



## Meeting of the Council

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held in The Council Chamber, County Hall, St Annes Crescent, Lewes on Thursday, 13 October 2016 at 6.00pm**

### Present:

Councillor N Enever (Chair)

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; R Blackman; W Botting; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; S Davy; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V Ient; T Jones; A Lambert; I Linington; A Loraine; E Merry; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O'Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; J Sheppard; A Smith; and R Turner.

### Apologies received:

Councillors S Barnes; J Carr; W Elliott; B Giles; R Maskell; C Sugarman; and L Wallraven.

## Minutes

### 25 Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 21 July 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 26 Declarations of Interest

Councillors Adeniji, Honeyman and Robertson declared their personal, prejudicial interests in Agenda Item 14 (Delegation of Street Trading Powers to Seaford Town Council).

## Action

**27 To Receive any Announcements From the Chair of the Council, Leader of the Council, Members of the Cabinet or the Chief Executive**Chair of the Council's Engagements

The Council received the list of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Council's engagements carried out since the Meeting of the Council held on 21 July 2016.

**28 Questions from Members of the Public**

Written questions were asked of the Cabinet Member for Customers and Partners, Councillor Nicholson; and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Smith, on the following subjects, copies of which were circulated to all Councillors at the meeting and made available to the public attending the meeting (a copy of which is contained in the Minute Book). Oral replies to the questions were given at the meeting by Councillors Nicholson and Smith; and Councillor Jones provided an explanation in advance of Councillor Nicholson's reply to the first question:

QuestionerQuestion Concerning

Vivian Carrick,  
Secretary,  
Peacehaven Focus Group

The Lewes District Infrastructure Plan dated May 2016 stated, in respect of the Telscombe Cliffs Unit (Telscombe Cliffs to East Saltdean), that 'no investment will be made to provide sea defences along this stretch of the coastline'.

What were the Council's immediate and future plans and assurances to local residents and businesses relating to the seeking of grants to be able to protect the cliffs along that stretch of coastline, from putting the A259 at risk, with the subsequent disastrous consequences for the economies of both the District and Brighton and Hove?

Vivian Carrick,  
Secretary,  
Peacehaven Focus Group

In the Council's external auditors report on the New Homes Project, it stated that £600,000 of public money was spent before the Project was cancelled. Could the Council confirm a detailed breakdown of all the costs in the £600,000 complete with chronological dates of commitments and clarify if studies were still being commissioned by the Council after the Council Meeting on 9 December 2015, when the Project was put on hold, eg the 'Economic Impact Report'? Could the Council also confirm that all the above information shall be

made available to the general public for the purposes of transparency?

Vivian Carrick,  
Secretary,  
Peacehaven Focus Group

In the New Homes Working Group report to Cabinet, Schedule 2 paragraph 2.3 made it clear that the issuing of confidential Pink Papers early on in the Project had constrained councillors and had a severe impact upon their sharing of information including details about the selection of sites. Could definite undertakings be made by the Council that, in future, a more open approach would be made to ensure that site selection for any potential developments of the Council's properties was made public immediately?\*

## 29 Written Questions from Councillors

Councillor Ient asked a question of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Smith, relating to what applications had been made by East Sussex County Council in relation to the cycling and walking investment strategy requests for bids by the government in order to improve the situation for pedestrians, walkers and cyclists along the route of the C7 from Lewes to Newhaven, copies of which were circulated to Councillors at the meeting and made available to the public attending the meeting (a copy of which is contained in the Minute Book).

An oral reply to the question was given at the meeting by Councillor Smith.

## 30 Questions to the Leader of the Council

### Questioner

### Question/Response

Councillor  
Saunders

#### Question:

With regard to problems associated with poor air quality in Newhaven, East Sussex County Council had carried out a traffic survey in that town that had been completed in March 2016. However, the subsequent release of the results in respect thereof had been consistently delayed. The Officer who had provided a Report to Lewes District Council's Cabinet at its meeting on 28 September 2016 relating to air quality in Newhaven, had become frustrated with East Sussex County Council's failure to provide the results and conclusions that would, inevitably, show what we already know.

Would the Leader of the Council insist that East Sussex County Council release its report which had been submitted by its consultants in March, some 7 months ago.

<u>Questioner</u>	<u>Question/Response</u>	
	<p>A combined approach could then be worked up, with all the authorities involved, to apply for the central government funding that would be required in order to implement the necessary improvements to the infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):</u> Councillor Smith reported that he would write to the Leader of East Sussex County Council to ask if the consultant's report could be released and, in the event that it could not be released, the reason therefor.</p>	ADLDS (M Robertson)
Councillor Murray	<p><u>Question:</u> Councillor Murray reported that she was aware of two recent instances in which Lewes families had experienced extreme difficulty in getting the Council to accept that it had a duty to find them emergency accommodation because they were homeless.</p> <p>Did the Council believe that it was adequately meeting its duty of care to the homeless when it was so difficult for clearly deserving cases to get the Council to accept their need?</p> <p>Did the Council not feel that it should be investing in more locally available emergency housing and did it regret closing down the Saxonbury housing accommodation in Lewes?</p> <p><u>Response (by Councillor Merry, Cabinet Member for People and Performance on behalf of Councillor Maskell, Cabinet Member for Housing):</u></p> <p>The Housing Needs team worked hard to deliver a quality service to all its' customers. Service delivery was shaped in accordance with legislation, case law and relevant codes of guidance. The way that local authorities dealt with homelessness was clearly defined in Part 7 of The Housing Act 1996. It was clear who the Council could assist and those who were not able to access housing. There were a number of reasons why a household might not be entitled to housing assistance.</p> <p>The team would be happy to explain the processes involved and the basics of the legislation if that would be beneficial. They might be able to explore the individual case histories, subject to obtaining the consent of the relevant households.</p> <p>Emergency accommodation was only used for homeless households in instances in which no other housing options were available. The use of such accommodation</p>	DSD (to note)

