

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**COUNCIL****4.30pm 6 APRIL 2017****COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

Present: Councillors West (Chair), Marsh (Deputy Chair), Allen, Atkinson, Barford, Barnett, Bell, Bennett, Brown, Cattell, Chapman, Cobb, Daniel, Deane, Druitt, Gibson, Gilbey, Greenbaum, Hamilton, Hill, Horan, Hyde, Inkipin-Leissner, Janio, Knight, Lewry, Littman, Mac Cafferty, Meadows, Mears, Miller, Mitchell, Moonan, Morgan, Morris, Nemeth, A Norman, K Norman, O'Quinn, Page, Peltzer Dunn, Penn, Phillips, Robins, Russell-Moyle, Simson, Sykes, Taylor, C Theobald, G Theobald, Wares, Wealls and Yates.

PART ONE**83 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 83.1 Councillors Marsh, Cattell, Mitchell, Morgan, Hamilton, Daniel, Gilbey, Russell-Moyle, Greenbaum, Littman Mears and Peltzer Dunn each declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 97(a), Notice of Motion concerning pension protection for local government employees as they had been a member of the East Sussex Pension Scheme. Each Member confirmed that they had applied for and been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on the matter by the Monitoring Officer.
- 83.2 Councillor Page declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 89(c), 'Give Our Children a School Place in Catchment' - Petition for debate as his grand-daughter was one of the 57 children without a preference place. He would therefore leave the chamber during the item and take no part in the debate or voting thereon.
- 83.3 No other declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.

84 MINUTES

- 84.1 The minutes of the last ordinary meeting held on the 26th January 2017 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings; and
- 84.2 The minutes of the budget council meeting held on the 23rd February 2017, were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings; subject to the budget figure in paragraph 78.5 on page 42 being amended to 4.99% rather than 4%.

85 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

- 85.1 The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that the City's football club were extremely close to securing promotion to the Premier League, needing only 12 more points from the last 6 games. He also noted that the club was encouraging everyone to get behind the team as part of their 'We're in Together Campaign' and as such he hoped all Members would find the time to put a 'selfie' on Facebook. In the meantime he was aware the council wanted to show its support by wearing the official blue & white stripes and therefore called on all Members to stand for a photo.
- 85.2 The Mayor then invited Martin Perry from Brighton & Hove Albion to address the meeting.
- 85.3 Mr. Perry thanked the council for their support and stated that he would ensure the team were made aware of the support and hoped that they would achieve promotion.
- 85.4 The Mayor then invited Nick Wilmot to come forward to receive the ISO901 certificate on behalf on the Environmental Health & Licensing Team, who had recently met the standard and offered the council's congratulations to the team.
- 85.5 The Mayor then referred to his recent activities including English Tourism week, which saw the renaming of the Brighton Palace Pier, the hosting of digital gaming companies from China, the unveiling of a Blue Plaque to Edward Zeth, who was a Brighton born Jew who served as an under-cover agent in France during the 2nd World War. He also attended the Kurdish New Year celebrations, the inter-school swimming championships, and noted that Brighton & Hove had recently been listed as the most active city in the country.
- 85.6 The Mayor then noted that the coming weekend would see the Brighton Marathon and associated events taking place, and invited Members to join him at any of his forthcoming charity events which included, 23rd April Biosphere Bike rides, and on the 30th April the Brighton Walk. He was also taking part in the Brighton Consortium's Paris to Brighton cycle ride from the 4th to the 8th May, during which he would be launching the Brighton Fringe.
- 85.7 Finally, the Mayor wished to draw Members' attention to the new Mayoral robes that had been designed and donated by Gresham Blake and thanked him on behalf of the council.

86 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.

- 86.1 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.
- 86.2 Ms. Antigone Nikiteas presented a petition signed by 254 residents requesting that the council allows horses to be kept in Stanmer Village.

- 86.3 Ms. Cook presented a petition signed by 662 residents the banning of fireworks in the city.
- 86.4 Councillor Taylor presented a petition signed by 90 residents requesting a bus shelter to be installed in Hazeldene Meads.
- 86.5 Mr. Mitchell presented a petition signed by 593 residents calling on the Council not to close Queen's Park Nursery School.
- 86.6 Councillor Deane presented a petition signed by 84 residents requesting double yellow lines to be installed in Surrey Street.
- 86.7 Councillor Bennett presented a petition signed by 55 residents requesting that the green in Court Farm Road be reinstated for public use and the burger van outside Blatchington Mill School be moved.

87 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 87.1 The Mayor reported that 8 written questions had been received from members of the public and invited Mr. Hawtree to come forward and address the council.
- 87.2 Mr. Hawtree asked the following question; "Would Councillor Robins please tell us how much it will now cost a reader to reserve a book - either not yet published or was not stocked on publication by the Libraries system - so that said reader is duly, personally, informed that it has been obtained and is reserved to await his/her collection when it has been added to the stock?"
- 87.3 Councillor Robins replied; "The Libraries Service now offers two levels of service for book requests: a paid for full service and a free basic service. The full requests service costs £7 for an adult and £3 for children and young people, payable up-front to cover administrative costs. Included in this price are:
- Regular updates on progress
 - Free reservation of the book if it is purchased; or a free inter-library loan if it is being obtained that way
 - Notification when it is ready for collection

The free basic service is available to customers who wish to make a recommendation for a book purchase.

- There is no reservation with this service, no inter-library loan and no specific notifications.
- The customer will need to check the catalogue themselves to see if the item has been bought and put into stock.
- They can then make their own reservation if they wish at the cost of £1 for adults and 50p for children, with concessions at half price.

This information is readily available at your local library if you'd like to pop in and ask them."

- 87.4 Mr. Hawtree asked the following supplementary question; “As your proposal is set to raise a mere £2,500, if that, will you agree to revisit this proposal in the next financial year 2017/18?”
- 87.5 Councillor Robins replied; “This charge is to cover the administrative cost of purchasing the item for the one off request and providing notification. It only partly contributes to the cost of borrowing from another library service. Our advice for customers requesting a book pre-publication is to wait to see if the library service is already intending to purchase it and then reserve it once it is in stock.”
- 87.6 The Mayor thanked Mr. Hawtree for his questions and invited Ms. Hynds to come forward and address the council.
- 87.7 Ms. Hynds asked the following question; “Given the housing crisis in our city and failure of developers to meet affordable housing targets, including Crest Nicholson paying £1.2 million rather than supply 8 affordable flats in a 47-unit block in Davigdor Road, Hove, why has the council turned down approaches from the KSD Group to build high-quality low-cost housing in Brighton & Hove following their successful pilot scheme in Lewes which saw KSD and Lewes District Council deliver two-bedroom homes for £90/week social rent?”
- 87.8 Councillor Meadows replied; “As I am sure you are aware the council is tackling the housing crisis in our city in a number of different ways. Building our own council rented homes, bringing empty properties back into use and developing in partnership to increase the supply of lower cost homes. It is unfortunate that I do not have any sway with private developers indeed I wish I did. However commuted sums through the planning process do allow us to use those sums directly on building more affordable homes on our own sites and, with that in mind, we are looking to build on three sites in the city.
- In 2016 potential developer partners were invited to submit expressions of interest to help us deliver new permanent homes for affordable rent. This was publicised to all those locally and nationally to explore the market as fully as possible and obtain best value for the council. KSD were one of those shortlisted developers. However after a rigorous selection process a local volumetric modular constructor was selected as the preferred developer.”
- 87.9 Ms. Hynds asked the following supplementary question; “The council has a target of building 50 fully wheelchair accessible new homes but, with 87 wheel chair users and 233 people that may need to use a wheelchair or have very poor mobility on the housing waiting list, shouldn't the target figure be in the hundreds rather than the tens?”
- 87.10 Councillor Meadows replied; “I do understand the issues around people with disabilities finding appropriate homes in the city and that is why in all our developments a certain percentage is given over to fully wheelchair accessible homes for those who are most in need and it is something that we want to progress throughout our building programme. We are aware of this and we are tackling it but unfortunately we are the first administration to start this work.”

- 87.11 The Mayor thanked Ms. Hynds for her questions and invited Mr. Royle to come forward and address the council.
- 87.12 Mr. Royle asked the following question; “If the PSPO is an attempt to address the issue of homelessness in Brighton and Hove, then what aftercare and support can a homeless person expect to receive when a PSPO is enforced, their shelter is destroyed and they are forced to sit in custody until a hearing, all for the supposed crime of being unable to provide an address?”
- 87.13 Councillor Mitchell replied; “PSPOs are not in themselves a measure to reduce homelessness. A PSPO seeks to address antisocial behaviour in specific city parks and open spaces that have been reported to the council and the police by people using those spaces who have felt sufficiently concerned to report the incidents that they have witnessed. It is not intended that the PSPO will address rough sleeping. If a rough sleeper is in breach they will be given the same support and care as they would in any other circumstance.”
- 87.14 Mr. Royle asked the following supplementary question; “Following the decision to postpone the opening on empty council buildings to the homeless community, combined with plans to move those in temporary accommodation to up to an hour away from the city by public transport, and now the PSPO targeting travellers and homeless communities. It seems that the council are attempting to outsource by forcing the poor and the homeless out of the city they call home. Why is it that a Labour controlled council is pursuing this agenda of social cleansing when you claim to represent the most vulnerable in society?”
- 87.15 Councillor Mitchell replied; “Officers will use a problem solving approach and this policy has been developed to fit in with the council’s rough sleeper and homelessness strategies and not to work against them. The legislation has to be used proportionately and it aims to balance the needs of the general public’s safe enjoyment of our parks and open spaces with the needs of those whose behaviour is causing complaint.”
- 87.16 The Mayor thanked Mr. Royle for his questions and invited Ms. Davies to come forward and address the council.
- 87.17 Ms. Davies asked the following question; “When a traveller family is targeted by the new PSPO law, the vehicle which is their home is removed and parents are put into the cells for the crime of having no fixed address, what will then happen to the children in these families who have seen their parents taken away?”
- 87.18 Councillor Mitchell replied; “No specific groups of people will be targeted by PSPOs. The only test for officers is whether the behaviour in those specific locations is a breach of the PSPO. If it is and the officers deem it proportionate, reasonable and necessary then a PSPO fixed penalty notice can be considered. The primary means of dealing with the antisocial behaviour will be for officers to point out that the PSPO is being breached and to ask that the activity stop and that the perpetrators move. In relation to unauthorised encampments exactly the same welfare checks as are carried out now will continue to be undertaken.”

