

PEOPLE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY ADDENDUM

4.00PM, TUESDAY, 14 JANUARY 2025

HOVE TOWN HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBER

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
21	PROCEDURAL BUSINESS	
22	CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS	
23	MINUTES	3 - 20
24	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	
25	MEMBER INVOLVEMENT	
26	SCRUTINY OF SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2026-27	21 - 80
27	CITY OF SANCTUARY UPDATE	81 - 100

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PEOPLE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

4.00pm 9 OCTOBER 2024

MINUTES

Present Cllrs O'Quinn (Chair), Sheard (Deputy Chair), Cattell, Czolak, Helliwell, Simon, Thompson, Mcleay, Shanks, Meadows. Joanna Maritndale (CVS), Doug Thompson (Older Peoples Council), Adam Muirhead (CVS), Becky Robinson (PaCC), Dr Ansuree Biswas Sasidharan (Standing Invitee BME), Lesley Hurst (Church of England education co-optee), Maria Cowler (Catholic Church education co-optee), Jasmine Oquosa-Withers, Maya McDevitt (Youth Council).

PART ONE

8 MINUTES

8.1 The minutes from the last People Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 9th July were approved by the members

9 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

9 a Declarations of substitutions: Doug Thompson for Sara Fulford (Older Peoples Council)

B Declarations of interest: Cllr O'Quinn declared a personal interest, noting that she – has been lobbied by parents from a particular area.

C Exclusion of the press and public: There are no part two items

10 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

10.1 The Chair gave the following communication:

There is a considerable amount of work that goes on behind the scenes with regards to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees in order that the Committees truly fulfil their purpose. There are many meetings between the officers and the Chairs and also with Executive Directors and other officers from the relevant departments plus regular meetings with relevant members of the Cabinet. As Chair of the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee I also do my best to have meetings with as many relevant organisations, charities and people as possible in order to further understand the issues that exist and possible ideas of how to improve matters via scrutiny. Examples of this are that I met with Caroline Ridley, CEO of

Impact Initiatives and visits to the Young People's Centre in Ship St and Stopover near St Peter's Church were arranged which were invaluable in adding to my knowledge of the services that exist for young people in the city. I also attended the launch of the Wellbeing Festival organised by Impact Initiatives and this supports older people in the city by providing many activities over a two week period. Regarding homelessness in our city, I met with Ray Bloom and his daughter who are engaged in some very positive and innovative schemes to assist in this area. To help understand the issue of loneliness, a growing issue for young people, I liaise with Together Co who are carrying out research with other partners on this subject. I am attending a Pedal People event next week in order to support them in their trailblazing work with 'Elder Care Rides' and I am also attending a Black History Month event at One Church. The councillors who sit on this committee are also very involved in finding out what is happening in the city by having meetings and talking to people so there is a considerable effort to understand what matters to people and where more scrutiny is required.

We've got 3 items to consider today.

I know that members were keen to look at issues concerning school places and catchments, so I have asked for an item on school organisation. As this is a scrutiny committee, we want wherever possible to hear different voices when we consider issues, so I have invited Curtis and Beth from Class Divide to attend the meeting. Class Divide is a grassroots organisation that campaigns to highlight and reduce education inequalities in Brighton & Hove. I have also invited some academic experts in the field of educational inequalities to the meeting. They are Professor Steven Gorard from Durham University and Dr Ellen Greaves from Exeter University.

We will first hear from Cllr Jacob Taylor and from officers, and I'll then ask Class Divide and our academic experts to each briefly address the committee. If members want to ask questions of our guests, or if our guests have any questions they'd like to ask Cllr Taylor, please feel free to do so.

For our second item, I have asked for a paper on the council's work to refresh our strategy for dealing with Transition from children to adult services. This can be a very difficult process for some of our most vulnerable people and it is crucial that we get transition right.

We are fortunate to have Fiona England from the Parent Carer's Council (PaCC) as a co-opted member of this committee. I have also invited Sally Polanski from Amaze to today's meeting. Amaze is an organisation that gives information, advice and support to families with children who have educational special needs and disabilities. Both PaCC and Amaze have been involved in the development of the strategy.

We will hear initially from Cllr Tristram Burden and from officers. I'll then ask Fiona and Sally to address the committee, before opening up for discussion and questions. Again, I'm sure that Sally and Fiona would be happy to answer questions and they are welcome to ask them also. The third item is on the refresh of the council's Drugs & Alcohol strategy. We don't have any external guests for this one, so we will go straight to Cllr Burden and to officers to present.

For all of these items, they are coming to scrutiny in part so that members of People committee can seek assurance that these key issues for people in the city are being properly planned for. If any members don't feel fully assured that this is the case, we can always look at specific issues in more depth at a later meeting or request more information in another way. However, we're also here to make a positive contribution to the development of thinking, so if members

have ideas for how a piece of work could be improved, please don't be shy – the relevant Cabinet Members are here today to listen to your ideas.

