concerns where we feel the manager will act to rectify. Both of these would then receive a revisit to check progress. Once they the initial visits to the larger chains are completed the team will move onto the convenience stores as a project, too.

In addition, this team is also working closely with identified officers from the Food Safety team who will engage with regional managers, Head Offices and Primary Authorities.

In addition to this we have been made aware that the pressures on supermarkets from the lockdown which started in December has not been the same as the first national lockdown. Our feedback has been that Supermarkets have increased delivery services and have not come under the same pressure with regards to in-store customer capacity or any specific lines of stock. While a further letter to all businesses, not only supermarkets, is proposed, to help alight on issues, supermarkets have been included in general email updates, and further updates are planned. In addition a more proactive approach is being taken through the deployment of Covid-19 marshals. Feedback can be provided on any response we receive as a result of this letter and on any further insight from the Covid marshals.

(5) Councillor Platts – Food Supplies in the City (2):

- 93.12 Can the Council confirm what action is being taken to ensure the City has a sustainable food supply now that we are experiencing the impact of Brexit in addition to the public health crisis?

Reply from Councillor Mac Cafferty, Leader of the Council

- 93.13 The Council had been preparing for Brexit for a number of years, with considerable uncertainty around the UK's future trading relationship with the EU. In August 2020 it was agreed by the Brexit Working Group and the Recovery and Renewal Board that it would be sensible to review Brexit related risks through the COVID working groups to ensure the overlap of potential issues was being considered by the right people and ensure contingencies were developed where necessary and possible.

In light of this the Food Cell developed an EU Transition Food Action Plan focussed on preparing the city for potential food supply and security issues emerging at the beginning of 2021 related to Brexit and with a particular focus on a no-deal scenario and its impact on vulnerable/low income residents. As well as engagement with local food

networks and highlighting potential risks and necessary planning the Food Cell sought funding for two contingency arrangements as outlined in a report to P&R on 3rd December 2020.

The Brexit Working Group agreed allocations from the Council's Brexit fund to specific actions that built on developments made during the COVID response and enabled contingency measures to be in place from the 1st January 2021 including:

- One off £20,000 grant funding to the Sussex Food Depot to scale up operations in time for responding to potential supply chain disruption at the beginning of 2021. The Depot is a social enterprise and innovation developed during the COVID response by Brighton Food Factory to source locally grown produce and donations for distribution to city food businesses and the emergency food network to reduce reliance on national/international supply chains and meet local need with local produce. The Depot is a partnership including Brighton Food Factory, Brighton & Hove Food Partnership, Hisbe, One Church and Gleaning Network.

The Council's one-off funding has enabled vehicles and staff to be ready to respond to emerging challenges from 1st Jan and is in addition to the Council's Property Team assisting with provision of a location for the depot itself.

Although this measure is related to food resilience in the event of a disruptive EU Transition, it also has the potential to support the Council's own sustainability agenda in the long-term. The Depot distribution model aims to ensure locally grown and sourced produce can be more widely accessed across the city and region whilst reducing onward costs to consumers. The Sussex Food Depot also want to grow to support local and regional food procurement including public services, large employers and local food businesses as well as community food projects.

- A £20,000 grant had also been allocated for purchasing food supplies if there is supply chain disruption at the beginning of the year that will directly impact on emergency food provision. Learning from COVID suggests that any disruption to the 'just in time' supermarket supply chains and potential for stockpiling can mean supermarkets are able to ration and meet most demand but that surplus food supplies dry up which impacts on the emergency food network reliant on that surplus.

Currently no major disruption to local food supply is being reported as a consequence of either COVID or Brexit however there are some accounts of price rises for certain produce which if sustained or exacerbated could lead to more local residents falling into food poverty. This is currently being monitored through the Food Cell and as well as the £20k emergency food fund, further funding to assist with mitigating potential impacts could be sought through the funding assigned to the Local Outbreak Plan.

(6) Councillor Platts – Disadvantage:

- 93.14 Trade union Usdaw has recently negotiated an increase in minimum pay for Morrison's workers and will become the first UK supermarket to pay at least £10 an hour from April. This is just over the current Brighton & Hove Living Wage of £9.50 per hour. Will the Council write to the Head Offices of other supermarkets with stores in Brighton & Hove urging them to do the same and help tackle disadvantage in our City?

Reply from Councillor Mac Cafferty, Leader of the Council

- 93.15 Local employers will clearly take their own position when entering into pay negotiations with their staff and unions. In this council, we have committed to pay the Voluntary 'Real Living Wage' and have been operating this for many years to help staff on lower pay. The council would therefore encourage all employers in the city to offer the Real Living Wage as a minimum within their pay structures and, in particular, stipulates this requirement in any services it procures externally from private sector providers.

For organisations to offer a higher award will clearly be a matter of policy and/or affordability for each organisation and, in this respect, we welcome the decision by Morrison's. I would be happy to write to all Head Offices to ask them to follow suit with the council and pay the Real Living Wage, as a minimum, and to note the example set by Morrison's to go further.

(7) Councillor Platts – Community Wealth Building:

- 93.16 Will the Council commit to writing to all supermarket chains represented in the City to ask them how much local produce they stock; if they will increase their range and ensure such goods are prominently displayed and clearly labelled as being produced locally? This would support local producers to grow their businesses, create local jobs and contribute to a sustainable food supply as well as reducing food miles.

Reply from Councillor Mac Cafferty, Leader of the Council

- 93.17 The Council is currently in the process of securing additional capacity within the Economic Development team to work with the city's food sector and all related local, regional and national stakeholders to develop and deliver the city's food goals.

Part of this role may require engagement with businesses and Government, where necessary, to effect change that will strengthen the sustainability and resilience of the local food system as it continues to adapt to the immediate challenges of COVID and the longer term impacts of Brexit and the climate crisis. Opportunities will be sought to engage with the development of the Government's National Food Strategy and highlight the benefits of investing in sustainable locally sourced produce.

This renewed focus on food policy for the Council will also build on the work that awarded Brighton & Hove the status of the UK's first 'Gold' sustainable food city.

This work and the collaborative efforts of the Food Partnership, local food organisations and community groups as well as support from the Council has highlighted, among other goals, the steps that can be taken to embed sustainable and circular economy principles in food waste and food growing locally. This has included the #Goodtogrow campaign, a pledge for food businesses, which includes consideration of sustainable food practices, work to increase the amount of locally grown produce available to community food projects, and to create opportunities for people to buy affordable healthy and sustainable food through markets and mobile pop-up shops and restaurants, particularly in areas with no existing provision. National retailer Lidl, BHCC and the University of Brighton worked in partnership in 2019 to better understand the circumstances and potential

barriers facing low-income families in East Brighton with regards to eating veg. Recommendations from the research fed into Lidl's National Healthy Eating Strategy.

93.18 In December I was proud to join cities around the world signing the Glasgow Declaration [1] which ahead of the COP26 climate talks, calls on national governments to play their full part in securing sustainable food and farming at the heart of the global response to the climate emergency.

93.19 The promotion of sustainable locally sourced produce will continue to be considered as part of this work going forwards.

[1] [HOME | Glasgow Food and Climate Declaration \(glasgowdeclaration.org\)](https://glasgowdeclaration.org)

(8) Councillor Allcock – Estate Development Budget:

93.20 The Estate Development Budget (EDB) is a scheme that was set up to respond to suggestions from Council tenants and provides money for ideas that can make a positive difference to their neighbourhood.

The requirements are that EDB projects:

- Involve and be supported by as many neighbours as possible
- Should be completed in the same financial year
- Do not cost more than £10,000 for main bids and £1,000 for quick bids
- Are not be something that could be done as a repair or as part of a larger maintenance programme

What performance management processes does the Council have in place for the EDB scheme?

Since the scheme was established. how many and what percentage of EDB bids/project:

- Have been completed within the same financial year as the bid was agreed?
- Are not completed and still outstanding?
- Could reasonably be construed as being a repair or part of the Council's Housing estate planned maintenance programme?

What is the monetary value of these bids/projects?

Reply from Councillor Gibson/Hugh-Jones, Joint Chair of the Housing Committee

93.21 Thank you for your question on the performance management process in place for the EDB scheme and for details of EDB bids.

The engagement of residents, marketing and communication, bidding and review processes are supported by the Community Engagement Team and the implementation of the projects and management of the budget is through the Repairs & Maintenance service. Prior to April 2020 this function was commissioned to Mears.

There is a resident led EDB Panel in place that reviews the delivery of all EDB bids with council officers. The panel meets 6 times a year.

