



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

COUNCIL ADDENDUM 1

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 29 JANUARY 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
70	TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS	5 - 8
71	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	9 - 16
72	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	17 - 22

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

Agenda Item 70

Subject: Petitions

Date of meeting: 29 January 2026

Report of: Director of Governance & Law

Contact Officer: Name: Anthony Soyinka
Tel: 01273 291006
Email: anthony.soyinka@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

1.1 To receive any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That Council notes the petition(s).

3. Context and background information

3.1 To receive the following petition:

[St James Street Rainbows](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to Look into creating a permanent rainbow installation in Brighton's LGBT Village.

Brighton & Hove has long been recognised as the UK's LGBTQ+ capital – a city defined by its inclusivity, diversity, and vibrant community. Yet, despite our reputation and our proud history, we are one of the only major LGBTQ+ cities without a permanent rainbow landmark in our public streetscape. Other UK cities, including Manchester and London, have created visible, permanent tributes such as rainbow crossings and public art. These installations are more than just colourful designs – they are daily reminders of acceptance, equality, and belonging. They serve as symbols of hope, especially for younger generations, and as a declaration that LGBTQ+ people are celebrated, not erased.

This is especially urgent now. Across the world, including in the USA, there are deliberate movements to diminish the power and visibility of the rainbow flag, most recently seen in the removal of the Pulse Nightclub memorial crossing in Orlando – a tragic erasure of a community's memorial and a stark reminder that progress is never guaranteed.

Brighton & Hove must stand firm in the face of this trend. Installing a

permanent rainbow feature – whether a rainbow road crossing, painted street, rainbow lampposts, or coloured lighting – would demonstrate our city’s leadership, pride, and commitment to visibility. It would also provide a lasting landmark for residents and visitors, cementing Brighton’s place as a city that not only embraces but celebrates its LGBTQ+ community.

We call on Brighton & Hove City Council to commit to creating a permanent rainbow installation in our streets. This is not simply about paint or lights – it is about heritage, visibility, and the city’s duty to stand against the forces of erasure, and to ensure that the rainbow continues to shine brightly in the city most closely associated with LGBTQ+ life in the UK.

3.2 To receive the following petition:

[Redirect the new 3x bus down Ellen Street instead of Clarendon Road](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to write to Brighton & Hove Bus Company to ask that they redirect the new 3X bus route that travels 140 times per day, to go down Ellen Street, (adjacent road) instead of Clarendon Road. This will retain the privacy of the houses on Clarendon road from the double decker buses, reduce congestion on the already busy road of Clarendon Road, and stop Clarendon road being made into a bus route, causing annoyance to residents of Clarendon Road.

The addition of a bus route on Clarendon Road residential street means there has been an increase in pollution, rubbish, noise and reduction in residents privacy. by using Ellen street which has the same width of Clarendon Road , it is less busy than Clarendon road, and the flats there will not be affected by the 140 buses travelling down the street as they are higher up. It is unnerving to have 140 extra routes per day, (8 per hour), travelling down the road just outside your door, and the buses can see directly into the residents homes.

3.3 To receive the following petition:

[Ban Street Parking Along Bus Routes](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to Prevent street parking along roads used by bus routes by adding double yellow lines.

Many roads are made unnecessarily difficult for buses to navigate due to the number of cars parked along the edge of the street. This adds to journey times because when buses are attempting to drive along these roads, they effectively become one-way streets, and buses must give way to oncoming traffic, or vice versa.

The primary purpose of public roads is for vehicles to travel along them, not for people to leave their unused cars lying around. Stopping parking along bus routes would make the full width of the road usable, and ensure that buses and other traffic could move in both directions.

3.4 To receive the following petition:

[Removal of Household Bins in Auckland Drive](#)

We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to reverse the decision of replacing household refuse and recycling bins with communal bins in Auckland Drive. No evidence has been provided to support the rationale behind the change and no consultation was raised with residents to properly voice their objections. We now ask that the change is halted and formal debate is raised.

Residents were notified in October 2025 about plans to remove current household bins and replace with communal bins in 2 locations along Auckland Drive. Residents raised complaints detailing their concerns to the refuse collection suppliers and to local councillors, with no reply. The suppliers have since contacted residents again to give notice that their scheme will commence in January 2026.