- 87.19 Ms. Davies asked the following supplementary question; “Why is it that Brighton & Hove City Council wants to target traveller families and ruin young people’s lives by potentially tearing their families apart?”
- 87.20 Councillor Mitchell replied; “A problem solving approach will be used with care and support offered where necessary. Provision for travellers is available at the newly refurbished site at Horsdean.”
- 87.21 The Mayor thanked Ms. Davies for her questions and invited Ms. Pepper to come forward and address the council.
- 87.22 Ms. Pepper asked the following question; “To what extent do councillors believe that the PSPO targets specific groups within in the city's community, such as the homeless and ethnically defined gypsies and travellers?”
- 87.23 Councillor Mitchell replied; “The PSPO does not target any particular group of people. It aims to deal with behaviour perpetrated by some people that impacts on people using specific parks and open spaces where anti-social behaviour is reported. We do however recognise that some rough sleepers and Gypsies and Travellers will be impacted upon. A full Equality Impact Assessment was carried out and accompanied the committee report that went to PR&G in July 2016.

To mitigate the impact on Gypsies and Travellers and rough sleepers we have the following in place:

- Provision for Travellers at Horsdean Transit Site (which has only had a 49% occupancy since it opened in August 2016)
 - PSPOs are only applied to 12 higher impact areas in the city where there is evidence of ASB and so there are many other lower impact areas where trespass would not lead to a Fixed Penalty Notice
 - For Travellers we have a toleration protocol whereby if they do go to a lower impact area and comply with a toleration agreement they can remain in that location for up to 28 days.
 - In regard to rough sleepers we also have the commissioned St Mungo’s to work with rough sleepers to assist them to find accommodation, although it may not be in the city if they do not have a local connection.”
- 87.24 Ms. Pepper asked the following supplementary question; “How will the Council ensure that the human rights of travellers such as those guaranteed in Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (1998); the right to respect his private and family life, his home and correspondence are not affected by this law?”
- 87.25 Councillor Mitchell replied; “My previous response to you outlined the legislation that this council works within and adheres to. The council has provided both permanent and transit pitches for Travellers. In regards to rough sleepers, we are working with our partner organisations to help them into accommodation”
- 87.26 The Mayor thanked Ms. Pepper for her questions and invited Mr. Garside to come forward and address the council.

87.27 Mr. Garside asked the following question; "As the i360 enters its eighth month of trading, Councillor Morgan, would it be in order to ask how much money the Council has so far received from this "attraction"? Furthermore, am I right in assuming that a fully audited breakdown of the relevant figures will be made available for public inspection?"

87.28 Councillor Morgan replied; "The payments received in the current financial year from the BA i360 are all on time and as forecast. These are as follows:

Payments already received

- Arrangements fee for the loan received in full £543,300
- Utilisation fees for the loan received in full £417,330
- Public works loan board fees for each load drawn down received in full £11,930
- Loan interest payment received in full before the due date of 31 December 2016 £1,063,544.60.

All payments and receipts are subject to the council's financial management processes and incorporated in regular financial monitoring reports to committee. All payments relating to the loan agreement with BA i360 have been made on time and as forecast. The council's statement of accounts incorporates transactions with the BA i360 and is subject to an external audit and made available for public inspection prior to agreement at the council's Audit & Standards Committee."

87.29 Mr. Garside asked the following supplementary question; "Bearing in mind the ongoing and frequent problems occurring with this attraction, in the event of the companies collapse into bankruptcy, does this authority have any contingency plans for the repayment to the Public Works Loan Board for the huge sum of money which it borrowed on the i360's behalf?"

87.30 Councillor Morgan replied; "I think it is in the interest of the city that the i360 does succeed. Its operational matters are a matter for BA i360 themselves. I am happy to speak to officers and obtain the relevant documents that were passed at the time of the agreement which was in the prior administration."

87.31 The Mayor thanked Mr. Garside for his questions and invited Ms. Mountain to come forward and address the council.

87.32 Mr. Garside informed the Mayor that Ms. Mountain had had to leave the meeting and therefore asked that he put her question to Councillor Mitchell on her behalf. Mr. Garside then asked the following question; "It is often claimed by this Administration, that the profits deriving from this City's exorbitant parking charges are very largely employed in covering the costs of Concessionary Bus passes for elderly and disabled residents.

This being the case, would it be pertinent for me to respectfully request a full breakdown of the sums of money paid by this authority to Brighton & Hove Buses, the Big Lemon, Stagecoach and any other bus company.

Also, could you please furnish me with the amount, if any, of money which we receive from Central Government for this purpose?"

- 87.33 Councillor Mitchell replied; "I'm afraid that I will not be able to provide a breakdown of the sums paid by the local authority to each of the bus companies because there are commercial sensitivities in relation to the council releasing that information. I can confirm that the total cost of the concessionary bus pass scheme to the council is £10,750,000. You asked about the amount of money for the scheme that is funded by the government and the answer is none. The vast of majority of parking fees have been frozen this year, where they have increased it is to target parking congestion in specific areas to free up more spaces for residents and business."
- 87.34 Mr. Garside asked the following supplementary question on behalf of Ms. Mountain; "As the devil invariably appears to be in the detail could you please indulge me in a little further detail precisely how many bus passes are issued and what is the cost of each one?"
- 87.35 Councillor Mitchell replied; "There are 43,000 individual bus passes issued by the Authority and as I have just said the overall cost to the council is £10,750,000. Individually the cost of administering each bus pass I'm afraid I don't have that information to hand."
- 87.36 The Mayor thanked Mr. Garside for the questions and invited Mr. Furness to come forward and address the council.
- 87.37 The Mayor noted that Mr. Furness was unable to attend and stated that a written response would be sent to him and noted that this concluded the item.

88 DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 88.1 The Mayor noted that no deputations had been received for the current meeting.

89 PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE

- 89.1 The Mayor sated that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at the council meeting. He had been made aware of five such petitions and would therefore take each in turn.

(A) STOP PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS

- 89.2 The Mayor then invited Gemma Challenger as the lead petitioner to present the petition calling on the Council to stop the enforcement of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) in Brighton and Hove.
- 89.3 Ms. Challenger thanked the Mayor and stated that she was presenting the petition on behalf of the NFA Residents Association and noted that it had well over 5,000 signatures. She stated that use of PSPOs were likely to infringe on the rights of the travelling community and homeless people and called on the council to take account of the recommendations of the Fairness Commission and not allow these to be used to criminalise particular, non-criminal, activities taking place within a specified area.
- 89.4 The Mayor thanked Ms. Challenger and called on Councillor Mitchell to respond to the petition.

- 89.5 Councillor Mitchell stated that the council had a responsibility to protect its public spaces and if used properly PSPOs would not infringe on the rights of people. There was a need to find a solution to the problem of unauthorised encampments and actions of a minority of people which impacted on residents and those using public spaces for their enjoyment.
- 89.6 Councillor G. Theobald stated that the council had a responsibility to its electors and residents and noted that there had been a full consultation on the introduction of PSPOs with 77% of residents agreeing that it would be a good idea. A report had been fully considered by committee and the decision agreed. He noted that the petition had a significant number of signatures from people outside of the city and proposed an amendment to the recommendation to the effect that the petition simply be noted and no further action taken. He also noted that a transit site for travellers was available and stated that residents should be able to use the public spaces in the city for their enjoyment
- 89.7 Councillor Wealls formally seconded the proposed amendment.
- 89.8 Councillor Mac Cafferty stated that he believed there was a need for a policy on this matter and not just guidance. He had been contacted by a number of residents concerned about the issue and anti-social behaviour. However, PSPOs were a blunt unsophisticated tool to deal with the problem and the Council already had powers that could be used to deal with anti-social behaviour e.g. by-laws. He was unaware of any evidence that showed PSPO's to be an effective measure and felt that there was a need to support those who found themselves to be homeless rather than criminalise them.
- 89.9 In response to the debate Councillor Mitchell noted the comments and stated that she was happy to provide Councillor Mac Cafferty with additional information in regard to the council's policy for PSPOs
- 89.10 The Mayor stated that an amendment to the recommendation to refer the petition to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee had been moved and put it to the vote which was carried.
- 89.11 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been **carried** by 42 votes to 11 with no abstentions.
- 89.12 The Mayor then put the recommendation as amended to the vote which was **carried** by 42 votes to 11 as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Marsh	✓		
2	Atkinson	✓			Meadows	✓		
3	Barford	✓			Mears	✓		
4	Barnett	✓			Miller	✓		

5	Bell	✓			Mitchell	✓		
6	Bennett	✓			Moonan	✓		
7	Bewick	Not present			Morgan	✓		
8	Brown	✓			Morris	✓		
9	Cattell	✓			Nemeth	✓		
10	Chapman	✓			Norman A	✓		
11	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
12	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
13	Deane		X		Page		X	
14	Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	✓		
15	Gibson		X		Penn	✓		
16	Gilbey	✓			Phillips		X	
17	Greenbaum		X		Robins	✓		
18	Hamilton	✓			Russell-Moyle	✓		
19	Hill	✓			Simson	✓		
20	Horan	✓			Sykes		X	
21	Hyde	✓			Taylor	✓		
22	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald C	✓		
23	Janio	✓			Theobald G	✓		
24	Knight		X		Wares	✓		
25	Lewry	✓			Wealls	✓		
26	Littman		X		West		X	
27	Mac Cafferty		X		Yates	✓		
					Total	42	11	0

89.13 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted and no further action be taken.