A new bid evaluation criterion has been produced, which the EDB panel refer to when voting on bids. This will be available for bidders' reference when completing applications. Bids for projects which benefit council residents on land owned by other parts of the council are considered for EDB funding, providing they have permission from the relevant directorate.

The Community Engagement Team supported the EDB Review group to identify key areas of social value which could be gained from an EDB project. They agreed additional questions to be included on the bid form which would allow an evaluation on these aspects to be carried out after the work was completed, based on feedback from residents. This process was implemented on the application forms in 2020/21. This means we will begin to look at the impact of EDB in 2021/22.

Bidders are now notified and acknowledged when their application is received, they are informed on the outcome of their bids, and they are given a follow-up on reasons for the outcome of their bid by the Community Engagement Team.

In addition, from April 2021, an end of financial year report will be produced. This will involve all stakeholders of the year's program and will include: the number of bids, what was funded, impact, and changes needed to the guidelines for the following financial year. This evaluation will also include qualitative information on how residents have measured the social value of their projects.

A new Engagement Strategy is planned for consideration at Housing Committee in March 2021. This will include proposed changes to the EDB process as identified through the EDB Review.

In terms of the bids outstanding from previous years, officers are working with residents to progress the delivery of the following outstanding bids:

- 2018/2019 – 7 bids with a total value of £8,000
- 2019/2020 – 22 bids with a total value of £28,000

For the current year of 2020/21:

- 37 main bids were agreed and 14 have been completed. 23 bids are outstanding with a total value of £125,000
- 17 quick bids have been agreed and 3 have been completed. 14 bids are outstanding with a total value of £13,000

We anticipate that the new review arrangements will identify potential delays more promptly in future. We do review bids through our resident engagement team and look to identify any works that would be picked up through our Repairs & Maintenance service or planned works programmes. We have worked with residents to improve this and establish clearer guidance around the EDB. Unfortunately, it is difficult to review historic information to identify which bids this would apply to.

(9) Councillor Grimshaw – Assisted Bin Collection Service:

93.22 Can it be confirmed how many residents use the assisted bin collection service and what are the figures regarding complaints? Is there a dedicated officer to coordinate assisted collections and how do the teams ensure that recycling, garden refuse and general waste are all aware of the need for assisted collection?

Reply from Councillor Heley, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

93.23 There are currently:

- 3156 assisted collections for recycling
- 3391 assisted collections for refuse
- 231 assisted collections for garden waste

It is not possible to breakdown the number of formal stage 1 complaints received about assisted collections.

There is not one dedicated officer, rather a team that support requests for assisted collections, as well as the crews that collect from these properties.

To obtain an assisted collection, residents are required to complete a form on the website or contact Cityclean for one of the Contact Centre team to request it on their behalf.

The completed form is sent to a dedicated mailbox where a Project Development Officer the request to a "beat sheet".

A beat sheet is a list of roads given to crews each day for them to empty the refuse, recycling or garden waste.

On the beat sheet, there is a column that indicates which houses on each street have an assisted collection and where the bin is situated.

Operatives will put the bin back to where they retrieved it from.

(10) Councillor Williams – SWEP:

93.24 There have been concerns raised by community groups that the council are operating what has been termed as 'Secret SWEP'. This is because arrangements for SWEP are not announced publicly thus difficult discover.

It is recognised that due to the pandemic, specific strategies to help rough sleepers have been put in place, and a lot of good work is being done. However, it is important concerned people, groups, and councillors are kept informed to enable people to actively help the homeless in bad weather. This is particularly important to make sure no one is left out.

The public wish to know what is the rationale for SWEP method of operation at this time, is the everyone in policy being implemented compassionately and sufficiently to include everyone in need and can we find a way to better inform when SWEP is triggered?

Reply from Councillor Gibson/Hugh-Jones, Joint Chair of the Housing Committee

93.25 We are also keen to ensure people know how to access our services and, as you know, during the current pandemic. The response to the pandemic means that rough sleepers get offers of accommodation 7 days a week, whatever the weather and as a result there are less than 30 people estimated to be rough sleeping at present. A very different set of circumstances. In this context for SWEP We had to reconsider how we reach out to people whilst striking a balance so that we don't want to attract people who already have accommodation as that could overwhelm services which are at full stretch particularly as we are currently unable to provide congregate accommodation.

As previously reported to Housing Committee, SWEP has not been secret. Information on how to support people to access SWEP has been shared in local media, via social media and is on our website. All organisations working with homeless people have had this information shared with them through the VCS and Operational Forums.

We have made a lot of accommodation available since the start of the pandemic for people who are assessed as at risk of rough sleeping in addition to those who are verified rough sleepers. There is no need for anyone to therefore be sleeping rough in the city. However, we recognise that there are a few people who have found it difficult to come in, and for those people when SWEP is triggered, we have made provision through our Street Outreach Services who are identifying anyone who is rough sleeping and in addition the public can report anyone they see or are concerned about through Streetlink. The Street Outreach Service are carrying out outreach shifts 7 days a week including bank holidays and over the full Christmas period.

This winter so far as at 22nd January 2021, we have been open on 31 separate occasions including being open every day from the 24 December 2020 to date 8 January 2021. We offer hot meals, snacks, drinks and support. We have provided 173 units of accommodation with an average of 8 people each night we have been open. We are ensuring that where someone will accept engagement, we have a clear onward accommodation offer in place and nobody needs to return to rough sleeping. It is pleasing to report that 22 people brought in through SWEP moved onto longer term emergency accommodation and remained housed when SWEP closed

This year due to the pandemic, we are unable to use congregate sleep space arrangements or offer open access to a single hub as in previous years. Instead we have acquired 14 units of self-contained accommodation to meet the needs of people who would otherwise rough sleep. Referrals therefore need to be managed but we do not turn people away, and if the 14 units are full, colleagues in Housing Options and St Mungo's No Second Night Out Service work together to ensure that everyone in need is offered safe accommodation during periods of severe weather

93.26 The trigger for us to open SWEP is the same this year as it has been for the previous two years: a predicated "feels like" temperature of 0 degrees Celsius or an Amber Weather warning. We also always open across the Christmas period regardless of

weather. Due to the current pandemic and advice from Public Health England, local Public Health colleagues and the MHCLG SWEP could not be delivered as it has been in previous years. Anyone seen rough sleeping by a member of the public can be referred to the SOS team via Streetlink or can be supported to access housing by calling the Housing Options duty line (available 24 hours 7 days a week including Bank Holidays).

(11) Councillor Childs – Planning:

93.27 I note with alarm the Government's new method for calculating house building targets which place the majority of the burden on the largest 20 English cities to fulfil national needs thus relieving Tory rural authorities of the need to build sufficient housing.

Will the Administration, take up with the Secretary of State, as a matter of urgency the new proposed housing targets that would require Brighton & Hove to increase its new housing target by over a third - placing more Green Field land at risk of development - and will they condemn the blatantly political method proposed by the Government that favours Conservative-led Councils?

Reply from Councillor Littman, Chair of the Planning Committee

93.28 In December the Government announced without any warning, evidence or consultation, it would add a further 35 per cent to the city's housing needs. Our housing needs will increase from 924 new homes needs per year to 1250. For a city that incredibly constrained.

This change was largely in response to the backlash the Government received to their proposals, last summer, to use a housing algorithm to calculate housing needs across the country. You are quite right - objections to this were strongest from rural districts where the increased needs would have been highest.

The result of the announcement for us though, and the other 19 cities, is that we will have additional pressure for development on our valuable open spaces and employment space. And we will also have a reduced ability to use our locally adopted policies to assess applications for housing. With the risk of more decision overturned at appeal.

Matters will be further worsened if the government goes ahead with its proposal to allow office, commercial and community uses - that contribute to the economy and the vibrancy and character of the city - to change to housing without needing planning permission. Once again, if this comes into force, we won't be able to use our locally agreed policies which further undermines local democracy.

I can confirm that the Administration will be writing to the Secretary of State to object in the strongest terms. I invite both Labour and Conservative colleagues to sign the letter so it can be a joint letter sent on behalf of all Groups.

(12) Councillor Wilkinson:

93.29 What measures are the Council taking to reduce vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian and cycle safety, improve air quality and encourage reduced car use in the Central Hove area?

Reply from Councillor Heley, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

93.30 As opposition spokesperson on the ETS committee you are very up to date with the council's work in tackling vehicle speeds, improving pedestrian and cycle safety, improving air quality and encouraging reduced care use across the city, which will all impact on central hove ward.