Residents have raised concerns including (but not an exhaustive list):

- Health and Safety of residents, including elderly, those with limited mobility, those with young children especially single parent households unable to walk half way down the road and back to dispose of their rubbish and recycling.
- Risk of increased vermin in the area.
- Increased risk of fly tipping in the area.
- Loss of parking bays in an area already struggling with parking, especially with the increased vehicles from the increasing number of HMO's and university students using the site on the industrial site
- Effect on house values
- Potential for this scheme to be rolled out across the estate resulting in further pressure on parking, fly tipping and vermin

So far the council have not listened to the valid concerns of residents.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Council

Agenda Item 71

Subject: Written questions from members of the public

Date of meeting: 29 January 2026

A period of not more than thirty minutes shall be allowed for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority at each ordinary meeting of the Council.

Every question shall be put and answered without discussion, but the person to whom a question has been put may decline to answer. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

1. Phil Grabsky asked:

I have lived on Tongdean Lane – between Withdean Stadium and Dyke Road Avenue – for 30 years and in the past 18-24 months there has been a sharp increase of traffic – often exceeding the speed limit and a large percentage of whom are ignoring the Restricted Access only signs – coming up and down the lane. There is no pavement so this traffic – often as I say at excessive speed – is a danger to adult, child and, not to be overlooked, pets. This has partly been caused by the large increase of attendance at Withdean gym. The building of football pitches, now padel courts and soon a pool, have and will only make matters worse. When we have requested speed bumps (which can be installed at relatively low cost) we are told someone has to be killed or injured first. Is this Council really willing to wait for that eventuality?

Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure.

2. Chris Hartfield asked:

Following 3 tragic deaths in Eastbourne the council made clear statements last year that, due to the lack of local temporary accommodation, “it has no choice but to use out-of- city emergency placements” however, it would “prioritise keeping people within Brighton and Hove wherever possible”. Why then, have they failed, despite 9 requests, to make comment or express interest on the tender submitted March 2025 from a local landlord offering accommodation in a centrally located Hove property of 9 self-contained units, which has incidentally been used by the council as temporary accommodation for Adult Social Care for 15+ years.

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing:

Brighton & Hove City Council

3. Andy Barker asked:

Rottingdean Croquet Club: I am here as chair of Rottingdean croquet club. We have been trying to sign a lease with BHCC for Rottingdean croquet green and club house since December 2024. When will the final lease be sent to the club?

Reply from Councillor Robins, Cabinet Member for Sports, Recreation & Libraries.

4. Paul Norman asked:

In November 2023 BHCC owned 1,298 homes in EPC Band D, and 88 homes in band E or below. Now that the government is looking at a target for all council homes to achieve an EPC rating of C by 2030, how many residential properties owned by Brighton and Hove City Council currently need work to an EPC of C: and what is the estimated cost of these works?

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.

5. Adrian Hart asked:

At a Cabinet meeting last year, data on child wellbeing and mental health risks were cited in support of policy decisions affecting local schools. Can leader Cllr Sankey or safeguarding lead Cllr Daniel explain what processes and safeguards are in place to ensure that any statistical evidence presented publicly is accurate, verified, and does not inadvertently mislead residents, particularly on sensitive issues such as suicide prevention and safeguarding? I feel certain everyone here agrees that accurate evidence and robust safeguards are essential to maintain public trust and protect children's welfare.

Reply from Councillor Daniel, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Youth Services.

6. Ross Harper asked:

I represent Leaseholders at The Barrows, the housing development agreed as part in the Open Market development by Hyde Housing. Hyde are the councils chosen housing partner and as such have had many developments agreed. Sadly our experiences of Hyde as a landlord have been dismal. The latest example is a huge hike in our Service Charge, in some cases 300-400%, this includes Hyde trying to change us for Fire Safety measures in relation to new government legislation after the Grenfell disaster. Hyde have increased their management fee to £40 per month per unit and our building insurance to £60 per unit, so before any costs we are paying £100pm each. I personally have seen my service charge go from £66pm to £250pm. If the council intend to keep Hyde as their preferred housing partner what can be done to protect residents from becoming trapped in unreasonable Service Charges?

Brighton & Hove City Council

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.