(B) A259 SOUTH COAST ROAD

89.14 The Mayor then invited Nigel Smith and Lynne Moss as the lead petitioner to present the petition calling on the Council to undertake a joint traffic impact study along the A259 South Coast Road with East Sussex County Council and Lewes District Council.

- 89.15 Mr. Smith thanked the Mayor and stated that the petitioners were hoping that the three authorities would work together to undertake a traffic congestion study, taking in to account the air quality in Rottingdean High Street. It was difficult to monitor the full length of traffic queues and the level of traffic which they believed exceeded the capacity of the road infrastructure and was likely to lead to the loss of the A259.
- 89.16 Ms. Moss stated that there was a need for the requested impact study and noted that level of congestion in Rottingdean High Street was unmerited. She also noted that there were planning applications for future developments which would add to the overall situation and pressure on the A259, and asked that officers ensure local ward councillors are kept up to date on the progress of the applications, as over 4,500 people had signed the petition.
- 89.17 The Mayor thanked Mr. Smith and Ms. Moss and called on Councillor Mitchell to respond to the petition.
- 89.18 Councillor Mitchell thanked the petitioners and noted that there had already been a great deal of cross-boundary work with other local authorities in relation to impact studies along the A259. She noted that low emission buses had been introduced and that passenger numbers had increased and suggested that more buses were needed along with connecting services to other areas around the city. She also felt that because of the various studies already undertaken it would be better to simply note the petition rather than refer it to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.
- 89.19 Councillor Mears stated that she felt that further action was necessary and that additional information would help to formulate an action plan to address the issues caused by the level of traffic along the A259. She noted that the air quality in Rottingdean was poor and that it was difficult to collect data and therefore joint action by all the authorities would be helpful.
- 89.20 Councillor Greenbaum stated that she believed the bus lane worked well and additional buses and the encouragement of more passengers rather than car use would also be beneficial. She therefore felt that the petition should be given further consideration at committee.
- 89.21 In response to the debate Councillor Mitchell noted the comments and stated that she was happy to accept the desire for the petition to be considered at the next committee meeting.
- 89.22 The Mayor noted that it was recommended to note and refer the petition to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for consideration and put it to the vote which was **carried** unanimously.
- 89.23 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted and referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 27th June 2017.

(C) GIVE OUR CHILDREN A SCHOOL PLACE IN CATCHMENT

- 89.24 The Mayor then invited Martin Dorminy and Anoushka Visvalingham as the lead petitioners to present the petition calling on the Council to ensure that children living in a catchment area would be given a school place in that catchment area.
- 89.25 Mr. Dorminy thanked that Mayor and confirmed that the petition had 1,446 signatures and that he was one of the parents of children directly affected, known as the misplaced 57 who did not get any of their initial school preferences. He noted that the Brighton & Hove School Organisation Plan for 2013-17 stated that the objective that all children should attend and have access to a local school. As things stood these children faced having to attend schools outside of their local community. He believed that the Admissions Policy should be made clear to parents in that it was unlikely that it would meet their needs.
- 89.26 Ms. Visvalingham stated that result of not getting any of their preferences had turned the lives of those families affected upside down. She believed that a catchment area should catch all those children within it and therefore asked for equality of treatment and the opportunity for all those children affected to attend a school in their catchment area. As such the council should provide a solution for all those affected.
- 89.27 The Mayor thanked Mr. Dorminy and Ms. Visvalingham and called on Councillor Chapman to respond to the petition.
- 89.28 Councillor Chapman thanked the petitioners for their presentation and also those parents that had also chosen to attend the council meeting and those who had come to the previous Children, Young People & Skills Committee where they had outlined their concerns. He was aware that the Executive Director and Head of Schools had also met with parents and noted that the situation had not been helped with the delay of opening a new Secondary School. He also noted that the situation had only become clear when people's preferences were submitted and reviewed in January. He accepted that the Admissions Policy could be made clearer and noted that the Education Authority's responsibility was to provide a place in the city and not within a catchment area. The Council also had to follow statutory guidelines and any changes to its admission areas had to be notified 18 months in advance. He was aware that 13 of the 57 children had now been offered one of their three preferences and he would encourage the others to submit an appeal to the independent panel, which would look at each case on its individual merits. However, he was aware that both schools in question were at capacity and any additional places would put pressure on their ability to provide a suitable learning environment for their pupils.
- 89.29 Councillor Brown stated that she wished to offer her sympathies to those parents and pupils who had not received one of their preferences. She noted that both schools had taken extra pupils in the preceding years but were not in a position to accommodate the 57 pupils in question. However, she did believe that the review of the catchment areas should have started earlier given the long lead in time that was required before changes could be implemented. The situation had been complicated by the lack of knowing where the new school would be located; however she also noted that other available schools had been graded as good by Ofsted and encouraged parents to visit them. In

the meantime she hoped that the review of catchment areas would be taken forward as a matter of urgency.

- 89.30 Councillor Phillips stated that she wished to thank the officers for the hard work that had been undertaken. However, the overall situation had been known before the publication of the Admissions Policy and whilst 13 pupils had now been offered one of their preferences, no other proposals had been put forward and that was not good enough.
- 89.31 Councillor Chapman noted the comments and stated that he understood the difficulties faced by the families and hoped that some way forward could be found.
- 89.32 The Mayor noted it was recommended to refer the petition to the next meeting of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee and therefore put the recommendation to the vote which was carried unanimously.
- 89.33 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted and referred to the Children, Young People & Skills Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 12th June 2017.

Note: Having declared a personal interest in the matter, Councillor Page withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the debate or voting thereon.

(D) BAN ANIMAL CIRCUSES IN BRIGHTON

- 89.34 The Mayor stated that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at the council meeting. He had been made aware of five such petitions and would therefore take each in turn.
- 89.35 The Mayor then invited Ms. Friend as one of the lead petitioners to present the petition calling on the Council to ban animal circuses in Brighton.
- 89.36 Ms. Friend thanked the Mayor and stated that the petition had reached over 1,500 signatures and sought the banning of circuses with performing animals, being both wild and domestic. She stated that 219 councils across the country had chosen to take such action and she hoped that as a progressive and innovative city, Brighton & Hove would follow them. She noted that the council had adopted an Animal Welfare Charter in 2002 which needed to be reviewed as it covered horses, dogs and birds but meant that it created an ambiguity in relation to other animals. She therefore called on the council to take a clear stance and ban all animal circuses.
- 89.37 The Mayor thanked Ms. Friend and called on Councillor Robins to respond to the petition.
- 89.38 Councillor Robins thanked the petitioner and stated that it was a complex and emotive subject. He was therefore keen to ensure that the legal position was fully understood and accepted that there was a need to review the Animal Welfare Charter. He would therefore request officers to bring a report to the next meeting of the Economic Development & Culture Committee to review the Charter and enable Members to consider it in conjunction with the petition.

- 89.39 Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted that the petition sought to ban animal performances in Brighton but questioned whether it should be aimed at council owned land as the council would have no jurisdiction over privately owned land. He had previously attended circuses but felt that society had changed over the last 25 years and the welfare and dignity of animals should now be given full consideration and circuses with animals prohibited from council owned land.
- 89.40 Councillor Greenbaum welcomed the petition and stated that it was the right time to ban animals in circuses. Today's circuses had great acrobats and they did not need to use animals as part of their acts, it was therefore time to make that change.
- 89.41 The Mayor noted that Councillor Robins did not wish to respond to the debate and that it was recommended to note and refer the petition to the Economic Development & Culture Committee for consideration and put it to the vote which was **carried** unanimously.
- 89.42 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted and referred to the Economic Development & Culture Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 22nd June 2017.