11 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

11.1 There were no public questions.

12 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

12.1 There were no member questions.

13 SCHOOL ORGANISATION

13.1 Cllr Jacob Taylor presented the report on school organisation to the committee.

13.2 Curtis James and Beth from Class Divide spoke to the committee about their campaigns on education inequality. Curtis set out the campaign that Class Divide has run since 2019. He said that research has shown that diversity in schools improves outcomes for the poorest students, and that mixing children from different backgrounds creates a richer learning environment. Curtis said that Brighton & Hove ranked 53rd out of 144 local authorities for school segregation. He said that he wanted the city to do everything possible to avoid losing another school. Curtis spoke about some of the concerns that he had received from parents. Beth spoke about her lived experience as a mother in Whitehawk with 3 children, highlighting the lack of choice for parents, and the expense of travel for children getting to school.

13.3 Professor Stephen Gorard, Director of the Durham University Evidence Centre for Education, spoke to the committee. Professor Gorard said that internationally and nationally, poorer children clustered together is strongly linked to an attainment gap. The most disadvantaged students do worse in areas where they are most clustered together in schools. By not clustering, it raises the level of attainment of everybody. The most disadvantaged gain the most, but there are no losers. Brighton & Hove is thinking of doing things along the right lines, but it needs to be done with the least disruption. It would be good to move to a system where it didn't matter which school children went to. Making schools more representative and raising the attainment level for all will help move to a system where it doesn't matter which school children go to.

13.4 Dr Ellen Greaves, Lecturer in Economics at Exeter University, spoke to the committee. Dr Greaves has carried out research on school admissions in England and said that most local authorities across England have a geographical based admissions criteria which tends to produce clustering effects. One model to mitigate this is a pupil premium basis, which BHCC is doing. Another model is to have a percentage allocation for pupils outside of the catchment area. A less widely used model is random allocation as a tie break. Dr Greaves said her personal view would be to evaluate the free school meals (FSM) intake before changing too much else. The FSM policy will go some way to address educational disadvantage. The issues of pupil admission numbers (PAN) and attainment disadvantage should be kept separate so as to be able to evaluate the FSM

policy. The main driver of school segregation is at residential level. Many parents would like to make a school choice but cannot due to transport distance. She said that changes should be made in a reasonable time with the minimum disruption to all involved.

- 13.5 Cllr Shanks asked a question about governance processes. Cllr Taylor responded that changes to catchments would need to be agreed at full Council before February 2025. Only changing PANs would not require full Council approval, but would require statutory consultation. Cllr Taylor said that he was happy to take criticism if the basis of the current engagement exercise was not communicated clearly enough, but it is important that the city has this conversation.
- 13.6 Cllr Sheard asked a question about the percentages of pupils eligible for FSM in the proposed options. Cllr Taylor responded that the estimated FSM numbers for each option are indicated. Option B provides the most rebalancing. We don't yet know what impact the new admissions policy around FSM will have.
- 13.7 Jasmine Oquosa-Withers from the Youth Council asked a question about the risk that adopting some of the options may lead to rising house prices as more families move into the catchment area of higher performing schools. Cllr Taylor responded that demand for schools and housing are linked and it is possible that demand for schools could increase demand for housing. However, moving to a system with a more equitable distribution of pupils across city schools should reduce these pressures by addressing the disparity between schools' performance that is a consequence of unbalanced intakes.
- 13.8 Cllr Czolak asked questions about transport as a potential barrier to pupil mobility and whether we would only hear from the loudest voices in any consultation. Cllr Taylor agreed that transport was an issue both in terms of routes and affordability. Ideally, all transport for children in education would be free, but this is not affordable. Cllr Taylor also agreed that we need to hear from more community voices, and noted that efforts are being made to do this.
- 13.9 Cllr Mcleay asked when the data on the impact of the FSM policy would be available. Richard Barker responded that this was anticipated around March 2025. Cllr McLeay also asked what can be done to work with academy or religious schools where the council has no direct ability to determine PAN. Cllr Taylor said he is working well with head teachers and has spoken with Cardinal Newman about them voluntarily reducing PAN.
- 13.10 Cllr Helliwell asked a question on the minimum intake numbers for schools to remain viable. Richard responded that no school is being asked to go below 180 pupils, or six forms of entry, which is enough to deliver the core curriculum. Dr Greaves said very few schools had PANs of less than less than 180 pupils; falling numbers means retention of staff is worse and in turn fewer parents wanting to choose it. Prof Gorard said that smaller schools on average have worse staff retention.