7. Linda Newman asked:

Pavement parking is a persistent and growing problem in Woodingdean, particularly on council estates built before car ownership was common. This creates serious difficulties for pedestrians who are often forced into the carriageway to pass.

I was very glad to see our Labour Government has now granted local authorities new powers to tackle pavement parking.

Can the Cabinet Member for Transport and City Infrastructure explain how Brighton & Hove City Council intends to implement these new powers in practice, and what approach the council will take to consulting with residents to ensure the enforcement reflects local conditions and priorities?

Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure.

8. David Tindell asked:

The bus real time information sign at London Road Shops Stop C is not working, It had not been working for a few weeks before I raised the issue with the councils Public Transport Team on the 31 July 2025, I have since followed this up with the Transport Team and the issue has still not been resolved (as of the 17 January 2026 almost 6 months), so when will this be resolved?

This is a council issue in that the latest problem is a power supply issue not related to the display issues (VIX Technology)

Reply from Councillor Muten, Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure.

9. Barry Stierer asked:

Will the Administration provide a comprehensive update on progress made in implementing the two actions mandated by the Notice of Motion passed at the meeting of Council on 13 October 2025 (amended Notice of Motion on Gaza and council financial exposure), including a precise timetable for both actions?

Reply from Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration.

10. Christina Summers asked:

In light of events at the October 13th Full Council, where a public rally took place outside the meeting and a resident deputation on community safety and antisemitism was interrupted mid-speech, can the Council explain what risk

Brighton & Hove City Council

assessments, safety measures, and liaison with the police were conducted to ensure the safety of residents attending the Council chamber and outside the building?

Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Chair.

11. Jacquelyn Brown asked:

An ever increasing number of tents are occupied in the St. Nicholas Church Rest Garden. I have been in contact with my ward Councillor Alison since November, who has been supportive. I have also written to my local Green MP.

There have been reports of antisocial behaviour, possession of knife and a dog who at times has been aggressive. The number and presence of the occupants is intimidating.

What are the Council going to DO to restore this public park to a place of peace, safety and recreation for the Community?

The notice on the gate clearly states that the Rest Garden is a BHCC park.

Reply from Councillor Alexander, Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities, Public Health & Adult Social Care.

12. Victoria Bhogal asked:

Following the Full Council meeting of 13th October 2025, officers referred to an external statement issued by Sussex Jewish Representative Council about the impact of that meeting. Can the Cllr Sankey explain how the Council ensures that decisions affecting residents' deputations and public questions are made fairly and independently of such external statements?

Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council.

13. Daniel Harris asked:

On BBC Politics South East, Helen Grant MP praised Brighton for acquiring "200 in-house units" of temporary accommodation. Bella, you didn't correct this false claim. On 31 December 2025, you signed a £19 million direct award to Base One Holdings—a private contractor incorporated in 2023—for 209 lease/license units, not council ownership. This misrepresentation was broadcast regionally. Part 2 remains confidential, preventing scrutiny of due diligence, alternatives, and conflicts of interest. Bella, will you immediately publish Part 2 of the Base One decision report?

Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council.

14. David Wilson asked:

Brighton & Hove City Council

Survey of lamp posts in Saltdean: The Saltdean Residents and Community Association would like to buy and maintain hanging baskets which would hang from lamp posts on brackets installed by a specialist company. The bracket installation would also be paid for by our association.

Councillor Fishleigh was advised by Councillor Allan that lamp posts would need to be tested by BHCC's specialist street lighting contractors for structural integrity. BHCC advised that the cost of this would be around £13,000 for six lamp posts. So around £2,000 per lamp post.

Do you agree this seems extremely expensive for street furniture that should be structurally sound anyway and will BHCC absorb this cost please?

Reply from Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Customer Services & Public Realm.

15. Sheila Rimmer/Lynora Knot asked:

The answer to Ian Needham's question was not complete, so please can you confirm whether or not existing tenants from the LPS blocks are being guaranteed a like for like offer to return to the new homes at a like for like rent namely at regular council social (target) rents not at the government's new definition of social rents which is much higher?

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.