(E) OPEN NIGHT SHELTERS FOR ROUGH SLEEPERS

- 89.43 The Mayor stated that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at the council meeting. He had been made aware of five such petitions and would therefore take each in turn.
- 89.44 The Mayor then invited John Hadman as the lead petitioner to present the petition calling on the Council to open night shelters for rough sleepers by utilising its empty properties.
- 89.45 Mr. Hadman thanked the Mayor and stated that the petition had reached over 4,150 signatures which demonstrated the strength of support for rough sleepers and the desire to find suitable properties that could be used as night shelters throughout the year. He stated that other organisations such as the churches and private owners had offered to collaborate with the council, in order to use properties at their disposal. He was also aware that the council did open up properties during the colder months after a 3-day period of cold weather but wanted to find a solution that offered somewhere to shelter throughout the year. He noted that following a previous Notice of Motion to the council a list of potential buildings was to be drawn up but that was still awaited after 6 weeks. He hoped that in bringing the petition it would lead to some progress and action being taken.
- 89.46 The Mayor thanked Mr. Hadman and called on Councillor Moonan to respond to the petition.
- 89.47 Councillor Moonan thanked the petitioner and acknowledged that the petition had a great deal of support. She noted that the country was in the middle of a housing crisis and that the numbers of rough sleepers were increasing. She stated that the council had introduced a Rough Sleeper Strategy to support those sleeping rough in the city and was looking to work with all partner organisations to ensure a joined approach to the

situation. She noted that the Council had a severe weather protocol that was implemented when there had been 3 consecutive nights of cold weather and that this was regularly extended beyond the guidance issued by DCLG. However, she also accepted that more needed to be done and a report was due to be considered at the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee in May on the potential of using council owned empty buildings as night shelters. A list of these had been drawn up and would be considered in conjunction with the plans identified for their future use. She believed that Mr. Hadman should take credit for highlighting the issue and she hoped that the council would soon be in a position to offer a better solution.

89.48 Councillor Bell thanked Mr. Hadman for bringing the petition and Councillor Moonan for her comments. He stated that there was a need to acknowledge the work being undertaken in the city to help rough sleepers but felt that more could be done such as not having to wait for 3 consecutive nights of cold weather. He believed that other climatic conditions should also be taken into consideration and that they should apply throughout the year and not just in the winter months.

89.49 Councillor Gibson welcomed the petition and stated that it was important to stress that the city was in the grips of a housing crisis. He noted that the number of people sleeping rough had increased to 144 with 89 people waiting for a hostel bed, the average wait time being 10 months. He also noted that rough sleepers were more likely to be attacked and only had a life expectancy of 47. He believed that an urgent response was required and hoped that this could be taken forward given the high level of public support shown by the petition.

89.50 In response to the debate Councillor Moonan thanked Mr. Hadman for his work in drawing the petition together and stated that with the report due to come to committee in May, she hoped that matters could be taken forward as quickly as possible.

89.51 The Mayor noted that it was recommended to note and refer the petition to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee for consideration and put it to the vote which was **carried** unanimously.

89.52 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be noted and referred to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 4th May 2017.

90 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.

90.1 The Mayor reminded Council 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 as detailed below:

(a) Councillor Druitt

90.2 “Can Councillor Hamilton explain how the government's £300m business rates discretionary fund will be split between local councils, how local businesses will be able to access the Council's discretionary scheme and what provision can the Council make to ensure the small businesses who face unaffordable increases [from the 1st](#) April are supported while the council's discretionary scheme is being set up.”

Reply from Councillor Hamilton – Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee

90.3 “The council was planning to review the discretionary rate relief policy in 2017/18 in any event, but now that the government has announced a much broader discretionary scheme for councils to administer (not just limited to charities and not-for-profit organisations) we will therefore perform an even more extensive exercise to define discretionary support packages.

The key elements of the government’s announcement are designed to support businesses following the 2017 Revaluation of all non-domestic properties:

- A £300 million discretionary fund, to be split among Local Authorities and administered locally.
- A £1,000 discount for pubs with a rateable value below £100,000.
- Ratepayers losing all or part of their Small Business Rate Relief as a result of the revaluation will have their bill increase limited to no more than £50 per month or £600 per year.

The Government is currently consulting on technical aspects of the new discretionary scheme, including how the £300 million will be split between authorities. Brighton & Hove will respond to this consultation. Once the government finalises these details, the council will be designing its scheme. This will include how businesses can apply and what criteria will be considered.

This £50 per month cap was announced too late to be incorporated into this year’s annual bills, but businesses have been contacting our Business Rates team and temporary arrangements are being put in place. The business rates section of the council website carries further details for local businesses to access www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/businessrates”

(b) Councillor Druitt

90.4 “Since Deliveroo has started predominantly using motorcycles rather than pedal cycles it has become both a nuisance and a danger to residents in the city, especially the city centre. I have had reports from many residents, fed up with delivery motorbikes going the wrong way along one way streets, using pavements and cycle paths, and weaving between bollards designed to stop traffic. What enforcement options does the council have, how often are these used, and can the Council invite Deliveroo’s Chief Executive to Brighton & Hove to agree concrete actions to address the problem?”

Reply from Councillor O’Quinn – Chair of the Licensing Committee

90.5 “Unfortunately, there are no Government requirements for Deliveroo delivery drivers to be licensed with the Council under any of the licensing regimes we enforce.

However, I have been made aware that local police are planning to start some enforcement activity of drivers who are breaching traffic rules by driving the wrong way down one way streets for example. I do not have any further information on the proposed activity at this stage. However, it may also be worthwhile for police and the

relevant authorities to look at the number of L- plated motorcycles which are being used for Deliveroo.

I will therefore request that Chief Superintendent Lisa Bell contacts Deliveroo's Chief Executive outlining the issues concerning motorcycles being used by Deliveroo so these issues can be taken forward."

(c) Councillor Mac Cafferty

90.6 "Given the extent to which last summer was marked by anti-social behaviour in the city centre parks and squares -and in my ward, in Norfolk, Brunswick and Palmeira Squares- what plans does the Labour administration have to ensure anti-social behaviour is minimised?"

Reply from Councillor Daniel – Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee

90.7 "You will probably be aware that we are implementing PSPOs in 12 locations in the city which will address ASB in specific parks and open spaces where ASB has been previously reported. This will help to set the tone for the city. We will closely monitor the implementation of the PSPOs.

The Designated Public Places Order remains in force. This enables the police to remove alcohol from people who are drinking and being anti-social or arrest them if they don't comply.

The Community Safety Team will work with residents affected by ASB. They will help co-ordinate responses from the police and other partner agencies and will bring perpetrators to justice where necessary. This includes contributing to a regular priority areas meeting where agencies get together to co-ordinate action to reduce ASB."

(d) Councillor Mac Cafferty

90.8 "Given that Hove's historic seafront railings and shelters make an important contribution to the city's visual identity, when will the Labour administration agree to have them painted?"

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

90.9 "The works to redecorate the railings and shelters in Hove has already been put out to tender. The returned tenders are being evaluated with a view to starting the works in the next few weeks depending upon the weather."

(e) Councillor Mac Cafferty

90.10 "With summer almost upon us once again, how will the Labour administration be preventing littering on our seafront?"

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

90.11 “City Clean has been running a hugely popular and successful ‘crime not to care’ campaign as we get the message out that littering is not an acceptable choice.

We have already had one beach clean-up day as part of this campaign and officers are working on a number of exciting promotions for the summer months too. I do believe that innovative and creative campaigns are a great way of getting key messages across to our residents and we also engage with VisitBrighton and the Business Improvement District to help get the message out to visitors and businesses too.

We are currently recruiting 20 additional beach cleaning staff and additional litter bins will be provided along the seafront in readiness for the summer months. For those who chose not to play by the rules we have, of course, a robust Enforcement Service who will and do provide fixed penalty notices for those committing crimes against our environment. I’m sure all Members will welcome the fact that Brighton & Hove City Council was named as the leading council in the country for tackling such crimes.”

(f) Councillor Wealls

90.12 “To ask the Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee to work with officers to complete the attached spreadsheet for each meeting of the NCE Committee listed stating how many papers (not petitions/presentations etc.), were presented FOR DECISION and how many FOR NOTING at this committee and how many of the papers presented were considered at other council committees?”

Reply from Councillor Daniel – Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee

90.13 “The NCE Committee has been in place for almost 2 years and developed strong working relations with community, voluntary and resident groups, which has enabled constructive engagement across a range of key issues for the city. It has taken significant steps forward, of which being the first committee to have signers present, and full interaction with representatives from the deaf community, is one example.

Now that the Executive Director for Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing is in place, it is expected that its extensive work programme can be further developed, to the benefit of residents and many of the administration’s and the council’s priority work areas.

Comparing the information requested by Councillor Wealls with the other policy committees below it is clear that the committee has taken decisions and proved to be an effective use of both Members and officers time.”

(g) Councillor G. Theobald

90.14 “Councillor Cattell will no doubt be aware that Southwark has become the second London Borough, after Wandsworth, to remove permitted development rights from all their pubs thereby providing formal protection from demolition or redevelopment as mini-supermarkets, estate agents, homes or shops. Given the previous commitment by this

Labour Administration to look into the possibility of bringing in a similar measure in Brighton & Hove, will Councillor Cattell please tell me how this work is proceeding and whether a report will be brought before the Economic Development & Culture Committee in the near future?"

Reply from Councillor Cattell – Chair of the Planning Committee

90.15 "Circumstances have now changed in relation to planning rules that allow loss of pubs without permission. On 24 March the Communities secretary Sajid Javid tabled an amendment to the Neighbourhood Planning Bill that removes the permitted development rights that allow change of use of pubs to other uses like shops. This change is likely to come into effect in the next few months. As a consequence an Article 4 Direction will not be required.

In the meantime Public Houses that are of community value should continue be nominated as Assets of Community Value to give them protection while the permitted development right is still in place. Advice on how to nominate pubs as Assets of Community Value is on the city council's website."

(h) Councillor C. Theobald

90.16 "Will Councillor Mitchell please tell me how often the Norton Road Car Park gets cleaned under the terms of the current contract and how often is its state of cleanliness monitored?"