- 13.11 Cllr Helliwell asked about Government plans to give councils more control over PAN and catchments for all schools. Cllr Taylor responded that a Bill was anticipated. We will need to see the detail of proposals before we can be sure what additional latitude this may give the council going forward.
- 13.12 Cllr Helliwell asked a question about school segregation. Curtis responded that it is impossible to justify a situation where some schools in the city have FSM rates as low as 15% and others rates at 50% of pupils.
- 13.11 Jo Martinadale asked about different ways of engagement outside of formal consultations, noting that The community and voluntary sector across the city can help with engagement. Cllr Taylor agreed and said the council hadn't got engagement right over many years.
- 13.12 Cllr Meadows agreed that everyone wanted children to have a good education. She spoke about the long distances traveling to school and the impact on friendship groups and the stress on children. Parental choice is something that parents should have, especially as schools specialise. Cllr Meadows emphasised the costs of transport even if families are not on FSM, and urged caution because of the need to evaluate the FSM policy before changing anything else. Beth agreed with the stress of transport to school and spoke of the three buses to Longhill that arrive within three minutes of each other. Cllr Taylor thanked Cllr Meadows for her comments, and agreed that transport was important. He did not think that choice was the most important factor, but said that everyone should have good service.
- 13.13 Becky Robinson said that the information on offer was light regarding SEN children, and asked if the council will work with PACC. Cllr Taylor said that if any proposals were taken forward, they would engage with them.
- 13.14 Dr Anusree Biswas Sasidharan said that she agreed with everything that had been said. She felt a consultation wasn't always the best method as middle class residents were typically more likely to respond than other groups. She suggested going to talk to people where they were. Choice of schools should not be such an issue as every local school should be good enough. She also expressed concerns about families who just miss the FSM eligibility.. Cllr Taylor said it was a good challenge and is an issue the whole city needs to tackle. Events in communities is a way to keep the conversation going.
- 13.15 Cllr Cattell asked Cllr Taylor what the outcome would be if nothing was done, particularly the PANs. Cllr Taylor said on the PANs 3 or 4 schools would remain very large with healthy budgets whilst other schools would experience falling numbers, would struggle to have the breadth of offer and would have to cut costs. Cllr Cattell asked if the do-nothing option was therefore not an option. Cllr Taylor said that was his view.
- 13.16 Cllr Simon asked a question on timescales, and also if the council could look at other local authorities with problematic distribution of secondary schools. Cllr Taylor responded that any decision on catchments needs to be made by the end of February, and working back from that there are deadlines for engagement and consultation. The

experts might know about local authorities with comparable geographical problems. Brighton & Hove has similar economics to London boroughs and has inequalities like everywhere but we have geographic concentrations of deprivation that London boroughs do not typically experience.

- 13.17 Cllr Shanks asked whether there was evidence of negative impacts on middle class pupils attending schools with high rates of FSM. Prof Gorard replied that as long as disadvantage is spread amongst schools it doesn't affect the attainment of middle class children.

14 TRANSITION TO ADULTHOOD STRATEGY

- 14.1 Cllr Tristram Burden, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Service Transformation; and Steve Hook, Interim Corporate Director Health and Adult Social Care, presented the paper on the Transition to Adulthood strategy.
- 14.2 Sally Polanski from Amaze and Fiona England from the Parents and Carers Council also addressed the committee.
- 14.3 Cllr Meadows asked what had gone wrong with the approaches of the previous strategy to require a refresh and why performance was so patchy. Steve Hook responded that services are being assessed against relatively new standards introduced in 2022. While services have not necessarily performed poorly, these new standards take a much broader approach to transition which requires a different focus for services. The refresh will support Different services to work more closely together. Previous strategies have been focused on children's or adult social care, but we are now looking at a much wider cohort going into adulthood not just at young people eligible for adult social care services. Cllr Burden added that, with a Labour council and government, there is an opportunity for a reset to focus on a one council approach.
- 14.4 Cllr Czolak asked questions about engagement with service users, and whether there is a particular focus on mental health, given the rising prevalence of mental and emotional health issues in young people. Steve Hook responded that, in terms of engaging with adults with lived experience, part of engagement has been with SpeakOut who work with adults who have learning disabilities. Issues around transition have been raised with them. Mental health is a key area of focus, and the council has worked with NHS Sussex on this. The mental health integration board has a lived experience advisory board and we plan to work with them.
- 14.5 Cllr Shanks asked question about engagement with schools and about streamlined support. Steve Hook responded that in terms of engagement with schools is key. The ambition is to get coordination right between schools, SCN caseworkers and social workers, and for people with complex health needs, the lead clinician. In terms of health services, young people with complex health needs are dealt with by a paediatrician who coordinates their care, but as adult they typically have to engage with a number of discrete services. The ambition is to develop a more coordinated approach to supporting adults with complex health needs.