Speed reduction

As you know, The Council works positively with the Police and are supporting their efforts with speed reduction throughout the city but more recently in Hove with the use of a Speed Indicator Device (SID) and our use of 9 mobile Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) that have also been deployed in several roads in the area and beyond. The SID tells the drivers what speed they are doing and the VAS give a reminder of the speed limit with an accompanying legend SLOW DOWN. You are also seconding a Notice of Motion to this same full council meeting that encourages a more modern approach to road safety in the city, so I refer you the content of that motion you are seconding with my colleague Cllr Hills. You will have more detailed knowledge of the specific issues in central Hove, so I would urge you to let me and officers know of any particularly bad areas that can be improved.

Walking and cycling

As a member of the LCWIP task and finish group, you are already aware of our work on this and have had the opportunity to give feedback regarding particular areas of improvement needed in your ward of central hove. This feedback will input into the process.

At the junction of Eaton Rd/The Drive, improvements have been made to the existing pedestrian facilities and additional crossings have been added so that all arms now have a safe crossing movement. We have also introduced an early cycle start stage at this junction with low level cycle lanterns and modified the stop line to discourage vehicles from entering the advanced stop line.

Central Hove also benefits from direct access to the new temporary cycle facilities on the seafront that were introduced as part of the Emergency Active Travel Fund programme, which we have worked together on in a lot of detail. This scheme is due to be extended further in the coming year including the introduction of further low-level cycle signals along the route as you know.

We are also trialling the use of a system called SmartCross. The primary aim of this system is to empower disabled pedestrians, particularly wheelchair and mobility impaired users who find it difficult to get to the push button. It will make it possible to trigger the wait box using an online app. Additionally it has a Covid related function where the wait can be triggered by passing your hand under the push button box without

having to actually touch it. If this trial proves successful, then it will be rolled out to a wider area.

Air quality & reducing car use

In January 2020, you seconded a motion that I proposed called “car free city centre by 2023” and last week at the ETS committee we both voted to advance this project further. This also includes plans for a city wide ultra low emission zone in order to radically improve air quality in the city, which will include central hove.

All new traffic signals in the City are ELV & LED so 90% saving in power consumption. We are also taking steps to improve remote monitoring of signals to avoid unnecessary visits (by car) to the signal faults plus the engineers are now being issued with hybrid or electric vehicles.

We are continuing to roll out the Citywide Spend-to-Save programme of replacing street lighting with LEDs to reduce power consumption and to reduce maintenance requirements.

Other measures being introduced as part of the Tranche 2 Emergency Active Travel programme will include a series of Active & Healthy Travel campaigns as well as more bikeshare hubs, Park Active schemes to encourage people to travel actively in the last mile of their journey as well as other incentive schemes such use of the Better Points app, which you are aware of through our extensive discussions at the ETS committee.

Access and School Travel

Through the Access Fund for Sustainable Travel, we’ve provided in-depth help to 12 Central Hove residents to support them into work by providing financial support for cycles, cycle fixing and training or paid their first month of travel using public transport.

The council’s School Travel Team have engaged Early Years and Schools in Central Hove, including providing support to St Andrew’s Primary with their road safety issues with more A-boards and on-going site visits at this school. The first Meerkat Trail to promote walking and scooting to nursery and school as part of the Access Project (Access Year 1) was focused around this area of Hove.

More recently, we supported West Hove Infants School through the implementation of an Emergency School Streets closure from Sept – October half term, which enabled social distancing outside the school when they returned during the Covid-19 pandemic. This also supported wider objectives of School Streets by encouraging families to use sustainable, active travel to and from school and deterring parking near the school gates, making it safer for children.

Several Early Years in CH have received Modeshift STARS accreditation including:
Honeycroft Centre nursery achieved Gold and we financed a bespoke buggy/bike shed for them

Helped Each Peach Childcare achieve Silver

Working with Dolphins Pre-school to move from Bronze to Silver

Working with Footsteps Day Nursery to maintain Gold

Have started working with Shirley Street Day Nursery and Hopscotch Nursery (Hove Station) on Bronze

Hundreds of school children in CH have taken part in Walk to School Week:

- October 2020: St Andrews took part – 622 children
- May 2019 : West Hove Connaught took part - 630 children

Six CH schools participated in the SMILE project with Reception children 2020:

Aldrington CE Primary
 Brunswick Primary
 Cottesmore St Mary's RC Primary
 St Andrew's CE Primary
 West Hove Infant - Connaught Road
 West Hove Infant - School Road

(13) Councillor Mears – Contracts and Accountability (Spend Tables):

93.31 The Council's website states that payments over £250 are to be published each month on the council website in 'spend tables':

"Each month we publish all the payments over £250 that we've made. They include payments to suppliers, grants to voluntary organisations and payments to individuals.

We reduced the threshold of publishing payments from £500 to £250, following changes introduced by the government."

<https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/council-and-democracy/council-finance/payments-over-%C2%A3250>

Despite this policy, the last spend table uploaded by the Council for scrutiny by the public was for June 2020.

At a time when so much Government funding is being provided and spent there is a need for accountability and transparency.

Can the Finance Chair advise why no spend tables have been uploaded since June 2020?

Can the Finance Chair please provide the spend tables for the missing months in the response?

Reply from Councillor Gibson, Joint Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy & Resources Committee

93.32 I am aware that there is currently a technical issue regarding the upload of this information to the council's website. Unfortunately, the advent of the pandemic has meant that the team, which has suffered staffing shortages due to cases of isolation and illness, has had to prioritise its primary function, which is to pay the council's many providers and suppliers promptly.

As you will be aware, cash flow is absolutely critical for local business, particularly small businesses, and in response to this we removed our standard payment terms of 30 days and effectively set this to zero so that we could get payments out to businesses as fast as possible and help them survive. This policy is still in place. This has obviously put very significant additional pressure on the team, and they have, quite rightly, prioritised paying our suppliers and providers as quickly as possible.

To give Members some further context, we have only had one Freedom of Information request in relation to the on-line payment data in the whole of last year. I am therefore happy to support the team in prioritising payment of suppliers and providers over production of this information. However, I fully agree that residents have a right to understand where government funding is deployed and would point to the many publicly available committee reports which detail the council's decisions as to how each and every allocation of grant funding is to be used.

The team have advised that the over £250 payment information should be available on-line within two weeks.

(14) Councillor Mears – Housing Repairs

93.33 The then Administration made a policy decision to insource the Housing Repairs Budget prior to last election.

Paperwork from the time estimated the cost of this policy decision would be nearly £10 million – to be incurred by the Housing Revenue Account.

What has been the additional cost of this policy to date beyond the original estimate, including costs associated with ongoing industrial action?

Bearing in mind that when this policy was presented prior to an election that very clear indications of the cost were provided, can the Chair confirm that the Housing Revenue Account, which is made up of tenants rent, will not be used to incur any ongoing additional costs going forward.

Reply from Councillor Gibson / Hugh-Jones, Joint Chair of the Housing Committee

93.34 For clarification, the decision made to bring the repairs and Maintenance Service in house has not cost the council £10m. The previous service had a cost comparable with the current service. Due to organisational changes in the wider repairs service including property and investment services, and impact on service of the COVID10 pandemic, it is difficult to make a like for like comparison with the costs prior to the service coming in-house. This is a wider piece of work which will take more time and will be reported to Housing Committee as requested by Councillor Mears. However, for information, the 2020/21 budget for the Repairs and Maintenance service is £10.315m. This includes one-off Programme Team funding of £0.410m, leaving a core budget of £9.905m for the in-house Repairs and Maintenance service.

For 2021/22, the budget proposals allow for an additional net increase of £0.436m for inflationary pressures and to reflect the updated staffing establishment costs when

compared to estimates at budget setting for 2020/21. So a total budget of £10.341m for 2021/22. There is also a further proposal for a one year cost of the programme team of £0.437m.

It is difficult to express whether there are any additional costs as a result of the industrial dispute as it is impossible to distinguish between the effects of the pandemic and the dispute. However, as you will be aware, the industrial action was contained to two occasions. What is more, any additional costs would need to be offset against the reduction in staff pay as a result of the strike and the possible reduced pay costs if recruitment was delayed. In the meantime, you will no doubt be pleased to hear that the council's proposal to bring the dispute to an end has been accepted by the GMB and we can now move forward with the harmonisation process.

(15) Councillor Barnett – Begging in the City

93.35 In an article in *The Argus* on 14 November 2020, Brighton Housing Trust's Andy Winter said that begging was the elephant in the room that needed addressing by the council and that a great opportunity has been missed to address these problems.

Mr Winter works very hard in Brighton and Hove and is well respected. He says that unless we actively challenge begging we won't effectively address addictions, and without addressing addictions, we won't end rough sleeping.