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

90.17 "Peake Cleaning visit the car park daily and empty bins, litter pick and sweep the floors. Additionally, an annual inspection of the car park is carried out by a structural engineer."

(i) Councillor C. Theobald

90.18 "Will the Chair of the Planning Committee please confirm whether or not it is the Council's policy not to publish the addresses of supporters of, and objectors to, planning applications and, if so, how can residents have confidence that these supporters and objectors are from the local area and who's views are therefore valid?"

Reply from Councillor Cattell – Chair of the Planning Committee

90.19 "As part of a review of Planning Committee practices, in response to recommendations from the Planning Advisory Service Peer Review, the cross party Planning Members Working Group has agreed to change practices to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the committee. One of these changes has been to trial, for two months, a new approach to setting out representations made on committee reports. This is to set out the total number of representations received and provide a summary of the points raised and no longer list all respondents.

All comments received on planning applications, together with the addresses of respondents, remain publically available and can be viewed on our website.

Trailing this change was agreed by all councillors on the cross party Members Working Group. This approach is more consistent with many other Local Planning Authorities and it makes more efficient use of officer time. Objections can still be viewed online and the approach will be reviewed following Planning committee in April.”

(j) Councillor Wealls

90.20 “Following the Assistant Director of Property & Design’s helpful description to the recent Policy, Resources & Growth Committee of the criteria for assessing bids to the Council’s Asset Management Fund, would the Lead Member for Finance & Resources please further confirm (i) when, and by what process, these criteria were agreed; (ii) what the process is for determining the overall size of the Fund; and (iii) what Member oversight there is of (i), (ii) and of the Asset Management Fund as a whole?”

Reply from Councillor Hamilton – Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee

“The Asset Management Fund (AMF) 17/18 is a capital fund that forms part of the council’s capital strategy to support property improvements, property related Health & Safety requirements and access improvements under the Equality Act 2010.

The Capital Resources & Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 agreed at February 2017 Budget council approved the £1m capital resources allocation to support the AMF.

The criteria for the bids follow general asset management principles and good practice and were agreed by Policy & Resources Committee in 2001. The asset management principles are further endorsed in the council’s Corporate Property Strategy & Asset Management Plan (AMP).

The bid and evaluation criteria are;

Bids:

- Bids should be clearly focused towards supporting the Council in meeting its strategic priorities.
- There is no provision to meet on going revenue costs arising from any schemes. Departments should plan to meet any such costs from within their own budgets.
- Bids should also reflect any additional costs required to complete the individual projects e.g. design fees, planning fees etc.
- Where match funding is proposed, the source of this funding is to be declared

Evaluation:

- The strength of the justification for the need for improvement (including Health & Safety)
- Cross departmental and multi-Agency / partnership working including matched funding.
- The overall impact of the project on the public and the outcome if the improvement was not made
- The level of risk including the robustness of arrangements for managing the project.
- Corporate need and priorities

- Value for money

Re (ii) When it started in 2001 it was £0.5m and it increased in 2008 to £1m when the fund was amalgamated with the Disability Discrimination Act Fund to allow a more streamlined approach to investment requirements for the council's building stock.

Re (iii) It had member oversight when there was an administration Asset Member Group in 2008 – 20011 and it has been discussed over the years as part of the 121 that I have with the Member for Property.

The size of the fund forms part of the Capital Strategy along with SIF and the ICT Fund. These corporate funds form part of the Council's Capital Investment Programme and are funded from capital receipts as part of the Council's asset disposal policy.

It is proposed that a cross party Asset Management Board be formed which will have oversight of the council's operational and non-operational property portfolio's. This resulted from a NOM to Council and PRG, it is currently in scope of the Policy Review Panel and a report is being brought back to May PRG with the recommendations of the Policy Review Panel to include the Asset Management Board TORs.

(k) Councillor G. Theobald

90.21 "Councillor Daniel will no doubt be aware of the concept of 'Community Fridges' which have been introduced in places such as Brixton and Frome to try and help make use of the scandalous amount of fresh food that is wasted in this country on a daily basis. I have been told by the Brighton & Hove Food Partnership that there is interest in setting up a Community Fridge in Brighton & Hove and so will Councillor Daniel please pledge this Council's support to the project and provide any assistance they may need to get it up and running?"

Reply from Councillor Daniel – Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee

90.22 "I am also pleased to inform council that the food partnership with a variety of partners was successful in the council's recent communities and third sector commission. The partnership of BHFP, Real Junk Food Project, FareShare, Food Matters, Sussex Gleaning Network, Food Waste Collective, members of the Emergency Food Providers Network, organisations providing shared meal, homelessness projects, pay as you feel cafes, and food banks will be involved in delivering activity to achieve three outcome:

1. Intercepting and redistributing food waste will be better connected with each other, with projects supporting vulnerable people with food provision and with organisations offering advice (debt, housing, benefits etc).
2. Better communication with residents about the issues of food waste and food poverty and what can be done to address these issues
3. The knowledge and experience of people working on interception and distribution and those supporting vulnerable people with food provision will be used to inform policy and improve practices in mainstream organisations.

They will be receiving three years funding 2017 - 2020.

The council is a key partner in the delivery of the city's food poverty action plan with approx. half the actions being taken forward by the council. The last NICE committee received an update as part of its governance role on the progress of the food poverty action plan. We were pleased to hear how much is being taken forward and achieved already half way through the term of the plan.

I think we are all in agreement that community fridges like food banks are not the long term solution to food poverty however they do help alleviate the symptoms.

There is considerable council resource going into and working with the Food Partnership already which will continue, and will support the community fridge project. The Food Partnership has strong working relationship with both public health and the communities team in the council and will raise any barriers or issues that the council can help remove.

From a food hygiene point of view providing the traceability of the food, temp continuity of the chill chain and date codes are managed we haven't got a problem with the idea. Plenty of similar organisations such as the Real Junk Food Project already working in the city."

(I) Councillor Druitt

90.23 The Council's website currently says "Councillors agreed at that meeting [Budget Council 2016] to give the [Play] service a one-off payment of £75,000 for this financial year to support the transition and to explore alternative funding options.

As we all know the Play service closed last December with no transition in place. I have been working with one of the Playbus team members to try and revive the service but what has become clear is that the money was spent last year not on transitioning but on normal service delivery. I would like to know why this money was not spent on transitioning the service to an independent service, what the council can now do to rectify this with respect to the Playbus, and what the council can do to make sure this misdirection of financial resources does not happen again.

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

- 90.24
1. The future of the Play Service was considered in the Autumn 2014 which led to a proposal that the council's General Fund will no longer fund the majority of the service but alternative funding was secured from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Public Health that enabled the service to continue in 14/15 but with a changed remit linked to this funding.
 2. From December 2015 extensive work was undertaken to secure alternative funding. Meetings also took place with GMB, Unison and Brighton & Buses to consider ways to attract funding.
 3. As part of budget setting for 2016/17 the budget for the Mobile Play Project was agreed to be removed by Budget Council, however it was agreed that the mobile

play provision budget be given a one off payment of £75k for the 16-17 financial year to continue the project and give more time to explore alternative funding options to create a long-term and sustainable Mobile Play Project.

4. The Mobile Play Project Supervisor was given additional hours to look at alternative funding options and worked full-time from March 2016. This has resulted in:
 - planned workshops with American Express staff to generate interest and funding opportunities
 - a supporter of the Dome pledging £5k for the work the project does in Lewes prison • an organisation called Outdoor Play and Learning (Opal) identified by the project supervisor working with him to deliver the franchised programme in Brighton primary schools. At the moment one school signed up and he will be trained by OPaL, once trained he will be then franchised to deliver and that will generate income.
5. Management support was given to the Play Service, including monthly supervision to the Play Supervisor, from the BHCC Service Manager, Youth & Communities.
6. The project supervisor has been supported to successfully apply and then start a course with the School for Social Entrepreneurs (SSE) to skill up being able to set up a Community Interest Company. Travel, subsistence and a contribution to course fees was paid for by BHCC.
7. The CIC (Play Tiger) was set up with the initial project plan written by the Mobile Play Project Supervisor and overseen by the BHCC Service Manager, Youth & Communities.
8. Over the past 6 months extensive support has been provided by the Assistant Director and legal services to support the transition and to assist in the play worker establishing his CIC. Support has been given to transfer assets, including the Play Bus and play equipment, to the new CIC. Maximum flexibility has been provided to the individual to meet as many requests as are legally possible to give the CIC the best start.”

91 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- 91.1 The Mayor noted that 12 oral questions had been received and that 30 minutes were set aside for the duration of the item.

(a) Apprenticeships in Schools

- 91.2 The Mayor invited Councillor Wealls to put his question to Councillor Chapman.
- 91.3 Councillor Wealls asked the following question, “In December 2014 council passed a notice of motion requesting that a report was brought to the next Children and Young People’s committee asking for information on take up of apprenticeships in school based vocational roles, what were the obstacles and what could we do to overcome those obstacles to increase students in school based apprenticeships. We didn’t see a report to the committee since then so can I just assume that the work has been done and since

the apprenticeship levee starts today all of our schools are up and ready to accept apprentices?”