- 14.6 Cllr Helliwell asked a question about the ‘neuro divergent with and without disability’ category in the draft strategy. Steve Hook responded that currently there are clear pathways for some neuro divergent young people, but not for others, and the ambition is to have clear pathways for everyone, including people who will not be eligible for ASC support.
- 14.7 Cllr Mcleay asked about The resource implications of the refresh. Steve Hook replied that it is important to recognise that poor transition planning has cost implications: providing crisis services can be much more expensive than planned services. It is unlikely that there will be much, if any, additional funding available, but we know that good planning can save money and deliver better outcomes for people. Examples of what the council is doing already include developing a service in Woodingdean on the site of a former care home to rehouse young people with complex needs who would otherwise have been placed out of the city.
- 14.8 Cllr Simon asked about best practice at other local authorities. Steve Hook responded that the council has looked at best practice across the country, with a particular focus on Birmingham City Council which has developed a through care service supporting young people from 14 to 24. However, every place is different and what works elsewhere might not work here; we want to preserve what is good here and enhance it. Cllr Burden added that he had recently read a book on transitions in which Brighton was cited as a best practice exemplar, particularly in terms of the work of the Oasis Project on young people with substance abuse.
- 14.9 Adam Muirhead said it was good that consideration had been given to children with SEND, mental health needs, neurodiversity, and looked after children; but why not youth offending services and probation? Steve Hook welcomed this challenge, noting that this may be more about the presentation than the contents of the strategy. There have been workstreams that have involved the leaving care team, probation and youth offending. Officers will reflect on how to communicate this important work more effectively.
- 14.10 Cllr Sheard asked a question about why there are distinct pathways for neurodivergence and learning disabilities. Steve Hook replied that the reason they have been separated is that there is a lot of complexity there.
- 14.11 Jasmine asked about the extent of which care leavers have been engaged with. Steve Hook said that they had really good representation from care leavers in the steering group and there has been significant input from them.
- 14.12 Dr Anusree Biswas Sasidharan welcomed the strategy and the sharing of transition strategy standards which will allow meaningful benchmarking. She said that this shows that the council is a learning organisation. She asked about representation from the police. Steve Hook said that the council attempted to be ambitious but needs to take into account resource limitations. In terms of the police we have attempted to engage with them but they haven’t been able to attend the steering group to date.

14.13 RESOLVED – that the Committee notes the Transition Strategy report.

15 REDUCING HARMS FROM DRUGS & ALCOHOL - BRIGHTON & HOVE DRUGS & ALCOHOL STRATEGY

- 15.1 Cllr Tristram Burden, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Service Transformation, and Caroline Vass, Interim Director for Public Health, presented the report to the committee.
- 15.2 Dr Anusree Biswas Sasidharan asked a question about data collection Ms Caroline Vass responded that data collection is robust, but sharing data across services was less so, and work is ongoing to improve this.
- 15.3 Dr Sasidharan asked about input from different ethnic groups. Ms Vass responded that services have tried to increase involvement from people from racially minoritised groups, but this has been difficult, with respondents being predominantly white males.
- 15.4 Jo Martindale noted that council strategies had a problem in the degree to which they link up with other strategies. Ms Vass agreed, and said that this was an area of focus.
- 15.5 Cllr Sheard asked about the groups like CGL, police, ES Veterans Hub, and the work with Project Adder. Could we piggy back on some of the work that they are doing. He also asked about the use of Naloxone, and how the council are working with partners to roll this out. Cllr Sheard asked how do you fight something that is so engrained in young people? Caroline Vass said It is not going to be an issue that we can tackle in a short space of time, which is why we are taking about a generational shift. We work very closely with East Sussex, and the police work across Sussex but we made a decision that our strategy would be about Brighton & Hove only, although we are working with neighbours on an alert system. Caroline said that earlier this year they funded someone from CGL to work on Naloxone to develop training and roll out. It is also being rolled out in police custody suites. Cllr Burden added that he is working to improve Councillors' understanding of Naloxone with councillors and on training of cityclean frontline workers.
- 15.6 Becky Robinson asked if they were aware of the link of ADHD and drug use and if there was working being done on this. Caroline Vass responded that this has been included in the Equality Impact Assessment; we are only just beginning to understand the link.
- 15.7 Cllr Shanks asked if needle exchanges well publicised. She also asked if injecting rooms were being looked at and about the potential to prescribe heroin. Caroline Vass replied that needle exchange is widely advertised to people who may be taking drugs intravenously. that the issue of injecting rooms is complex and it will be interesting to see what happens in Glasgow with their pilot. However, providing injecting rooms would be very expensive and in fact not currently legal in England. In terms of opiate prescription, the city has a very stable methadone programme that people can access through their GPs. Buprenorphine is long acting, is working well, and also has positive feedback in terms of stabilising people and getting them off the habit.