I wholeheartedly agree and so would most of Brighton and Hove in my opinion. In my ward of Hangleton and Knoll I often speak to beggars to understand the situation they are in. Several have told me they live in accommodation provided by the council and receive food and benefits but continue to beg on the streets due to their addictions and because they feel nothing will be done to stop them.

We must take heed of Mr Winter's advice.

Please could you provide advice on the following?:

- a) The number of people the council estimates are currently begging in Brighton & Hove
- b) What efforts the council are making to end begging and aggressive begging on the streets of Brighton & Hove City Council
- c) Whether the Council would support a Cashless Donation Scheme such as that recently introduced in the Royal Borough. The Cashless Donation Scheme encourages residents to support a rough sleeper pathway as opposed to giving spare change to beggars in order to provide more effective help to people.
- d) If so, whether the council would use its Communications programme to support a Cashless Donation Scheme in the City with the aim of providing better care and ending begging on the streets.

Supporting information:

<https://www.sloughexpress.co.uk/news/maidenhead/164657/council-to-launch-cashless-support-for-rough-sleepers.html>

Supporting information:

<https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/18871492.brighton-housing-trust-boss-prevention-key-ending-homelessness/>

Reply from Councillor Gibson / Hugh-Jones, Joint Chair of the Housing Committee

93.36 I am afraid that we do not have details of the number of people begging in the City. It is worth noting (especially in the context of everyone in) that some people begging are accommodated and should not be understood as homeless. However the Council works with partners such as the police and outreach services to ensure that those identified are offered opportunities to engage with support services to address issues such as substance misuse, which can lead to the need to beg. Police colleagues will take enforcement action where individuals are identified to be causing particular and persistent concern. The council and partners already have in place a donation scheme, 'Make Change Count' ([Make Change Count 2020: support for homeless women and men - JustGiving](#)) which we encourage residents to give to rather than directly to those begging and donations will be used by charities supporting those individuals who feel the need to beg. The Council comms team promote this through the website.

(16) Councillor Simson – Public Space Protection Orders

93.37 Can the Chair of the TECC Committee please advise:

- a) Why has the Council not renewed PSPOs on the City's Parks?
- b) When and by whom was this decision taken and was there a vote?
- c) When did PSPOs for city parks expire?

Reply from Councillor Osborne / Powell, Joint Chair of the Tourism, Equalities, Communities & Culture Committee

93.38 The PSPOs for Parks and Open Spaces expired in December 2019 and a report went before the TECC committee in November 2019 where a vote was taken by the committee not to extend them.

(17) Councillor Theobald – Patcham Roundabout

93.39 Thank you for your answer to my written question at the last council meeting.

In your answer you advised the following:

Work is in progress to reach an agreement between Highways England, the council and a contractor for these works to go ahead. The roundabout is owned by Highways England and therefore a 3-way contractual arrangement is required which is agreed by all parties. Negotiations and due diligence and progressing and we hope this will be finalised shortly so that works can start in the New Year.

93.40 Can you provide any update since the last meeting on the status of this project including whether negotiations and due diligence have now been finalised?

93.41 Is there a start date for works yet?

93.42 I have been asking these questions for at least the last five years and had a number of incorrect answers.

Reply from Councillor Heley, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

93.43 I appreciate that it has taken a very long time to find a solution to improve this roundabout. This is because of the complexity of the location, there are underground tanks and it will be costly for any contractor to get on and off the roundabout in order to be compliant with health and safety and traffic management regulations given its location. Officers are still progressing the 3-way agreement and a lot of the work has been completed by it is not yet final. All being well the project should be signed off and started soon. I have asked officers to brief ward councillors as soon as we have a date.

94 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

94.1 The Mayor noted that 13 oral questions had received and that 30 minutes were set aside for the duration of the item. The Mayor then called on Councillor Platts to put her question to Councillor Mac Cafferty.

94.2 Councillor Platts asked the following question, Residents in my ward of East Brighton have been suffering the impact of drug dealing, this includes anti-social behaviour, disturbances at all hours of the day and night and, in some cases, violence. Residents are living in fear when they should have the right to a peaceful life. Plus, the local government and the police have left our resources stretched and we urgently need a more effective multi agency response. Will the Leader of the Council join me in writing to the Police and Crime Commissioner, and the Government demanding more resources to tackle drug dealing in our city?

94.3 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, Yes, of course, I would be very happy to on such an important issue. Drug dealing and the pernicious effect on the city is affecting all communities in the city. I know from the conversations I have had with you and the other Brighton & Hove councillors that it is having a really nasty affect and the events like cuckooing and there have been really bad problems with a number of our own tenants in different parts of your ward.

94.4 Councillor Platts asked the following supplementary question, I think that we need an officer that deals specifically with drug use and abusive tenants to tackle the scourge of drug abuse and dealing in our city. Will the Leader of the Council appoint such an officer and work with me to set up a drugs summit to kick this process off, or will Labour need to propose this as part of our budget amendments?

94.5 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, I am more than happy to explore it and am more than happy to work with you and the other agencies on creating a summit. As to the specific point about the budget I am happy to explore out of this meeting what that might look like. But I hope you take me on my word that I am very serious about doing something about this, as I imagine we all are as it is very important.

- 94.6 Councillor Bell asked the following question, Does the Leader of the Council believe that social value should be high on the agenda for a balance of economics?
- 94.7 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, When I got the topic of your question I thought it was going to be about an economic theorist Rosenstein's seminal work about balanced economics in 1943. I am really disappointed not to get that. You raised a really good point however about social value and how it impacts, and of course it is centrally important to how we do things to do with the local economy. This is why when we last ran the city council between 2011 and 2015 for example we did set up a scrutiny on this, I believe Councillor Simson chaired that particular scrutiny work and we all agreed at the time that it was really important in terms of what it was going to say and do especially around things like procurement and the evidence of that is now out there with things like the Procurement Advisory Board, which we all know is helping us make sensible decisions and helping drive our decisions that will be good for local communities.
- 94.8 Councillor Bell asked the following supplementary question, I would like to ask further if you would agree with me that social value, residents and business consultation must be a part of all that we are looking to achieve and I are not just noted, but are actioned on within the corporate plan. And that would you put the most important interest above the ideology policy making and consider the impact of these on our tourism and hospitality sectors. Finally, I would like to ask the leader if he would please request that he bring members to stop talking down our tourism sector in the media.
- 94.9 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, I am not aware of any of my colleagues talking down the tourism in the city and I would find that very hard to believe and we are all committed in my administration so that when the time is right that we are able, once again, to be the envy of the country with record tourism numbers and to recall visitors to the city. In terms of the broader question here in terms of the sense of value to the way that we do the budget, but also the way that we conduct the consultation, especially around those landmark decisions such as the budget every year, we have indeed incorporated a whole load of that into the way that we are talking to different communities in the city around the budget so believe that we are doing some of that. If your question is, do we need to do more? I believe we do need to do a bit more in terms of what way we engage businesses in the city and that is why I am more than happy to commit out of this meeting for both myself and Councillor Druitt as we have scheduled meetings with representatives of local businesses again before the budget and we will of course be raising the budget with them and trying to reflect the budget as a result of these discussions.
- 94.10 Councillor Childs asked the following question, In view of the current and planned house building program across the city, what action is being taken by the Council to ensure adequate public infrastructure both that provided by us directly but in terms of us working with other bodies to ensure provision of essential services such as GP services, NHS dentists, school places, roads, transport and other services are in place.
- 94.11 Councillor Littman replied, I will do my best to answer. It is tricky when the title is planning and that is the name of the committee I chair. We have partners like the CCS and utility providers who are consulted on the City Plan and are consulted on any major applications. The Council introduced a Cumulative Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which will operate alongside the Section 106 developer contributions. The S106 money will

address site specific infrastructure requirements, the CIL will be used to address cumulative infrastructure requirements associated with developments. Officers are updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify 4 grades of infrastructure required and specific infrastructure projects which need funding. Government's arrangements for CIL will be set out on how the CIL money can be bid for in order to progress projects across the city.

94.12 Councillor Childs asked the following supplementary question, What specific action will be taken by the Council to ensure the residents of Saltdean are not placed as a service detriment as a consequence of the Coombe Farm housing development and, in particular, that there will be sufficient NHS dentists, nursery school, GP and bus services provided to meet the demand of the 70 new planned houses?