QuestionerQuestion/Response

was not a long term option and the Council aimed to make decisions on homelessness applications as quickly as possible. All emergency accommodation was required to be of a specified standard in respect of which the Council had a close and effective joint working relationship with proprietors.

The Council was building 22 new homes on former garage sites to help meet housing need and would be looking to bring more homes forward in consultation with local people.

Saxonbury was not fit for purpose and, when it was closed, twelve additional units of accommodation were sourced around Lewes town.

**31 Ward Issues**

Ward issues were raised by Councillors on the following subjects:

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
Councillor Lambert – Seaford North Ward	<p>The Council owned the Cradle Hill industrial estate in Seaford in respect of which local residents had persistently raised concerns about the number of heavy goods vehicles and skips from companies that were located on the estate and which travelled along narrow residential roads with parked cars either side that were clearly unsuitable for that kind of traffic. The issue applied particularly to Quarry Lane and Valley Drive.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u></p> <p>That the Council join Councillor Lambert and East Sussex County Councillor Carolyn Lambert in writing to firms on the estate who used skip lorries and other heavy goods vehicles to request that they use the appropriate routes to access the estate namely; the A259 and Alfriston Road.</p> <p><i>(Note: The Cabinet Member for Waste and Recycling, Councillor Franklin, reported that the Council did not own all of the Cradle Hill industrial estate. He suggested that the Council write to its tenants on the estate to request that they do not drive heavy goods vehicles and skip lorries along the narrow residential roads. He further suggested that the Council write to</i></p>	<p>DRP</p> <p>DRP</p>



<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
	<p>the existing ground floor and there was a basement that could also be utilised. Such suggestions would benefit from the right promotion and possible partnering by, say, the Wave Leisure Trust. Newhaven Town Council would be happy to assist and provide support in bringing the idea forward.</p> <p><i>(Note: The Leader of the Council, Councillor Smith, reported that, whilst the Council's objective was to regenerate Newhaven town centre in a sustainable way, Councillor Saunders' suggestions would be taken into account as part of that process).</i></p>	DRP
Councillor Harrison-Hicks – Peacehaven East Ward	<p>Councillor Harrison-Hicks thanked the Council's Officers who had met with her and Councillor Neave to discuss matters relating to car parks in Telscombe and Peacehaven following which Piddinghoe Avenue car park had been repaired and work to the Steyning Avenue and Fairlight Avenue car parks was scheduled to be undertaken.</p> <p>Additionally, some broken fences around some of the recycling bins had been renewed and others were scheduled to be replaced or repaired before the end of 2016.</p> <p>Extra visits by the recycling teams would take place to try to reduce the amount of fly-tipping at the car parks.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That Councillor Harrison-Hicks' thanks be passed to the Officers concerned.</p>	DSD

## 32 Notices of Motion

The Chair reported that a Notice of Motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 14 by Councillor O'Keeffe which related to the discretionary reduction in liability for Council Tax.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14, Councillor O'Keeffe moved, and Councillor Robertson seconded, a revised version of the Notice of Motion to that which was set out in the Agenda papers as follows:

"This Council agrees that the present Council Tax Reduction Scheme should be fully reviewed by Cabinet with particular focus on the self-employed who earn less than the floor amount, and their access to the hardship fund for relief."

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

**32.1** Accordingly.

DSD

### **33 Delegation of Street Trading Powers to Seaford Town Council**

Councillor Franklin moved, and Councillor Gander seconded, the motion that the recommendations set out in Report No 134/16 relating to the delegation of street trading powers to Seaford Town Council, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

**33.1** Accordingly.

DSD

*(Note: Councillors Adeniji and Honeyman declared their personal, prejudicial interests in this item as they were members of Seaford Town Council and, therefore, left the room and took no part in the consideration, discussion and voting thereon. However, before leaving the room, Councillor Adeniji made representations to the Council in support of the Recommendations that were set out in the Report.*

*Councillor Robertson declared his personal, prejudicial interest in this item as he was one of the candidates for the forthcoming by-elections for Seaford Town Council and, therefore, left the room and took no part in the consideration, discussion and voting thereon).*

### **34 Changes to Committee Memberships and Outside Body Representatives**

The Leader of the Council moved the motion that the recommendations set out in Report No 135/16 relating to changes to committee memberships and outside body representatives, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

**34.1** Accordingly.

ADLDS

### **35 Meetings Attendance**

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Robertson seconded, the motion that the recommendation set out in Report No 136/16 relating to the attendance at Council meetings by Councillor Sugarman, be received and

adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

**35.1** Accordingly.

ADLDS

The meeting ended at 7.09pm.

N Enever  
Chair