- 15.8 Cllr Czolak asked about future funding for drugs work. Ms Vass responded that there has been additional Government grant funding which is due to end in March 2025. To date there has been no confirmation that this funding will continue, and there would be significant issues across the country if the funding does end.
- 15.9 Cllr Czolak asked about the link between drugs and housing services, noting that there is good practice from other places such as Birkenhead. Caroline Vass responded that partnership with housing is a key focus of the strategy.
- 15.10 Cllr Mcleay noted that drugs-related issues were a significant problem in her ward, but that residents tell her they don't feel supported in reporting problems. More could be done to make this process easier.
- 15.11 RESOLVED** – that the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 8.22pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PEOPLE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

4.00pm 28 NOVEMBER 2024

HOVE TOWN HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBER

MINUTES

Present: Councillors O'Quinn (Chair), Sheard (Deputy Chair), Cattell, Czolak, Helliwell, Simon, Thompson, Mcleay, Meadows. Jessica Sumner (CVS), Michael Creedy (Older Peoples Council), Adam Muirhead (CVS), Becky Robinson (PaCC), Lesley Hurst (Church of England education co-optee).

PART ONE

16 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1 a Declarations of substitutions: Cllr McNair for Cllr Lyons, Michael Creedy for Mary Davies (Older Peoples' Council), Jessica Sumner for Joanna Martindale (CVS).

B Declarations of interest: There are none.

C Exclusion of the press and public: There are no part two items

17 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 The Chair gave the following communication:

Today we are here as a joint meeting of both the Place and People Overview & Scrutiny Committees as part of the budget scrutiny process. We are joined by Cllr Jacob Taylor, Deputy Leader of the Council and cabinet member for Finance & City Regeneration, and Nigel Manvell, the council's Chief Financial Officer, who will be talking to us about the budget and then taking questions from members. I will note that we have the Leader of the Council, Bella Sankey here.

Both Cllr Jacob Taylor and Nigel Manvell will explain more shortly but at the moment we are still awaiting more details from the government to inform the budget setting process, so the report is high level budget thinking and the legal and financial background to the budget. You may have noted from the papers that we don't actually know what the financial settlement is until the 19th December, which is the day of Full Council.

The minutes of this meeting and any specific comments made by committee members will be shared with the Cabinet to inform their planning, which is exactly what the purpose of this committee.

We will look in depth at the details of the budget plans in our scheduled Place and People meetings in January, by which time there will be the detailed information available about the financial settlement.

Although we only have one item on the agenda, there are a lot of us here this afternoon and so we will have a lot of questions to get through. Can I therefore please request that both those asking and answering questions are as brief and to the point as possible, so succinct, please everybody. We want everyone who wishes to contribute to have the opportunity.

18 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

4.1 There were no public questions.

19 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

5.1 There were no member questions.

20 GENERAL FUND BUDGET UPDATE 2025-26 TO 2028-29

25.1 Cllr Bella Sankey (Leader of the Council) introduced the paper and summarised the current financial situation of Brighton & Hove City Council. She wished that circumstances were better and attributed this to systemic underfunding over many years and a large demand on key services, mainly Adult Social Care and Homelessness. The announcement made in the Autumn budget amounts to a 3.2% increase in funding for local government but there is no overnight fix for the significant challenges facing the sector. Cllr Sankey has received a letter from the Local Government Minister, Jim McMahon, who has written to all leaders of councils about plans for radical reform of local council funding. This includes a £600m recovery grant for areas with the greatest need and deprivation. It also includes a new approach to financial settlements across multi years rather than one. There will be a consultation on the reforms that will give more power and responsibility to local councils. The reports pack shows work underway to tackle the in year funding gap of £6.8m and the predicted shortfall of £31.6m for the next financial year. The council will receive further details of the funding settlement from central government next month and the council will move to engage with stakeholders on this with the scrutiny committees looking at the details in the new year.

25.2 Cllr Jacob Taylor (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and City Regeneration) presented the report to the committee. He added that the news that was received yesterday regarding the i360 will have an impact. There is outstanding debt of £51m which translates into £32m outstanding payments to the council. This will amount to £2.2m per year that will need to be paid back until 2040. The i360 is currently going through the administration process.