16. Jerome Cox-Strong asked:

Like so many living under social landlords who care more about profit than people, Southern Housing tenants on Pankhurst Avenue in Hanover are sadly used to severe issues going unfixed. Flooded lifts, broken external doors, leaks dripping through ceilings shutting down community spaces, and a total indifference to the needs of vulnerable residents.

Tenants tell me that for months, they've asked Southern to fix broken lights on the cut-through to Brighton General Hospital, leaving the ramp and stairs pitch black at night. Southern blame the NHS - yet that path is on Southern's property. It's clear from Southern's abysmal maladministration rate - approaching 92% in 2024 - they will not follow their obligations and responsibilities unless they're forced to.

So will the council step in, force them to act, and send a message that social landlords across the city cannot act with impunity and ignore the needs of their tenants?

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.

17. David Gibson asked:

Brighton & Hove City Council

In the last 3 years over 100 homeless people in Brighton and Hove have died mostly living in privately provided temporary and emergency homeless accommodation. For many years housing campaigners have been pressing for the council to provide emergency and temporary accommodation. The last council made a start by acquiring Gladstone house and thankfully no one has died living in this council run facility. Expanding more council owned temporary accommodation is needed quickly since council owned homeless accommodation costs less and is better quality. This can be done more if council commit to designating at least 80% purchases under the current home purchase scheme as temporary homeless accommodation (for the first few years of its use) Will the council do this?

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.

18. Diane Montgomery asked:

Whilst developers seek to maximise their offer of shared ownership “affordable” homes agreed in planning as Gill Williams points out shared ownership is open to residents living outside the city and does not reduce waiting list, so the quota percentage of shared ownership sought by the council and reflected in the imminent planning note need to be tiny or zero (so as to maximise the benefit to local residents in the greatest housing need) Will you ensure that the quota is very low or zero in the forthcoming planning note?

Reply from Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing.

19. Nigel Furness asked:

As the plans for this year’s Sussex Mayoral Elections have now been postponed until 2028, partly, I understand Councillor Sankey, as a result of your input, what, if any, plans have you advocated to steal our citywide elections next year?

Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council.

20. Charles Harrison asked:

Procurement: On 02 Jan 2026 the Council entered a 6-year contract spending over £18 million of public funds with a provider, Base one, who were only incorporated as an organisation in 2023 and therefore do not have a proven track record of delivering a service. This award was an “urgent decision” made by the Leader of the Council.

We are aware that homeless numbers have been increasing for the last 2 years and that the surge in the use of costly private nightly placements is not a new trend either.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Why was this decision to place such a major contract so rushed, without consideration of alternative actions or proper public scrutiny at a council meeting?

Reply from Councillor Sankey, Leader of the Council.

21. Adam Dennett asked:

In the papers published on 21st January, in point 3.34 the council saw fit to use as part justification for their changes to the sibling link priority, a petition from the Equity in Education group citing support for the changes. More egregiously these responses were added to a table under 3.30 where they were combined with the overwhelmingly negative responses from the official consultation, to give the false impression of overall support for the proposals. Anyone who has taken an undergraduate class on statistics would be able to explain why it is both wrong and misleading to do this, with double counting of respondents, totally different sampling frames etc. If one of my students handed something like this in for an assessment they would fail, so why do the council officers think it is permissible to mislead Full Council again with more adulterated consultation outputs?

Reply from Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration.

22. Lizzie Moore:

Before approving an irreversible merger, what specific financial and educational evidence has the council itself reviewed to satisfy its Best Value duty that merger offers a lower-risk and better outcome than federation, and where can this evidence be seen?

Reply from Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration.

23. Alison Woolfenden

The Cabinet report for 13 November stated it was “not possible to quantify” the impact of the expanded sibling link, yet Councillor Taylor told Cabinet it would affect “eight or nine children” and Richard Barker told parents on 3 December “eight or nine children per school;” numbers that are inconsistent, but suggest some modelling was likely already known.

No catchment-level figures were published before the consultation closed on 9 January, yet just 12 days later modelling revealed 15% of Patcham pupils and 20 in the DS/V catchment could be displaced, preventing parents from responding meaningfully, or submitting evidence.

Can the Council clarify when the catchment-level modelling behind these figures was first known, whether it was known before the consultation closed, and if so, why it was withheld, and how this approach complies with the

Brighton & Hove City Council

School Admissions Code, Gunning principles, and Nolan standards of openness, honesty, and fairness?