- 91.4 Councillor Chapman replied, “We are working very hard on increasing the number of apprenticeships in the City and indeed in schools and our apprenticeship officer has been meeting with schools across the city and will continue to do so and briefings have been given to schools forums and to head teachers and a letter also has gone out to head teachers last week about the apprenticeship levee and obviously is Councillor Wealls would like more information on this process I would be happy to look into this for him.”
- 91.5 Councillor Wealls asked the following supplementary question, “We’ve had two years to get this right and I expect we are well behind the curve in terms of the work we could have done with schools to get them ready for the apprenticeship levee and I suspect that had we gone on a done what Council wanted to do in 2014 we’d be much better placed for our schools to be supported in this. Would you agree with that?”
- 91.6 Councillor Chapman replied, “I believe our schools are being support with the levee which is coming in today and as I say we have an apprenticeship office who is liaising with schools to support them to encourage and increase the number of apprenticeships in schools and I will continue to encourage this.”

(b) Tagging

- 91.7 Councillor Mac Cafferty asked the following question, “I’d like to start by thanking City Clean officers who by astonishing coincidence clearly saw my oral question and started to rapidly remove some of the tagging in my ward before today’s meeting. I reported one massive piece of graffiti in my ward on the 27 January. It took me 1 hour to remove it myself 35 days later on Saturday 4 March with powerful chemicals, a power hose and under kind instructions from City Clean officers.

I put it to Cllr Mitchell that her administration is losing the war against the taggers in the city centre at just the time when we need our city centre looking at its best for our visitors. This is the worst tagging has been in all my time as an elected representative and some of our residents report it’s the worst they’ve seen in 40 years.

My question is how many fixed penalty notices were issued in the last year for tagging and graffiti offences?”

- 91.8 Councillor Mitchell replied, “Eighteen.”
- 91.9 Councillor Mac Cafferty asked the following supplementary question, “City Clean until relatively recently used to gather intelligence to push for prosecutions on this matter with Sussex Police. What strategy does the administration have in place to push to be proactive about stopping tagging and not just mopping up after the event?”
- 91.10 Councillor Mitchell replied, “City Clean Staff do actually spend a lot of time and resources cleaning away graffiti and tagging from street furniture and other areas right across the city. We also notify private property owners when their property has been graffitied. Hopefully the impending national litter strategy will contain powers for local

authorities to enforce graffiti removal from private property because that is what we need. Prior to removing tags they are photographed for criminal evidence purposes. We are in early discussions with Community Pay Back in relation to graffiti removal. We can supply graffiti wipes for people to remove graffiti but they are not suitable for all surfaces as you probably know. Also I'm really pleased to hear that the additional wardens operating in Brunswick are very proactive in removing graffiti and the additional presence that they provide enables a really rapid response both in terms of enforcement and removal. This is something that we will continue to bear down on as always we could do with a lot more resource."

(c) Conforming to Traditional and Largely Moral Practices

91.11 Councillor Janio asked the following question, "In our increasingly complex extended order society learnt customs, morals and traditions lie between instinct and reason. These customs and traditions enable societies to function without explicit written rules. Brighton & Hove City Council constitution states that all Councillors will represent their communities and bring their views into the council's decision making process i.e. become the advocates of and for their communities. Can the leader of the council suggest how I am to fulfil my role as a ward councillor given that many council related functions have been sanctioned in my ward without knowledge such as the recent so called ecological survey that has resulted in the devastation of wildlife rich areas of Benfield Valley and that in allowing this your administration is either braking with the Council's long accepted customs, morals and traditions or is simply plain incompetent."

91.12 Councillor Morgan replied, "I am for one am delighted that someone would ask me a question quoting from the writings of Friedrich Hayek, in this case his 1988 work 'The Fatal Conceit' specifically the introduction 'Was Socialism a Mistake' a pure coincidence I'm sure.

Were you Mr Mayor to allow me unlimited time I would respond by quoting liberally from Francis Fukuyama excellent critique of Hayek in the New York Times in 2011 however I doubt other members of this council let alone residents are hugely interested in this academic discussion on political theory. I may have a degree in it but I am more interested in getting the bins emptied these days. As to the events in his ward I'd be happy to look into that and get back to him. Councillor Janio would do well to note another Hayek quote 'We shall not go wiser before we learn that much that we have done was very foolish.'"

91.13 Councillor Janio asked the following supplementary question, "I think Hayek also said that a socialist was someone who doesn't understand economics but that is another matter. Mr Mayor several of my colleagues have also experience similar levels of secrecy from your administration but there is a more immediate and serious issue before us tonight so I have changed by question.

Can the leader of the council confirm that bringing an agenda item 95 for decision tonight with a report marked as draft accompanied by an extensive set of minutes to be presented to this Council that hasn't gone back to committee for approval and yet now has to justify a draft substantive item and has today been almost changed to recommend to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee means that your Labour

Administration has finally discarded the accepted customs morals and traditions of this council or is simply incompetent.”

91.14 Councillor Morgan replied, “Mr Mayor of course I don’t accept that and the issue which Councillor Janio refers to will be dealt with under that item with explanations from the people involved. I’m very pleased to see that Councillor Janio is wearing his Ronald Reagan tie again tonight so I’ve bought him a Donald Trump hat which I have amended to say ‘Make Hangleton Great Again’.”

(d) Customer Satisfaction

91.15 Councillor Page asked the following question, “Councillor Morgan has been claiming in the media and indeed in his long speech at budget council that satisfaction with the council is up 20% since his administration took over. Can Councillor Morgan please tell me where that data comes from?”

91.16 Councillor Morgan replied, “The facts that I have quoted are from the City Tracker stats that show that overall satisfaction in the last two years has risen and has remained reasonably stable following its nadir of 41% in 2014. It increase to 60% in 2015 and was 58% in the 2016 report. The figures for people who are service users are stable from 40% in 2014 to 60% in 2015 and 2016. We have increased trust in the council by 7% since 2015, we’ve reduced the number of people who feel the council doesn’t act on all of their concerns by nearly half from 12% in 2014 to 7% in 2016 and increased the numbers of people who believe who do by 7%. Satisfaction with refuse collection has risen from 36% in 2014 to 67% in 2016. Satisfaction with recycling has risen from 44% to 66%, satisfaction with street cleaning has risen from 47% to 65%, and satisfaction with schools has risen from 48% to 54%. These are the statistics that I am quoting from.”

91.17 Councillor Page asked the following supplementary question. “Would Councillor Morgan agree that he is being a bit misleading by picking out an anomalous result in 2014 that does not represent the overall trend for the past 5 years?”

91.18 Councillor Morgan replied, “The one fact that I would point out is that tens of thousands of residents of Brighton & Hove gave an assessment of the customer service under the Green Administration in May 2015 that is why you are where you are and we are where we are now.”

(e) Armed Forces Day

91.19 Councillor Mears asked the following question, “Can the Leader of the Council confirm the Council’s support for Armed Forces day a national event on the 24 June each year bearing in mind that this council is signed up to the military covenant. I note the Council is supporting Armed Forces day at Blind Veterans UK on the 25 June even though the council has a budget funded by the Ministry of Defence there is no council armed forces day in the city on the 24 June this year.”

91.20 Councillor Morgan replied, “Council will I’m sure be aware that Armed Forces day formally Veteran’s Day was established in 2006 by the Labour Government. Councillor Mears will I hope be aware from her own group leader that decisions around events to

mark Armed Forces Day were taken in October by the leaders group of which he is a part following representations about resourcing from the police and in recognition of the very low attendance levels at event in New Road. The decision was made to focus our resources on remembrance events in November if Councillor Mears was unhappy with this cross party decision then she had a number of months to raise it with Councillor Theobald. As she said events to make Armed Forces Day will be taking place at the Blind Veteran's Centre on the 25 June which I will be attending. There is also the flag raising ceremony at the Old Steine War Memorial at 11am on 19 June to which all members are invited. The Council is also support an event organised by the Royal British Legion to mark Armed Forces Day and its planning for centenary events to make the end of World War One next year."

- 91.21 Councillor Mears asked the following supplementary question. "One of the reasons why Armed Forces Day was abandoned is not because residents did not support the event which they do in numbers and they did last year. I was in fact because local dignitaries never bothered to turn up which is a great shame because residents were looking at empty seats with names on.

The Royal British Legion will be supporting the event on 25 June and we will have a stall there. Will the Leader of the Council set an example and support the service being organised by the Royal British Legion on the 24 June this year at the Old Steine War Memorial?"

- 91.22 Councillor Morgan replied, "Mr Mayor I think I made it clear in my initial comments that I would be supporting the events as I have done in the past two years."

(f) Teaching Facilities for Adults with Learning Difficulties

- 91.23 Councillor Deane asked the following question, "Would Councillor Morgan agree that the provision of teaching facilities for adults with learning disabilities by the voluntary sector deserves to be recognised and support by this council?"

- 91.24 Councillor Morgan replied, "Yes I do."

- 91.25 Councillor Deane asked the following supplementary question. "Will Councillor Morgan respond to Rosa Monkton and support Team Domenica in finding a suitable premise with security of tenure from within the council's property portfolio?"

- 91.26 Councillor Morgan replied, "I certainly don't recall receiving any correspondence but I will have my office look in to it and make sure we do provide a response to points raised."

(g) Student Housing Developer Contributions

- 91.27 Councillor Miller asked the following question, "Would Councillor Cattell agree with me that it is unfair that student housing providers don't have to pay affordable housing contributions by commuted sum?"

- 91.28 Councillor Cattell replied, "Councillor Miller will be aware of the fact that we have discussed this in detail about the difference between use classes orders under which we

can ask for section 106 contributions and you were actually at the committee when we discussed it.”