25.3 The Chair opened up the meeting for questions.

25.4 Cllr Sykes asked a number of questions: whether the increase in National Insurance contributions for employers is reflected in the budget; he asked for more information on the Section 31 grant; about any mitigations for the £2 - 4m to go towards rough sleepers; about the competition between public funds and how that works; concerns

regarding consultation and the lack of detail in the budget for the public to comment on; and that it was difficult to understand the narrative between this paper and the one presented in September. Cllr Taylor acknowledged the points raised around the difficulty following the narrative between papers and said they will look into that. Although the principle focus is on the General Fund, other budget matters are of relevance, such as changes to the Capital budget. The council is a relatively asset-rich organisation which is an area to explore in terms of the potential use of capital receipts to fund modernisation. Cllr Taylor commented on insourcing and wanting to bring back children in care who have been placed outside the city. These placements can be very expensive, particularly for those with special needs and Cllr Daniels is leading on a pilot project to look into creating a facility in-house for this in Woodingdean called Rainbow Lodge. There needs to be a balance between insourcing and outsourcing depending on who is best placed to manage these services. There may already be an established third party who can take this on. Officers are looking into whether the council can make investments to buy property for the purpose of council-run temporary accommodation. In terms of social care costs, Cllr Taylor said that the increase in National Insurance contributions does not apply to the council but will apply to the private sector of which the council procures Adult Social Care services and whether this has been added to the financial pressures in the paper. Nigel Manvell, Chief Financial Officer, confirmed that there is an estimate built in for this, including living wage costs, inflation and other factors. The government have confirmed that the Market Sustainability Grant will continue to be awarded which will help with some of these costs. Mr Manvell went on to explain about the Section 31 grant and that the government will be ending some reliefs that were available to the hospitality and retail sector and that this will now have to be collected via business rates directly to the council. Cllr Taylor responded to the question regarding the consultation process; he would have liked to publish the budget at the end of December but there will be no settlement until 19th December so this is not possible. He hopes that in future years this can be brought in earlier.

- 25.5 Cllr Fishleigh asked that employees have been asked for ideas to make savings and whether anything good has been suggested; and whether the council needs Bartholomew House at all as it's always empty when she has been there. Nigel Manvell said that they are working through the responses from the engagement exercise with employees last year and that it remains open for suggestions. They have been holding "in conversation" events with employees with around 200 people on the Teams call where the budget was discussed. Cllr Taylor explained that from his experience, employees are using Bartholomew House but that they are considering the entire estate, looking at numerous council buildings and ensuring the best use of them.
- 25.6 Cllr Fishleigh asked about the Star Chamber and whether more external people with good relevant expertise were involved; she also asked if there was any money left in the Carbon Neutral Fund when £27m was granted in 2021. Cllr Taylor explained about the public engagement event taking place on the budget with the use of a budget simulator to visually show the pressures the council is facing. He encouraged others present to recommend this event to anyone they think might be interested, particularly people with financial expertise. Nigel Manvell said he will come back on the question regarding the Carbon Neutral Fund.
- 25.7 Cllr Meadows asked a number of questions, as follows: the update on the budget has already been reported to Cabinet and what is missing is the portion of each Government

fund allocated to Brighton & Hove; that information on page 11 is misleading as the figures quoted are not the amounts the council will receive; that she was interested to hear what schemes might get cut as part of the capital programmes review; that she is concerned because every effort that has been made by this council to insource services has ended up costing double; whether exploring the use of AI will result in job cuts; where the paper talks about managing the demands of Adult Social Care and whether this would result in cutting off those who need care but are not eligible for benefits; that she would be interested to hear more about a wholly owned housing stock; to have more details on the discontinuation of non-statutory activities; what the review into the delivery model of schools' IT services has come up with; and she questioned whether the council would lose out on adult social care placements due to increasing costs. Cllr Taylor replied that in relation to insourcing there is a balance between insourcing and outsourcing and sometimes insourcing is more expensive, sometimes not. Many of these services are owned by private entities with a high level of profit being made. If services were insourced, the council would not be looking to make a profit. In terms of AI, the council is already using some applications such as a minuting app. This may in time mean that some roles can be deleted, with staff redeployed elsewhere. In terms of Adult Social Care, they want to be transparent about the process from the beginning so that families are aware that they would be expected to contribute to costs before going through the lengthy assessment process. Cllr Taylor confirmed that they would not be looking to explore a private housing company for the council's current stock.