Reply from Councillor Taylor, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance & City Regeneration.

Subject: Deputations from members of the public

Date of meeting: 29 January 2026

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the council, nominated by the mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the mayor and voted on without discussion that the spokesperson for the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification that three deputations have been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

1. Support the Together Alliance against the far right

Supported by:

Davinder Mankoo
Christian Hogsbjerg
Dr Gil Mualem-Doron
Sue Bowes
Phil Mellows

Summary of Deputation:

The Together Alliance is about building solidarity and unity across communities and is supported by UK charities, unions, civil society organisations, politicians and other individuals including Sir Lenny Henry, Leigh-Anne Pinnoch, Steve Coogan and Paloma Faith, offering a platform of 'love, unity and hope'. At a time when representatives of the far right minority are feeling emboldened to spout hatred and the politics of poison, the Together Alliance is advocating hope over fear, and rejects narratives of division and racism.

<https://www.togetheralliance.org.uk/>

Given the far right is on the rise in the US and UK, leading to fear and intimidation of black and Asian communities, Brighton and Hove council – as an anti-racist city of sanctuary - should follow the lead of Sefton council and sign the Together Alliance statement and promote the national mobilisation on Saturday 28 March widely across its media and social media channels as well as supporting putting up posters on prominent locations such as the seafront. The Together Alliance statement is below:

The voices of division in our country are growing louder. Those who preach division are becoming more confident.

Brighton & Hove City Council

For the first time we face a far-right party topping the polls, and far right protests on our streets mobilising the biggest numbers they ever have.

Their false promises seize on the very real economic problems people face, in order to scapegoat migrants, Muslims, and refugees.

But we can change things together. The voices of unity can grow stronger. We can show that strength lies in solidarity. That the change we need comes from us working together for hope not despair, for unity not racism.

- Together we can reject narratives of division and racism.
- Together we can build solidarity across communities.
- Together we can unite against the far right.

Our alliance of over 80+ organisations and hundreds of individuals is coming together to say enough is enough.

We are mobilising and organising across the country to bring a message of hope over fear, prior to holding a major demonstration in London on March 28th, 2026.

Join us and help us build an alliance for hope and unity.

2. Deputation from Equity in Education regarding the proposal to extend the sibling link to all families in Brighton & Hove

Supported by:

James Baird
Nicola Clewer
Essie Marks
Lesley Reeves
Raphael Schlembach

Summary of Deputation:

Introduction

- Representative from Equity in Education advocating for families living in north-east Brighton
- Deprivation, social segregation and educational disadvantage in our area
- Recent changes to the secondary schools admissions arrangements (free school meal and open admissions priorities) and why more change is needed

Response to the proposed change to sibling link priority

- The unfairness of the current sibling link policy and how it impacts on families in our community and elsewhere in the city
- Benefits of proposed changes for families across Brighton & Hove
- Response to the consultation from our community
- Why the sibling link and opened admissions priorities are and must remain separate

Brighton & Hove City Council

Concluding remarks

- Appeal to councillors to vote through the proposal to extend the sibling link to all families in Brighton & Hove

3. **Deputation from parents affected by this year's proposed Secondary School Admissions changes**

Supported by:

Matthew Boote
Rebecca Korda
Evgeny Batov
Eva Myers
Lou Mitchell
James Christie
Nichola Tuck
Mark Jukes
Thomas O'Leary
Hannah Heathcote
Leanne Evans
Juliette Dyke

Summary of Deputation:

This council is proposing major changes to secondary admissions for the third year in a row - yet still no impact assessment has been carried out on the last two rounds of changes. Councillors and the public have no evidence about whether previous policy aims were met, or what unintended consequences have already occurred.

The new proposal would extend sibling priority to all children, regardless of where they live. At present, sibling link applies only to children living in catchment. Removing that safeguard introduces a clear and serious risk: in- catchment children, including those on free school meals, could lose places at their local school because out- of- catchment siblings are placed ahead of them.

As worded, this is a policy to extend deliberate displacement of children from their local schools, including those on Free-School-Meals.