94.13 Councillor Littman replied, Looking specifically at the Coombe Farm development this application is still viable so CIL will be collected 15% of that CIL money will go into a neighbourhood fund for Saltdean. More strategic requirements around the need for school infrastructure and health facilities will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, provision of health care services is taken into account city wide through liaison with the NHS. The CCG is taking forward a significant number of primary care developments to ensure capacity to deliver additional services as well as increasing outreach services for secondary care. Local primary schools currently have a surplus capacity and young children from families moving into Coombe Farm and Falmer Avenue should help reverse the dwindling pupil numbers forecast for local schools. Neither of the recent consented developments would result in vehicular trips to warrant any junction modelling. So, I am sure you will join me in lobbying, through our city's MPs for a legislative framework for town planning which will give us greater control over these issues.

We are currently doing everything we legally can to ensure appropriate infrastructure especially for new developments such as those in Saltdean which will result in an additional 104 much needed new homes, including affordable homes and contribute to us achieving our very challenging housing target.

94.14 Councillor Nemeth asked the following question, Our research shows that eight and a half hours and counting amounting to 76% of Green and Labour allotted Notice of Motion time has been spent talking about parliamentary matters in council meetings over the past year. Without resorting to referring to our National Government, and in doing so helping me to make the point further, does the Leader of the Council understand why residents are furious that councillors, like us, who have been democratically elected to run the council are both avoiding their own duties and undermining our local members of parliament when they continually raise parliamentary matters in the council chamber?

94.15 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, In terms of the question I do hope that you understand that this is the third time in 3 months that you have raised the same question, so debatably you could be accused of the very thing you are trying to accuse me of which is sadly wasting time.

As far as the consideration around our relationship with Government, our problem is that we are such a centralised society, economy and democracy that we are having to lobby

our Government around so many different issues. You will also know, from the very start off our administration onwards and the very opening speeches I gave when we became the administration that we have been lobbying and are more than happy to work with your colleague Councillor Bell on this for more powers locally. I am happy to do that with you, because I believe you may indeed have a point that I agree with which is – of course we need more powers locally we need more budget capacity locally, we need to be able to set our budgets more locally, but there is a big problem there because it is still an ask of central government.

94.16 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question, Just to clarify I didn't ask this question before, I asked about the secret agreement last time, but I am happy with that answer and I am not going to ask a supplementary.

94.17 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following question, Lockdown confirmed how vital our city's parks, playgrounds and other public green spaces are for our physical and mental well-being.

How well these assets are maintained is a reflection of our city's values and priorities? Cityparks receives a fraction of the council's annual budget and is a genuinely low-cost service that can be enjoyed by residents regardless of their income or where they live. Please would the council look at every way possible to increase City Park's budget in 2021/22 so that additional people can be recruited for enforcement, graffiti removal, organising volunteer teams and, perhaps most importantly, ensuring that all external funding sources are continually investigated.

Please would the council reconsider its appointment of a private company to dish out £100 parking fines to residents who simply want to go for a nice walk around Stanmer Park?

94.18 Councillor Heley replied, We do of course understand the importance of parks and open spaces to takes walks and recreation and this has been highlighted during the pandemic. There are dedicated car parks available for visitors to Stanmer Park. Parking enforcement is taken against vehicles parked on the grass verges and in other areas which are not safe or suitable for parking. There is clear signage to indicate where parking is not permitted and where it is. Vehicles parking on the grass areas cause damage to the beautiful environment that people are there to enjoy. Verge parking also causes problems for larger vehicles that need to access and exit the park including buses, tractors, service and emergency vehicles. Designated parking will be increased in the park in the coming months as the Stanmer Restoration Project is due to complete in the Spring. However, we would like to encourage park users to consider other forms of travel in the park such as cycling, walking and the many transport options when covid transmissions respite. The Council will therefore be retaining the services of the private company to enforce parking restrictions on verges in order to protect the beautiful park and environment.

94.19 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following supplementary question, Just for the record in 2019 when this private parking company lost a contract in Peacehaven, Lloyd Russell Moyle, MP, who pushed for the decision, said "that he wants that company chucked out of the area entirely". Do you think it is acceptable for cars with blue badges on them to

get parking fines on council owned land? And if you don't think it is acceptable then will you instruct the parking to stop issuing fines?

- 94.20 Councillor Heley replied, I didn't really hear that, but I support the right that blue badge holders have and that would apply in Stanmer Park as well, so if you have a specific issue let me know. But the parking restrictions are there for the safety of everyone, including disabled drivers.
- 94.21 Councillor Fowler asked the following question, I have been asked by the residents of Hollingdean and Stanmer when we will have more electric vehicle charging points as often the lamp post charging points have non-electric cars parked in them. I have read a recent survey and more than half of people looking to buy electric vehicles are put off as they will find it difficult to charge them. Some residents were looking forward to 2 dedicated charging spaces in Hollingbury Rise. Please can I have an update on when they will be installed and when they will be installed across the city?
- 94.22 Councillor Heley replied, I totally understand, and I have been pushing for that as well. By May this year we will have 88 legally enforceable exclusive electric vehicle charging bays across the city, with clear signing and marking that will provide further confidence to potential electric vehicle purchasers and need the assurance that you mentioned, that charging bays will not be blocked by other cars. I don't have list of each specific one, if you want to get in touch, we can find out quite easily.
- 94.23 Councillor Fowler asked the following supplementary question, Does the Administration agree that to contribute to our city becoming carbon neutral by 2030 that residents should have access to roadside electric charging and will you, as Chair, agree to expedite ways to deliver these increases of dedicated charging bays as necessary, or immediately to support residents of our city who are choosing to switch to electric vehicles.
- 94.24 Councillor Heley replied, the answer is yes.
- 94.25 Councillor Bagaeen asked the following question, The Council has pledged to use our resources and change what we do to actively dismantle racist structures and challenge racial inequality in the city. We say, on our website, that we will work in partnership with black and minority ethnic people, including council staff, residents and community groups to directly shape our Anti-Racism Strategy.
- Why then has the council failed to co-create this Anti-Racism Strategy with its only ethnic minority elected Member?
- 94.26 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, My understanding is that the really important work on the anti-racist pledge and, I believe, it was last reported that on 18 January it goes to the TECC Committee where your Conservative Party colleagues will be party to the discussion and will be able to do all the usual things that they will be able to do with the recommendations of that particular report and it comes to each particular TECC Committee. As to the specifics of engaging your good self I am confident that we would want you to be doing that as well. But the usual way, as you know that engagement would happen to other members would be through the delegations that come through the different service committees of the council.

94.27 Councillor Bagaean asked the following supplementary question, Direct engagement is probably more effective than going through colleagues at committee on this really important matter.

Why does the Council co-opt a non-voting ethnic minority, and the emphasis here is on non-voting, to sit on the Council's main decision making committee, Policy & Resources, rather than appoint an ethnic minority representative to that role and has he found that appointment effective in terms of addressing the challenges or representing our ethnic minority communities?

94.28 Councillor Mac Cafferty replied, I chaired the panel for the co-optee to the Policy & Resources Committee and, as you know, we were inundated with this wonderful talent for it that we ended up adopting a co-optee to the TECC Committee as well. I believe Councillor Mears was the Conservative Group representative to that panel and I believe that we all were massively impressed at both the talent of the people we were short listing and the wonderful way the 2 adopted co-optees conducted themselves at those interviews which has carried on in their important work on both committees and I know, from the work that I have already conducted with Anusree Biswas, who is the Policy & Resources Committee co-optee, that we are getting effective challenge where we need it from that co-optee and I imagine my colleague Councillor Powell is receiving the same at the TECC Committee as well. I think this is a really good working relationship and it is one that we would want to foster into the future and it is indeed something that we have been trying to get changes to the Constitution adopted as well, with possible changes to other committees to really begin to move the council in the direction of fighting racism and of course all party support in that to date has been present and I hope that it continues.

94.29 Councillor Allcock asked the following question, I am sure you know that meat, dairy production and fishing are responsible for at least 18% of greenhouse gas emissions. Intensive animal farming poses a significant threat in terms of the emergence of the new pandemics and increased antibacterial resistance and extensive research has shown that the biggest change that we can all make to reduce our environmental impact is to adopt a plant based diet.

Will the Administration, in consultation with schools, seek to introduce one meat free meal a day and another fully plant based meal a day per week across all its maintained schools by the start of Autumn term to encourage diet change and demonstrate another contribution that this city can make to mitigate the global climate crisis?

94.30 Councillor Clare replied, As you may be aware the contract that we have isn't in all maintained schools, it is only in primary and secondary schools, academies have their own arrangements so we can't necessarily commit to doing so across all our maintained schools. You may remember at the November CYPS Committee, we had a public question asking about how we can introduce more vegan options and shift the emphasis around how vegan children are treated as it currently treated as a 'special' diet and that wasn't felt right. I committed in the answer to that question to discuss with Caselinks, catering providers, how we can introduce more vegan options and I am looking forward to seeing the results of that as soon as it is available.