- 25.8 Cllr Cattell asked about fitting costs related to the i360 into the budgeting process and whether there is a backstop. Cllr Taylor explained that there are ideas coming in, one from a bungee jumping company in New Zealand, but that they need to wait for the administration process to finish which would ultimately determine the outcome for the city. In terms of financial planning, there isn't much more that can be done other than lay out the facts.
- 25.9 Adam Muirhead was pleased to see Spend to Save mentioned in the paper and asked if the council is considering innovative ways to invest. Cllr Taylor said that one of the difficulties is the way that public finance works, with organisations each individually responsible for their budget. This can make it difficult for public sector organisations to take actions that will benefit other parts of the public sector. The government is talking about a "total place" approach which would entail looking at all the budgets in a geographic area which are interconnected and try to think about them as one entity. Cllr Sankey added that the new government is serious about thinking more about total place and when the bright red lines have been drawn between different public sector bodies historically doesn't always make sense as they are all interconnected. Cllr Sankey went to 10 Downing Street to represent Brighton & Hove where the Prime Minister asked about public sector reform. Cllr Sankey gave an example of how the council works with a multi-disciplinary team based at A&E making interventions to reduce the number of people presenting at emergency hospital departments due to social causes, such as not having the correct care package, housing etc. This kind of preventative measure ensures people have the assistance they need and diverts them away from emergency services, which also saves money.
- 25.10 Cllr McNair said that the situation with the i360 raises questions about the council's ability to manage money and asked what Labour has been doing to save the i360 as it is costing the taxpayer huge amounts of money. Cllr Taylor said that previous

Conservative councillors were great supporters of the i360 and that it was the Labour opposition that had the desire to protect the taxpayers in this situation and did not want to pump more money into the i360. To offer support, they had met with the private company who runs the i360 to look through their budgets and give advice, but as it is a private company, it is ultimately up to them what they do.

- 25.11 Sara Fulford was concerned about the effect the budget would have on older people, particularly as there is fragility in the market for nursing home provision. Nursing homes cost too much and she was concerned about the level of threat over inhouse provision as they are already paying very high costs. If the inhouse service is lost then they are completely vulnerable to the market. Can the council be more imaginative about getting money in? Ms Fulford commented that the paper was difficult to understand and questioned whether vulnerable people will have a meaningful opportunity to engage, including those with no IT access. Cllr Taylor said that it is complex to communicate to people and getting input from the public isn't easy. There is a new budget simulator online that should help and everything will be summarised and explained at the consultation event. In terms of insourcing, decisions need to be made depending on where the council is best equipped to itself run services. EIAs are important in making these decisions and the council needs to think about how best to involve the community and voluntary sector in the EIA process.
- 25.12 Becky Robinson said that there is a lot of focus in the paper on educational psychologists and wondered how they can ensure that, with the demand on the system, children with SEND support are not overlooked. Cllr Taylor said educational psychologists make a big difference in terms of early intervention but that the assessment pathway doesn't work quickly enough which is something the department are looking into. There is an increase in SEND funding from central government and they are keen to see how this translates locally.
- 25.13 Cllr Sheard asked about the demand and costs for physical support split by age groups in the paper and how those numbers were calculated. He also asked whether further financial resources would have to be put aside to compensate for the i360 debt and wanted more detail on how poverty will be addressed in the budget, particularly child homelessness. Cllr Taylor said that they try to map out the demand; the number of new service users and the complexity of needs and then work out the cost. In some cases these do end up balancing each other out. In relation to the i360, £2.2m per year will have to be put aside but this is subject to the administration process and any funds that can be recovered. In order to combat homelessness, they want to build more council houses that are more affordable. The council are exploring options to improve interventions and to acquire more council owned temporary accommodation.
- 25.14 Mark Strong asked a question about the implications of central government funding on transport and waste. Would there be an increase in the maintenance of pavements and whether reducing charges for parking would mean more people driving, which would mean increased costs, such as pothole maintenance. He also asked a question about food waste and the potential for the council to run this pilot scheme with the current community-led schemes, which would reduce costs. Cllr Taylor said that there is a safety element to the conditions of the road and pavements, the weeds were out of control in some areas and tree roots are causing a problem. He welcomed the funding

for potholes. Cllr Taylor said that there are always more transport projects than parking revenue and they need to get the balance right between parking costs and discouraging driving in the city. The new reduced car park charges were designed to encourage people to use the car parks rather than on street parking because they are underused. He said that Cllr Rowkins knows the community groups well and will see how best to work with them on food waste.