91.29 Councillor Miller asked the following supplementary question. “I believe that student housing is in the C2 category. Would Councillor Cattell like to review as part of City Plan part 2 whether introducing a section 106 contribution to student housing is a viable proposition to take forward?”

91.30 Councillor Cattell replied, “You already know that purpose built student housing is in a special use category and not C2 as was explained to you at a recent Planning Committee meeting.”

(h) Youth Service

91.31 Councillor Phillips asked the following question, “Now that there is a cut in the youth service budget and the early help budget could Councillor Chapman Clarify how the remaining money in each budget is going to be spent and therefore what in each budget is going to be cut?”

91.32 Councillor Chapman replied, “I wrote to all Member’s yesterday to advise them that we will be looking into setting up a cross party working group looking into the youth service going forward where all of these questions will be answered.”

91.33 Councillor Phillips asked the following supplementary question. “Councillor Chapman wrote in last week’s Brighton and Hove Independent an article about needing to shout louder over school funding cuts. How does he plan to oppose and push the government other than a few mealy moth words?”

91.34 Councillor Chapman replied, “I intend to continue to campaign to government through the Labour Party in terms of ensuring the schools are properly funded going forward.”

(i) Party Houses

91.35 Councillor Druitt asked the following question, “I have received a number of concerns from residents in Upper North Street about the development of a party house at Number 19 by Portmore investments. Can the administration is doing to work with party house owners as soon as they are identified to ensure that change of use planning permission is sought if required, permission is sought for any licensable activities and the legitimate concerns of neighbouring residents are addressed before party houses become operational?”

91.36 Councillor Meadows replied, “It’s a shame that Councillor Druitt chose to submit a question with such an ambiguous title which was directed at the wrong person. The question should have been addressed to the Chair of Planning”

91.37 Councillor Druitt asked the following supplementary question. “I did not address the question to a specific councillor I asked a question on party houses to the administration and I expect someone to be able to answer it.”

91.38 Councillor Meadows replied, "I would like to refer Councillor Druitt to the notice of motion which I have brought to this council which actually deals with party houses. I am actually working on that. Recently there was a private members bill on the subject that went to parliament and I am in the process of writing to every council leader across the country on this subject."

(j) Developer Applications

91.39 Councillor Greenbaum asked the following question, "On the agenda of the last Economic Development & Culture Committee we had a report on section 106 developer contributions technical guidance update. My colleague Councillor Druitt and I tried to put forward an amendment there and my question is seeking clarification about why this amendment wasn't accepted. Where a developer is negotiating on affordable housing and seeks to make a commuted payment instead our guidance says the council may require the developers financial information to be provided on an open book basis, the amendment was seeking to remove the word may from the guidance. Although the amendment was accepted we were reassured that this was happening anyway.

Can we please be told what format this is happening in, what the timeline is and when that will be in place by?"

91.40 Councillor Cattell replied, "The amendment was not accepted because procedurally we would have had to produce a new report rather than amend the recommendations on the report it was nothing to do with the sentiment of the amendment. This was raised at the December Planning Committee by Councillor Russell-Moyle and as a result of that officers are looking at how other authorities deal with this as it is not as simple as saying we will always require full disclosure. Officers are currently looking at the legal implications for this but I am afraid I cannot give you a timeline but I will bring more information back to the Economic Development and Culture Committee."

(k) Hove Library

91.41 Councillor Sykes asked the following question, "In June 2016 Policy & Resources committee voted not to sell Hove Library and since then a cross party group have been pursuing ways of reducing the deficit following that decision. In March of this Year the Environment, Transport and Sustainability committee considered the bike share scheme and in that paper Hove Library was removed from a list of possible locations because the future of the library was 'uncertain'. This doesn't add up and I wonder if Councillor Robins can explain and as an aside I wonder if he could remind us what the annual reported saving of the sale of Hove Library was supposed to be?"

91.42 Councillor Robins replied, "I fear this might have been aimed at the wrong person as I was not involved in the report which was taken to Environment, Transport and Sustainability committee. According to Chair of the ETS Committee this was the product of an officer error."

91.43 Councillor Sykes asked the following supplementary question. "The question to Councillor Robins as a senior member of the administration is what part of all this chaos would he describe as getting the basics right?"

91.44 Councillor Robins replied, "I think Councillor Morgan earlier on explained how we feel we are getting the basics right. If Councillor Morgan hands me those statistics I will run through them again and as often as you like but there seems be very little point to that."

(l) Building Council Homes

91.45 Councillor Gibson asked the following question, "Will Councillor Meadows pledge that the administration will do all that is within their power both to continue and grow the council house building programme?"

91.46 Councillor Meadows replied, "I am happy to pledge that we intend to continue building lots and lots more council rented homes."

91.47 Councillor Gibson asked the following supplementary question. "When can we expect to see a net increase in the council house building schemes as a result of this administration's efforts?"

91.48 Councillor Meadows replied, "You question gives me the chance to talk about our new joint venture with Hyde because that will bring us up to another 1000 new homes for the city."

92 CALL OVER FOR REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

(a) Callover

92.1 The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that Items 95 and 96(a) had been reserved for discussion; and

Item 95 - Community Safety & Crime Reduction Strategy;
Item 96(a) - Corporate Parenting Strategy.

(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports

92.2 The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

Item 93 - Pay Policy Statement as amended by the technical clarification circulated with the addendum;
Item 94 - Annual Investment Strategy 2017/18;
Item 96 - Review of the Constitution – February 2017.

(c) Oral Questions from Members

92.3 The Mayor noted that there were no oral questions arising on items that had not been called.

93 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

93.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18 as detailed in appendix 1 to the report and amended with the revised wording to paragraph 18 be adopted.

94 ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2017/18

- 94.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Annual Investment Strategy 2017/18 as set out in appendix 1 to the report be approved.

95 COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY CONSULTATION

- 95.1 The Mayor noted that the next item related to the Community Safety & Crime Reduction Strategy and that following discussions at the Whips' meeting earlier in the day, it had been agreed that the Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee put forward an amendment that would be taken without discussion. The effect being that the strategy would be approved subject to any amendments being agreed at the Policy, Resources & growth Committee on the 4th May and the strategy then coming into force. He therefore called on Councillor Daniel to move the amendment.
- 95.2 Councillor Daniel stated that she was aware of some concerns regarding the proposed Community Safety and Crime Reduction Strategy 2017-20, which had been considered by the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee and noted that a proposed amendment to the recommendations had been circulated. She stated that the strategy was one of the few plans and strategies reserved to full council and therefore sought support for the proposed amendment so that the strategy could be taken forward.
- 95.3 Councillor Moonan formally seconded the proposed amendment.
- 95.4 Councillor Wares stated that he had now read three versions of the proposed strategy, which supposedly incorporated changes requested by Members, with the last version only being circulated earlier in the day. He did not feel that this was the appropriate way in which to deal with the matter and that the strategy should have been published before it was agreed at full council. As such he could not support the proposed amendment.
- 95.5 Councillor Littman stated that when the report was presented to the NCE committee it was accepted that it could be debated in full at the council meeting. Members of the committee raised a number of points that officers agreed to incorporate into the final version of the strategy and yet these had not been included fully. As such he felt that the strategy should come back to the NCE committee rather than the PR&G committee for approval before being referred up to full council.
- 95.6 Councillor Daniel noted the comments and apologised for the failure to include the agreed changes at NCE committee in the revised strategy; but noted that overall the strategy was accepted and the changes amounted to two sentences. She believed the strategy could be agreed and had hoped that any additional changes could then be incorporated at the PR&G committee meeting. However, she was willing to accept the proposal to defer the item and for it to be reconsidered at the next NCE committee meeting.

- 95.7 The Mayor noted that there was support in the chamber for the matter to be referred back to the NCE committee and therefore sought clarification from Councillor Daniel on her previous amendment.
- 95.8 Councillor Daniel stated that she was happy to withdraw her amendment and to propose that the item be deferred and the strategy reconsidered by the NCE committee before coming to full Council in July for approval.
- 95.9 Councillor Moonan formally seconded the amendment.
- 95.10 The Mayor noted that an amendment to the recommendation had been moved to defer the item and refer the strategy back to the NCE committee, which he put to the vote and which was carried.
- 95.11 The Mayor then put the amended recommendation to the vote which was **carried**.
- 95.12 **RESOLVED:** That Item 95, Community Safety & Crime Reduction Strategy 2017-20 be deferred and referred back to the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee for consideration at its next meeting before coming to full Council in July.

96 REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION – FEBRUARY 2017

- 96.1 **RESOLVED:** That the proposed changes to the Council's constitution as set out at paragraphs 3.2 to 3.19 in the report and Appendices 1-3 (together with the amendment to paragraph 2(c) in Appendix 3) be approved and adopted.

CORPORATE PARENTING STRATEGY 2016-19

- 96.2 Councillor Yates introduced the report and noted that all Members of the council had a corporate parenting responsibility and thanked Councillor Page for referring the report to Council. He stated that the number of looked after children had increased from 438 in 2016 to 464 in 2017 and that there was a need to work to ensure that they had the same life opportunities as any other child in the city. He urged all Members to read the report and support the work that was being taken to help these children.
- 96.3 Councillor Bell welcomed the report and noted that a number of the looked after children had taken the time to write to the Members of the Corporate Parenting Board.
- 96.4 Councillor Page welcomed the report and stated that it was important to reflect on the importance of the Looked After Children's Strategy. He supported Councillor Yates' comments and hoped that all Members would take the time to read the report.
- 96.5 The Mayor noted that the report had been referred to the Council for information and moved that it be noted.
- 96.6 **RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

97 THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION:

(a) Divesting from Fossil Fuels.