In Varndean and Stringer catchment the council's own 30% cap for children on free school meals would be reached before all in- catchment FSM children are offered places. Those children would then be just as vulnerable to displacement as any other. This directly contradicts last year's policy change, which was explicitly designed to *protect* in- catchment children on free school meals.

This proposal would even prioritise children who do not live in the city over children who do. It applies not only to siblings who gained places through open admissions or the FSM priority, but also to families who move out of the city.

Brighton & Hove City Council

The result is predictable: more children unable to attend a school they can easily travel to, more separation from primary school friendship groups, more random allocation, more uncertainty for families, more appeals. Yet the council has carried out no assessment of these likely impacts or even bothered to articulate them before going out to consultation.

In November, cabinet papers stated it was not possible to quantify how many siblings this change would affect. This is wrong. During the consultation, some individuals received private emails from Richard Barker containing figures - quite large numbers. These figures were never published. How can the community respond to a consultation and how can councillors be expected to make an informed decision when the data is withheld?

Deliberate displacement hits hardest on those children with the least resources. Information the Council shared with the adjudicator last year showed that the first to be displaced will be those whose parents or carers didn't put any application in - who are likely to already be facing less stable home circumstances and who are unable to navigate increasingly complex admissions systems.

We are asking councillors today to reassess this proposal and amend it so that in- catchment children are not de- prioritised. This could be easily achieved by:

- counting out- of- catchment siblings within the existing 5% open admissions quota, or
- introducing a split sibling criterion that places out- of- catchment siblings after all in- catchment children.

The proposed changes to waiting lists also prioritise administrative convenience over supporting families through an already complex process and should be rethought.

Over 1,500 children apply for secondary places in Brighton & Hove every year. Councillors have a responsibility to ensure that any policy change is evidence- based, transparent, and properly assessed. We are asking you to insist on that due diligence before our children pay the price

4. Mission:HOME – Request for faster building of Social Housing on small sites in Brighton and Hove for families experiencing homelessness.

Supported by:

Scarlett Chapman
Gordana Chapman
James Chapman
Bill Wallsgrave
Mike Bosnivic

Summary of Deputation:

Brighton & Hove City Council

This deputation highlights demonstrated public support for additional social housing, and shows that such support increases when residents are given fuller information about families living in long-term temporary accommodation.

It asks the Council to increase efforts to identify small, under-used sites suitable for social housing, and to bring them forward for development sooner.

Context

Around 1,000 families in Brighton & Hove live in temporary accommodation, many for six to eight years or longer. Prolonged stays harm children's health, education, stability, and long-term outcomes.

The Opportunity

The key issue is delay. Small, under-used council sites can often deliver family-sized social rented homes faster than large developments. Used together, these sites can reduce time spent in temporary accommodation.

Why Small Sites Work

Small developments integrate families more quickly, place little additional pressure on services, are easier for communities to absorb, and reduce long-term social and financial costs.

Evidence from Woodingdean

Mission: HOME is supporting engagement on a live application for four family-sized council homes on a small site in Woodingdean. When residents are given clear information about family homelessness and the role of small sites, many choose to support the proposal, alongside legitimate objections.

Role of Mission: HOME Mission: HOME is a grassroots, community-led initiative. It does not build housing or make planning decisions. Its role is to support informed public engagement and demonstrate that public backing for small-scale social housing exists where residents are able to engage with fuller context.

Supporting Information:

Mission: HOME — background note

Mission: HOME is a grassroots, community-led initiative based in Brighton & Hove, focused on family homelessness and the long periods many children spend growing up in temporary accommodation.

The project started from a simple observation: when people understand what family homelessness actually looks like, and how long families are waiting, many are more open to small, well-designed social housing being built in their communities.

Mission: HOME does not build housing and does not make planning decisions. Our role is to help residents understand the issue, encourage thoughtful engagement, and support constructive participation where local housing proposals come forward.

Brighton & Hove City Council

The current focus of the project is on small, under-used sites and how these can become permanent family homes more quickly than large developments. Woodingdean is one example of this approach, where residents have engaged constructively with a proposal after being given fuller context about the families affected and the need for homes.”

This note is provided simply to explain the background to Mission: HOME and the thinking behind the deputation. It is not intended to set expectations or require a response.

More information is available at:
www.missionhome.org.uk