- 94.31 Councillor Allcock asked the following supplementary question, I believe the council's school meals contract that is currently worth £4m per year and is held with Caselinks whose parent company is West...? Holdings expires on 21 July 2022, so will the Administration consider bringing this service in house when the contract ends, in order to ensure profits and wages are kept within our city's economy and also provide greater flexibility with regards to developing services such as local food suppliers and diet?
- 94.32 Councillor Clare replied, Yes as you said the contract ends, from March school governors will be canvassed for their views on whether they think we should extend the current contract and governing bodies, although not required, will be consulted in that time frame. Following consulting them we will then be considering the contract and what the future provision is and if we do go with a different contract then tendering will happen in the autumn. As you know, and as you are as well, we are very committed to community wealth building so we like to see local providers being able to take contracts so I can't commit necessarily to saying that that contract would be in house or a local provider until we have consulted with schools. I think that is the right first step, but I would like to see it based more locally.
- 94.33 Councillor McNair asked the following question, While the introduction of cycling and pedestrian friendly initiatives, such as the widening of pavements, to help combat the spread of Covid19 is sometimes welcome, some essential tradesmen such as roofers, who live in Patcham & Hollingbury, are telling me that they are finding it increasingly difficult to park close to where they need to work with the loss of available parking spaces that can take the space of a van, especially in the centre of town. They need to park close to their work, with their long ladders etc and, despite having permits which cost around £700 a year. What consideration has been given to helping these key workers park close to their work?
- 94.34 Councillor Heley replied, As you probably know, trader's parking permits can be used across all zones and within the 'Terms of Use' outlined within the Council's website. We are also, in the budget, proposing that for trader's permits the cost is frozen to recognise the fact that we are in difficult times. It may be difficult for some of them, but we are in the third lockdown which proves further why we have extended things like the pavements. If you want to get in touch with the specific areas, then we can take a look at it further.
- 94.35 Councillor Heley has made a good response, but what guarantees can you give that tradesmen key workers will be included in any future consultation regarding changes to parking availability, especially with regard to any implementation of the Carbon Assembly report and whether future permit charges will be adjusted accordingly down, as well as up?
- 94.36 Councillor Heley replied, I think what you are probably referring to are things like the 'Ultra Lower Emission Zone' and the 'City Centre Proposals' and although we are very early on in those thoughts and ideas, I believe that we have already identified traders as a particularly important stakeholder and identified them as a group to have specified exemptions, so we will continue to look into that.
- 94.37 Councillor Wilkinson asked the following question, Brighton & Hove's Climate Assembly recently published its' recommendations for how our city could meet our target of

becoming carbon neutral by 2030. In the top 3 key recommendations was the recommendation that healthier, low traffic pedestrianised communities. We have also seen clear national Government guidance and active Covid related traffic measures and last year the ETS Committee agreed to pilot a low traffic neighbourhood in the Hanover area of the city. In view of this, will you join me in welcoming me in the public discussions which have taken place in the city about the value of low traffic neighbourhoods in encouraging walking and cycling and decreasing air pollution, when also having the positive effect of opening up residential and shopping streets and their communities?

94.38 Councillor Heley replied, I am surprised you had to ask me the first half of that question because I think you know how committed I am to the idea of low traffic neighbourhoods and the fact that the Green Group put forward the idea to have a trial in Hanover, which we are progressing and are having an update report to the next ETS Committee meeting.

We are hoping to expand low traffic neighbourhoods to other areas of the city and that will, of course, involve resident's consultations.

94.39 Councillor Wilkinson asked the following supplementary question, When I speak to my local residents, there is one issue raised over and over, the issue of rat running along local roads, the result of drivers trying to shear a few seconds off of their journey by trying to avoid the main roads and traffic lights. Local residents have approached me with regard to creating a low traffic neighbourhood in my ward.

94.40 Will you give your support to a consultation on the possible implementation of a low traffic neighbourhood in Central Hove?

94.41 Councillor Heley replied, That is really good to hear, because I am interested to hear of residents who want to trial low traffic neighbourhoods. We will have to look into the details, but I believe it will be best to do the pilot in Hanover well and properly, and then we can start to think about other areas. But I support that.

95 COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME 2021/22

95.1 Council considered the report of the Acting Chief Finance Officer regarding the Council Tax Scheme 2021/22. This report had been considered by the Policy & Resources Committee on 21 January 2021.

95.2 Councillor Gibson introduced the report. He said that the Green Group had said that they do all they could to locally to alleviate the impact of austerity and making the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) more generous was part of that process. One of the most important features was the 2% additional allowance. Previously the CTRS had either remained the same or become less generous and this set a new direction of travel. This was a positive report and he commended it to Council for approval.

95.3 Councillor Yates welcomed the report and noted the Labour Group amendment to the recommendations which had been agreed at the Policy & Resources Committee. There had been a 16% increase in the number of working households claiming council tax reduction, so was pleased that the CTRS had been improved. Receiving CTRS also

allowed residents to access other benefits. He confirmed the Labour Group would be supporting the report.

95.4 Councillor Miller said that the Conservative Group welcomed and supported the report.

95.5 Councillor Druitt said that main points in the report were to increase the maximum discount 80% to 82%, to reduce the minimum award from £5 per week to 1p per week, to apply council tax reduction automatically if a person was on universal credit and to increase the Discretionary Fund to a higher level of £200k. He supported Councillor Gibson is commending the report.

95.6 **RESOLVED:** That Council agreed -

- (i) The maximum rate of Council Tax Reduction discount be increased from 80% of Band D to 82% of Band D;
- (ii) The minimum award of Council Tax Reduction be reset to 1p per week;
- (iii) Funding of £0.200m be allocated for the Discretionary Council Tax Reduction fund;
- (iv) The requirement for completing a Council Tax Reduction claim form be removed for Universal Credit recipients, in the circumstances described in paragraph 4.9 of the report;
- (v) It is noted that the council's appointed S151 Chief Financial Officer will, prior to 1 April 2021, exercise delegated powers to increase the appropriate calculative elements of the scheme to give effect to national changes;
- (vi) It is noted that a more fundamental review of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme will be undertaken and consulted on for 2022/23, including the alignment of the scheme with a wider review of the council's Welfare Support Framework.

95 A BRIGHTON & HOVE CLIMATE ASSEMBLY

95.1 Council considered the report of the Executive Economy Environment & Culture which formally welcome the final report on the Brighton and Hove Climate Assembly and the interim report of the Youth Climate Assembly, noted the findings, noted the initial city council response and requested that officers consider the findings in the development of the Carbon Neutral Plan, fifth Local Transport Plan and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. The report was referred to this meeting by Councillor Platts on behalf of the Labour Group.

95.2 Councillor Platts thanked everyone for their involvement with the Assembly and said that the all recommendations of the Assembly should be taken and accepted as a whole.

95.3 Councillor McNair thanked those who took part in the Assembly. He noted that the Assembly had presented ten ambitious goals which they wanted to be implemented together, and that they asked for consultation with the community on an on-going basis. To achieve carbon neutrality by 2030 residents needed to change their habits and their attitudes, and the Council needed to ensure that this was communicated.

95.4 Councillor Mac Cafferty said that this was an important and exciting piece of work and had brought together residents from all works of life with their views on how the climate emergency could be addressed. He thanked everyone who had taken part.

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

96 EVICTIONS

96.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Williams on behalf of the Labour and Green Groups and formally seconded by Councillor Osborne.

96.2 Councillor Mears proposed an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Barnett.

96.3 Councillor Williams noted the comments and confirmed that she did not accept the amendment.

96.4 The Mayor noted that the amendment had not been accepted and therefore put it to the vote and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were voting for the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group. Councillor Peltzer Dunn did not vote on this item;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was voting for the amendment;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting against the amendment.

96.5 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost and therefore put the following motion to the vote:

The Council notes and welcomes the campaigns by the Citizens' Advice Bureau, Acorn and Shelter which call upon landlords not to evict tenants for the duration of the pandemic, and calls for;

- 1) Officers to actively contact landlords, letting agencies and housing providers to request that they;
 - do not evict tenants for the duration of the pandemic;

- work with the council, tenants' unions and representatives to find alternative solutions to eviction;
- desist from discriminatory practices that act as barriers to benefit claimants such as 'no DSS' policies, requiring 6-months rent in advance, homeowner guarantors and prohibitive terms and conditions;

2) The Council further asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government urging;

- 1) The ban on evictions be extended for at least 6 months;
- 2) The exemption to this ban which allows for eviction due to rent debt accrued during the past 6 months be removed;
- 3) The introduction of a grant to help with Covid-related rent debt;
- 4) The introduction of enforcement measures to prevent unlawful discrimination against benefit claimants by landlords and letting agents.