97.1 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Russell-Moyle on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group and seconded by Councillor Allen.

97.2 The Mayor then put the following motion as listed to the vote:

“This Council requests the Chief Executive writes to the Chair of the East Sussex County Council Pensions Committee asking the Committee:

- To commit itself, over the course of the next five years, to divest the East Sussex Pension Fund from direct ownership and any commingled funds that include fossil fuel public equities and corporate bonds, and
- To focus re-investment in areas that minimise climate change and reduce the Fund's carbon footprint;

while ensuring the Fund continues to generate a sufficient level of return to ensure the current and future sustainability of the fund.”

97.3 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried by 33 votes to 20 with no abstentions as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Marsh	✓		
2	Atkinson	✓			Meadows	✓		
3	Barford	✓			Mears		X	
4	Barnett		X		Miller		X	
5	Bell		X		Mitchell	✓		
6	Bennett		X		Moonan	✓		
7	Bewick	Not present			Morgan	✓		
8	Brown		X		Morris	✓		
9	Cattell	✓			Nemeth		X	
10	Chapman		X		Norman A		X	
11	Cobb		X		Norman K		X	
12	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
13	Deane	✓			Page	✓		

14	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn		X	
15	Gibson	✓			Penn	✓		
16	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	✓		
17	Greenbaum	✓			Robins	✓		
18	Hamilton	✓			Russell-Moyle	✓		
19	Hill	✓			Simson		X	
20	Horan	✓			Sykes		X	
21	Hyde		X		Taylor		X	
22	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald C		X	
23	Janio		X		Theobald G		X	
24	Knight	✓			Wares		X	
25	Lewry		X		Wealls		X	
26	Littman	✓			West	✓		
27	Mac Cafferty	✓			Yates	✓		
					Total	33	20	0

97.4 The motion was **carried**.

Note: Closure Motion.

97.5 The Mayor noted that the meeting had been in session for four hours and therefore in having regard to the constitution, he was required to move a closure motion under procedural rule 17 to terminate the meeting.

97.6 The Mayor then put the motion to close the meeting to the vote which was unanimously rejected.

97.7 The motion was **lost**.

(b) Support for Unaccompanied Children in Refugee Camps.

97.8 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Littman on behalf of the Green and Labour & Co-operative Groups and seconded by Councillor Daniel.

97.9 Councillor Bell moved an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group, which was seconded by Councillor G. Theobald.

97.10 The Mayor noted that the Conservative amendment had not been accepted in full but that clause (c) had been accepted by Councillor Littman as an amendment to the

original motion. He then put the amendment as moved by Councillor Bell to the vote which was lost by 20 votes to 32 as detailed below:

97.11 The Mayor then put motion as amended by the inclusion of clause (c) to the vote which was carried by 52 votes to 0 against, with no abstentions.

97.12 The Mayor then put the following substantive motion to the vote:

“That following the announcement that the so-called ‘Dubs Amendment’, a scheme for unaccompanied children to come to the UK is to be closed, this Council requests that:

The Chief Executive write to the Home Secretary to ask that she honours the Government’s commitment to play its part in providing safe-haven to unaccompanied refugee children; and makes the requisite funding available to BHCC and all other Local Authorities willing to give a place of sanctuary for these blameless survivors and encouraging her to continue talks with other Local Authorities to take part in the National Transfer Scheme and in the Vulnerable Children’s Relocation Scheme.”

97.13 The Mayor confirmed that the motion as amended had been carried by 52 votes to 0 with no abstentions as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Marsh	✓		
2	Atkinson	✓			Meadows	✓		
3	Barford	Not present			Mears	✓		
4	Barnett	✓			Miller	✓		
5	Bell	✓			Mitchell	✓		
6	Bennett	✓			Moonan	✓		
7	Bewick	Not present			Morgan	✓		
8	Brown	✓			Morris	✓		
9	Cattell	✓			Nemeth	✓		
10	Chapman	✓			Norman A	✓		
11	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
12	Daniel	✓			O’Quinn	✓		
13	Deane	✓			Page	✓		
14	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn	✓		
15	Gibson	✓			Penn	✓		
16	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	✓		

17	Greenbaum	✓			Robins	✓		
18	Hamilton	✓			Russell-Moyle	✓		
19	Hill	✓			Simson	✓		
20	Horan	✓			Sykes	✓		
21	Hyde	✓			Taylor	✓		
22	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald C	✓		
23	Janio	✓			Theobald G	✓		
24	Knight	✓			Wares	✓		
25	Lewry	✓			Wealls	✓		
26	Littman	✓			West	✓		
27	Mac Cafferty	✓			Yates	✓		
					Total	52	0	0

97.14 The motion was **carried**.

(c) TUPE Pension Protection for Local Government Staff.

97.15 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Moonan on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group and seconded by Councillor Horan.

97.16 The Mayor then put the following motion as listed to the vote:

“We call on the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Damien Green to amend the Fair Deal Guidance 2003 to include staff from Best Value Authorities such as Brighton and Hove City Council within the guidance. This will ensure they have the same rights as other public sector workers to retain their Public Service Pension Scheme when they are TUPE'D out of local government employment.”

97.17 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried unanimously.

97.18 The motion was **carried**.

(d) Kings House.

97.19 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Nemeth on behalf of the Conservative Group and seconded by Councillor G. Theobald.

97.20 The Mayor then put the following motion as listed to the vote:

“This Council resolves to request that the Leader of the Council:

- (i) Makes a full public statement on why the consortium that was picked as preferred buyer of King's House has dropped out so far into the process;
- (ii) Issues a briefing note to Councillors detailing exactly what went wrong and what lessons can be learnt; and,
- (iii) Updates the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee of the budgetary consequences of the ongoing delays of this and other major projects."

97.21 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried by 30 votes to 21 with no abstentions as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen		X		Marsh		X	
2	Atkinson		X		Meadows		X	
3	Barford	Not present			Mears	✓		
4	Barnett	✓			Miller	✓		
5	Bell	✓			Mitchell		X	
6	Bennett	✓			Moonan		X	
7	Bewick	Not present			Morgan		X	
8	Brown	✓			Morris		X	
9	Cattell		X		Nemeth	✓		
10	Chapman		X		Norman A	✓		
11	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
12	Daniel		X		O'Quinn		X	
13	Deane	✓			Page	✓		
14	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn	✓		
15	Gibson	✓			Penn		X	
16	Gilbey		X		Phillips	✓		
17	Greenbaum	✓			Robins		X	
18	Hamilton		X		Russell-Moyle		X	
19	Hill		X		Simson	✓		
20	Horan		X		Sykes	✓		
21	Hyde	✓			Taylor	✓		
22	Inkpin-Leissner		X		Theobald C	✓		

23	Janio	✓			Theobald G	✓		
24	Knight	Not present			Wares	✓		
25	Lewry	✓			Wealls	✓		
26	Littman	✓			West	✓		
27	Mac Cafferty	✓			Yates		X	
					Total	30	21	0

97.22 The motion was **carried**.

(e) Clean Air.

97.23 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Deane on behalf of the Green Group and seconded by Councillor Sykes.

97.24 The Mayor then put the following motion as listed to the vote:

“This council notes the damaging effects of diesel engine emissions to people's health and to the environment and therefore commits to accelerating initiatives that will reduce this harm and lead to cleaner air. This council resolves to:

- 1) Request the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to follow the example of Westminster City Council and introduce visitor parking differentials to incentivise diesel vehicle drivers not to enter the highest polluted areas of the city;
- 2) Request the Licensing Committee to consider calling for a report detailing the options to:
 - Enforce the Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002 in relation to vehicle idling offences;
 - Ensure that all new taxi licences issued under the council's policy of managed growth are for low emission vehicles only, and that all replacement taxis are low emission vehicles;
- 3) To facilitate (2) above, this council requests the Chief Executive to write to Business Secretary, Greg Clark, requesting that financial assistance be made available to taxi drivers switching to more environmentally friendly vehicles, as announced at the recent opening of the new London Taxi Company factory in Coventry.”

97.25 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried unanimously.

97.26 The motion was **carried**.

(f) Housing Support No Evictions

97.27 The Notice of Motion as listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Gibson behalf of the Green Group and seconded by Councillor Druitt.

97.28 The Mayor then put the following motion as listed to the vote:

“This council notes the Government changes to welfare benefits, including the introduction of the benefit cap and proposed removal of entitlement to housing benefit for 18-21 year olds.

In view of the potential impact of these changes and the number of individuals likely to fall into rent arrears and possible eviction, the Council resolves to:

Request the Housing & New Homes Committee to call for a report outlining how the risk of evictions caused by the housing benefit changes and benefit cap will be minimised. The report will take into consideration the following actions:

- Where it is possible to clearly identify that arrears are solely due to the benefit cap or removal of entitlement, that officers use all means other than evictions and bailiffs to recover rent due;
- That the Council work with partners to ensure all those affected by benefit changes are, wherever possible, prevented from eviction and homelessness; in particular recognition of the fact that a disproportionate number of LGBT young people find themselves at risk of homelessness, and as such may be adversely impacted by the changes.”

97.29 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been carried unanimously.

97.30 The motion was **carried**.

98 CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting concluded at 11.05pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2017