96.6 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group would be abstaining, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group. Councillor Peltzer Dunn did not vote on this item;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was voting for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was abstaining.

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was voting against the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting in favour of the motion.

96.7 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried.

97 SAVE THE UNION LEARNING FUND

97.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Childs on behalf of the Labour Group and formally seconded by Councillor Williams.

97.2 Councillor Brown proposed an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group which was formally seconded by Councillor McNair

97.3 Councillor Childs noted the comments and confirmed that he would accept the amendment with the additional wording if Councillor Brown agreed to accept the original wording of the Notice of Motion. Councillor Brown did not agree.

97.4 The Mayor noted that the amendment had not been accepted and therefore put it to the vote and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were voting for the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she would be abstaining;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was voting for the amendment;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting against the amendment.

97.5 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost and therefore put the following motion to the vote:

This Council notes with concern the letter received by the TUC in October from the Department for Education, outlining Ministers' decision to end the Union Learning Fund (ULF) from March 2021, and;

This Council recognises the excellent results that have been achieved by the Union Learning Fund;

- 68% of learners with no previous qualifications gained a qualification;
- 68% of employers say unions are particularly effective at inspiring reluctant learners to engage in training and development;
- 70% of learners would not have taken part in learning without union support;
- Every £1 invested in the Union Learning Fund generated a total economic return of £12.24;

This Council further requests the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Education, outlining this Council's support for the work of the Union Learning Fund, and urging;

- The Government to continue investing in the Union Learning Fund.

97.6 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group would be abstaining, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was voting for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was abstaining.

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was voting against the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting in favour of the motion.

97.7 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried.

98 BONE MARROW, STEM CELL AND ORGAN DONATION

98.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Miller on behalf of the Conservative Group and formally seconded by Councillor McNair.

98.2 Councillor Evans proposed an amendment on behalf of the Labour Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Williams.

98.3 Councillor Miller confirmed that he would accept the amendment.

98.4 The Mayor noted that the amendment had been accepted and therefore put the following Notice of Motion as amended to the vote:

This Council:

- Requests officers to take the necessary steps to allow staff to take time off work for bone marrow, stem cell or organ donation without having to use annual leave;
- Commends the huge personal sacrifices that residents undergo to save the lives of others and sets out to assist in promoting that endeavour;
- Requests officers to put in place a communication campaign to all staff and residents of the city encouraging them to become blood donors and bone marrow/stem cell donors through the British Bone Marrow Registry (part of the NHS Blood & Transplant service) or the leading charities in the field – Anthony Nolan and DKMS Foundation; and
- To target this communication campaign particularly at staff and residents who are under 40, and those of all Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds, since these groups are most needed on the registries.

98.5 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group would be abstaining, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was voting in favour of the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was voting in favour of the motion.

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was voting in favour of the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting in favour of the motion.

98.6 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried.

99 VALUE FOR MONEY SAVINGS

99.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Bagaeen on behalf of the Conservative Group and formally seconded by Councillor Miller.

99.2 The Mayor put the following Notice of Motion to the vote,

This Council:

1. Notes that the Administration is responsible for a budget of hundreds of millions of pounds each year;
2. Notes numerous recent examples of taxpayers' money being wasted as listed in Supporting Information below;
3. Requests that the Council initiates a 'value for money' programme examining back-office savings, further savings under a Workstyles programme 2 and how further similar financial occurrences can be avoided, with a report being sent to Policy & Resources Committee within 6 months to outline the results of this; and

Requests that officers provide the estimated costs in this report to Policy & Resources Committee, if necessary through going out to tender, of removing every piece of graffiti from public and private land within the city boundary; and this to be a recommendation of spend from the savings outlined in (3).

99.3 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were against the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were against the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were in favour of the motion, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was against the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she would be abstaining;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was in favour of the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was against the motion.

99.4 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had not been carried.

100 COP 26 & WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS

100.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Phillips on behalf of the Green and Labour Groups and formally seconded by Councillor Platts.

100.2 Councillor Fishleigh proposed an amendment which was formally seconded by Councillor Janio.

100.3 Councillor Phillips noted the comments and confirmed that she would not accept the amendment.

100.4 The Mayor noted that the amendment had not been accepted and therefore put it to the vote and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were voting for the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was for the amendment;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was for the amendment;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting against the amendment.

100.5 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost and therefore put the following motion to the vote:

Council notes that this year the UK is hosting COP26, a key forum focusing on climate change and actions that will affect the wellbeing of future generations.

Council also notes the progress of the Wellbeing of Future Generations Bill, following the adoption of a similar Bill in Wales, that confers a statutory duty on councils in Wales to consider how decisions will impact upon wellbeing now and into the future.

Council therefore resolves to:

- express its support for a Wellbeing For Future Generations Act and associated impact locally, that would require public bodies to consider how decisions made now affect future needs, and tackle persistent problems such as poverty, health inequalities and climate change;
- further to the government's 10 point Environment Plan, to ask the Chief Executive to write to government to request that local councils are given the funding and powers needed to take action on the wellbeing of future generations, by implementing climate and ecological emergency action by 2030, further to the meeting of COP 26 in the UK this year.

And further, calls on Policy & Resources Committee to address the wellbeing of future generations in our city, through:

- Agreeing to commission a report to review options for how council can ensure, through cross-party and city-wide collaboration, that the impact of decisions on future generations are adequately understood, risk assessed and analysed;
- that as part of this work, councillors agree to review, through the annual KPI report and other processes, a yearly appraisal of long-term economic, social, environmental and cultural trends, and to use these trends to publish additional 'future generations' impact assessments' in council reports for decision.

100.6 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were in favour of the motion, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was for the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was for the motion.

100.7 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried.

Closure Motion

- 100.8 The Mayor noted the meeting had been in session for 4 hours and in accordance with council procedural rules, he was required to move a closure motion. He therefore moved that the meeting should be concluded and put the motion to the vote.
- 100.10 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:
- Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were in against the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;
- Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;
- Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were against the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;
- Councillor Brennan confirmed that she would be abstaining;
- Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was voting against the motion;
- Councillor Janio confirmed that he was voting against the motion;
- Councillor Knight confirmed that she was against the motion.
- 100.11 **RESOLVED:** The Mayor noted that the motion had been lost and therefore moved to the next item.

101 ROAD DANGER REDUCTION

- 101.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Hills on behalf of the Green and Labour Group and formally seconded by Councillor Wilkins.
- 101.2 Councillors Peltzer Dunn, Janio, Fishleigh, Lewry, Gibson and Nield spoke on the motion.
- 101.3 The Mayor put the following Notice of Motion to the vote,

This council notes that the Government looks set to incorporate a 'hierarchy of road users' into the Highway Code, with cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders defined as our most vulnerable road users. This acknowledges the vehicles with the greatest potential to cause harm to other road users.

We call upon the council to:

- sign up to the Road Danger Reduction Forum Charter², which looks at ways to make roads safer for all road users;
- work with Sussex Police on ways to keep our most vulnerable residents safe on our roads;

Update the city's road safety strategy through:

- bringing to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee an updated safety strategy including road danger reduction measures such as:

- creating an environment, using positive incentives, that supports the use of active travel methods and explores options for future financial subsidies for active travel where finance allows;
- measuring danger on our roads through metrics other than just a reduction in casualty numbers, with a view to a proactive approach that does not require incidents to occur before action is taken;
- increasing the number of pedestrian crossings by schools and parks;
- looking to expand the number of school road closure orders;
- expanding interventions designed to cut drivers' speed, such as Low Traffic Neighbourhoods.

101.4 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were for the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were for the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were for the motion, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he would be abstaining;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was for the motion.

101.5 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been agreed.

102 TRANS INCLUSION

102.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Powell on behalf of the Green, Labour and Conservative Groups and formally seconded by Councillor Evans and Councillor Simson.

102.2 Councillor Janio spoke on the motion.

102.3 The Mayor put the following Notice of Motion to the vote,

This council notes that:

- Brighton & Hove has seen rising levels of hate crime towards transgender people by 43%.

- the recent High Court judgment on transgender young people's access to healthcare pathways has caused great uncertainty and anxiety for many transgender children, young people and their families in our city and across the UK.

This council believes:

- that all people should feel safe in our city, be treated with compassion and deserve equality.
- all people should be treated as equals, regardless of their gender identity
- the gender identities of cisgender, transgender and non-binary people alike are all equally valid.
- Trans men are men. Trans women are women. Non-binary identities exist and are valid.

Further that this council reaffirms its commitment to:

- Working towards equality and a safer city for transgender people.
- Working to ensure inclusive practices are implemented across the council in order that all people feel welcome and valued.

102.4 The Mayor and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were for the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were for the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were for the motion, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was for the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was for the motion.

102.5 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been agreed.

103 SUPPORT FOR EXCLUDED UK AND THOSE EXCLUDED FROM COVID SUPPORT SCHEMES IN THE CITY

103.1 The Notice of Motion as listed on the agenda was proposed by Councillor Osborne on behalf of the Green Group and formally seconded by Councillor Hugh-Jones.

103.2 Councillor Theobald proposed an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group which was formally seconded by Councillor Barnett.

103.3 Councillors Janio and Appich spoke on the motion.

103.4 Councillor Osborne noted the comments and confirmed that he would not accept the amendment.

103.5 The Mayor noted that the amendment had not been accepted and therefore put it to the vote and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were against the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group were voting for the amendment and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was against the amendment;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she would be abstaining;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he was for the amendment;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was voting against the amendment.

103.6 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost and therefore put the following motion to the vote:

This council notes that three million people across the UK have missed out on Government financial support schemes set up in the pandemic ('the excluded') due to technicalities such as:

- recently changing job;
- being a director of a limited company;
- earning less than half their income through self-employment;

Council notes that campaigns such as ExcludedUK have asked that the Government close the gaps in its financial support schemes, and explore options to retroactively compensate people and businesses that were ineligible for the Government's financial support.

Council therefore resolves to:

- Support the 'Excluded UK' campaign and its efforts to support 'the excluded';
- ask all councillors to sign ExcludedUK's open letter to the Chancellor that calls for such consideration; calling on the government to address the disparities in support, to ensure that all can receive support they need at this time;
- seek the support of councillors in promoting support available from organisations focused on financial inclusion and support in the city, including by:

- Requesting that Policy and Resources Committee consider what additional practical steps the Council can offer to offer support and advice wherever possible to those affected;
- Continuing to promote the council's community hub that can assist with such matters as help with bills and mental health.

103.7 The Mayor called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were in favour of the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group would be abstaining, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he would be abstaining;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she was for the motion.

103.8 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried.

104 UNIVERSAL CREDIT

Notices of Motion for Confirmatory Vote

104.1 The Mayor advised that following the difficulties with the webcasting at the 17 December 2020 Council meeting, there was a need to hold confirmatory votes for the following notices of motion:

Item 104 - Universal Credit (Item 75 on the agenda for December meeting)

Item 105 - Action to Reduce the Impact of Fireworks (Item 76 on the agenda for December meeting)

Item 106 - Support United Nations TPNW – ICAN Cities Appeal (Item 77 on the agenda for December meeting)

Item 107 - Power of Youth Charter (Item 78 on the agenda for December meeting)

104.2 The Monitoring Officer said at the 17 December 2020 meeting the above Notices of Motion were discussed and voted on when the webcast was not working, because of that those proceedings were not held in accordance with the regulations relating to virtual meetings, which meant that those votes were effectively void or of doubtful legality. It was therefore suggested that members have a confirmatory vote on those items again without further discussion. There were two options, either to vote on each item separately or to take a block vote. It was suggested that Items 104, 105 and 107 be

taken by a block vote and Item 106 be voted on separately as there had been an amendment on that item which was carried by the Mayor's casting vote.

- 104.3 Councillor Platts noted that one of the Labour Group had had to leave this meeting, and that could impact on a vote for Item 106. Councillor Bell asked if someone who was not at the December meeting, and so had not heard the full discussion on the items, could vote at this meeting. The Monitoring officer confirmed that it was not essential for someone to have heard the discussion to be able to vote. Councillor Bell asked if Members could change the way they voted at the December meeting, and was advised they could.
- 104.4 The Monitoring Officer confirmed that if Members wanted to have a block vote they would need to suspend the Standing Orders. Alternatively, Members could vote on each item separately which would mean that Standing Orders would not need to be suspended.
- 104.5 Councillors Mac Cafferty, Platts and Bell confirmed that they would agree to having a block vote to confirm that they would be voting the same way for Items 104, 105 and 107 and to have a recorded vote for Item 106.
- 104.6 The Mayor asked if Council were agreeable to suspend Standing Orders to have a block vote on Items 104, 105 and 107. Council agreed. The Mayor confirmed that there would be a recorded vote on Item 106 for both the amendment and the motion.
- 104.7 The Mayor put Items 104, 105 and 107 to the vote, and called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:
- Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group would be voting the same way for those motions and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;
- Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group would be voting the same way for those motions and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;
- Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group would be voting the same way for those motions, and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;
- Councillor Brennan confirmed that she would be voting the same way for those motions;
- Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she would be voting the same way for those motions;
- Councillor Janio confirmed that he would be voting the same way for those motions;
- Councillor Knight confirmed that she would be voting the same way for those motions.
- 104.6 The Mayor referred Item 106 and said that there would be a recorded vote for both the amendment and the motion. He called on each member to confirm if they would vote for, against or abstain on the amendment.

The votes were 20 For, 18 Against and 13 Abstentions (three Councillors were not in attendance when the vote was taken).

		For	Against	Abstain			For	Against	Abstain
1	Allcock		√		28	Lewry			√
2	Appich		√		29	Littman	√		
3	Atkinson		√		30	Lloyd	√		
4	Bagaeen			√	31	MacCafferty	√		
5	Barnett			√	32	McNair			√
6	Bell			√	33	Mears			√
7	Brennan	√			34	Miller			√
8	Brown			√	35	Moonan		√	
9	Childs		√		36	Nemeth			√
10	Clare	√			37	Nield	√		
11	Davis	√			38	O'Quinn			
12	Deane	√			39	Osborne	√		
13	Druitt	√			40	Peltzer Dunn			√
14	Gibson	√			41	Phillips	√		
15	Grimshaw		√		42	Pissaridou		√	
16	Ebel	√			43	Powell	√		
17	Evans		√		44	Platts		√	
18	Fishleigh			√	45	Rainey			
19	Fowler		√		46	Robins		√	
20	Hamilton		√		47	Shanks	√		
21	Heley	√			48	Simson			√
22	Henry		√		49	Theobald			√
23	Hill		√		50	Wares			
24	Hills	√			51	Wilkinson		√	
25	Hugh-Jones	√			52	Williams		√	

26	Janio		√		53	West	√		
27	Knight	√			54	Yates		√	

104.7 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been accepted.

104.8 The Mayor then called on each member to confirm if they would vote for, against or abstain on the Notice of Motion as amended. It was agreed that a recorded vote was not needed for the substantive Notice of Motion as amended. He therefore called on each of the Group Leaders to confirm their position as well as the Groups in turn and each of the Independent Members:

Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that the Green Group were for the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Green Group;

Councillor Platts stated that the Labour Group were for the motion and this was confirmed by the Members of the Labour Group;

Councillor Bell stated that the Conservative Group would be abstaining and this was confirmed by the Members of the Conservative Group;

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she was for the motion;

Councillor Fishleigh confirmed that she would be abstaining;

Councillor Janio confirmed that he would be voting against the motion;

Councillor Knight confirmed that she would be voting for the motion.

104.9 **RESOLVED:** It was agreed that:

- (i) Item 104 - Universal Credit. The decision to agree the Notice of Motion was confirmed.
- (ii) Item 105 - Action to Reduce the Impact of Fireworks. The decision to agree the Notice of Motion was confirmed.
- (iii) Item 106 – Support United Nations TPNW – ICAN Cities Appeal. The Notice of Motion as amended was agreed.
- (iv) Item 107 - Power of Youth Charter. The decision to agree the Notice of Motion as amended was confirmed.

105 ACTION TO REDUCE THE IMPACT OF FIREWORKS

105.1 This matter was discussed under Item 104.

105.2 **RESOLVED:** The decision taken at the meeting held on 17 December 2020 to agree the Notice of Motion was confirmed.

106 SUPPORT UNITED NATIONS TPNW - ICAN CITIES APPEAL

106.1 This matter was discussed under Item 104.

106.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Notice of Motion (as amended) was agreed.

107 POWER OF YOUTH CHARTER

107.1 This matter was discussed under Item 104.

107.2 **RESOLVED:** The decision taken at the meeting held on 17 December 2020 to agree the Notice of Motion as amended was confirmed.

108 CLOSE OF MEETING

108.1 The mayor formally closed the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 10.40pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2021