- 25.15 Cllr Mcleay asked about the pressures on the homeless budget and the exploration of fundraising ideas; what level of funding needs to be raised? She also asked about the renters reform bill and what will be the impact on housing allocation? Cllr Mcleay asked about whether the Household Support Fund could be used in a more preventative way and asked a question about EPR and whether it was meant for food waste rather than just disposals and collections. Cllr Taylor said that Cllr Mcleay may be right about the EPR and it is there to recognise the increased responsibilities towards the Environment Act and they are likely to get some money to go towards recycling and waste services. In terms of the Housing Support Fund, they are looking into changing the focus from pure crisis point to being more preventative. For those eligible for temporary accommodation, the council will see if they can secure accommodation in the private sector to reduce costs pressures but will allow them to keep their place on the allocation list. The Renters Reform bill might mean that some landlords will leave the sector, which might drive down house prices. Officers are currently trying to assess the impact of this bill. It is also difficult to estimate funding for homelessness.
- 25.16 Jessica Sumner said that the CVS can help with solutions and creative thinking. There is a lot of demand on the sector with high level crisis services sitting in the wider community outside the council. There is a lack of inflationary increases on grants in the sector and the organisations need subsidising. The CVS ends up bearing the cost of living wages which could lead to a loss of delivery which will have an impact on council services. Ms Sumner mentioned the EIA process and noted that promised actions are not always implemented and that decisions are sometimes taken without having the full picture. Cllr Taylor said that last year there was a reduction in the third sector investment fund but, following a consultation earlier this year, it was decided not to make any further reductions. In respect of the EIA process, Cllr Taylor said he will take this away as an action point.
- 25.17 Cllr Thompson asked what measures have been considered to reduce home to school transport costs? Cllr Taylor said that they are exploring insourcing and seeing if current services could be more effectively managed.
- 25.18 Cllr Hewitt asked a question about income generation and what other measures are being explored. The council is asset-rich and whether they can develop these to raise funds, such as making more use of council owned garages. Cllr Taylor said that many of the garages are vacant and they need to use them better. He said it might be worth selling some assets in order to reinvest elsewhere. The council had hired a fundraising officer who brought in a lot of additional funding.
- 25.19 Cllr Winder asked about the scope of savings planning, whether it included statutory services, and what steps were being taken to manage impacts on vulnerable people. Cllr Taylor said that the delivery of all services is within the scope of the budget process, although the council is obliged to provide statutory services at a certain level. EIAs will

be really important during this process to help identify the communities most impacted by budget savings.

- 25.20 Fiona England asked a question about current pressures on children with learning disabilities transitioning to Adult Social Care and the need for a Social Care Officer role who can help with forecasting and developing services with a strategic overview. Could this role be a Spend to Save consideration? Cllr Taylor said he would take that away to consider.
- 25.21 Cllr Meadows asked about payments to adult social care providers and whether there was a risk that the council would lose out on care places if it was unwilling to uplift costs to reflect increases in provider expenses, such as higher employer NI; whether the new cap of £1 per bus ticket for 2 months is reflected in this budget and what the revised cost is for the members' allowance scheme. Cllr Taylor responded that the third party provider uplifts are included in the budget. He said that the bus fare referred to in the papers is not the new £1 cap but the normal discounts the council contributes towards such as OAP bus passes. There is no proposal to increase members' allowances.
- 25.22 **RESOLVED** – that the People and Place Overview & Scrutiny Committees note the Cabinet report on the General Fund Budget Update.

Meeting closed at 18.45

The meeting concluded at Time Not Specified

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

Brighton & Hove City Council

People Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Agenda Item 26

Subject: Scrutiny of School Admission Arrangements 2026-27

Date of meeting: 14 January 2025

Report of: Corporate Director of Corporate Services

Contact Officer: Name: Giles Rossington
Email: giles.rossington@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

For general release

Action Required of People Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

1. To note the report and provide any recommendations to Cabinet.

Proposed Primary Admissions Numbers 2026/27	Planned Admission No. 2026-27
Name of School	
Aldrington CE Primary	60
Balfour Primary	90
Benfield Primary	30
Bevendean Primary	60
Bilingual Primary	90
Brunswick Primary	90
Brackenbury Primary	30
Carden Primary	60
Carlton Hill Primary	30
City Academy Whitehawk	60
Coldean Primary	60
Coombe Road Primary	30
Cottesmore St Marys Catholic	60
Downs Infant	90
Downs Junior	128
Elm Grove Primary	60
Fairlight Primary	60
Goldstone Primary	90
Hangleton Primary	60
Hertford Primary	30
Hove Junior School (Holland Road)	64
Hove Junior School (Portland Road)	128
Middle Street Primary	30
Mile Oak Primary	60
Moulsecoomb Primary	30
Our Lady of Lourdes	30
Patcham Infant	90
Patcham Junior	96
Peter Gladwin Primary	30
Queens Park Primary	60
Rudyard Kipling Primary	45
Saltdean Primary	60
St Andrew's CE Primary	90
St Bernadette's Catholic Primary	30
St John The Baptist Catholic Primary	30
St Joseph's Catholic Primary *	30
St Lukes Primary	90
St Margaret's CE Primary	30
St Mark's CE Primary	30
St Martin's CE Primary	30
St Mary Magdalen Catholic Primary	30
St Mary's Catholic Primary	30

St Nicolas CE Primary	60
St Paul's CE Primary	30
Stanford Infant	60
Stanford Junior	96
West Blatchington Primary	30
West Hove Infant (Portland Road)	120
West Hove Infant (Holland Road)	60
Westdene Primary	60
Woodingdean Primary	60
Secondary Admission Numbers 2026-27	
	Planned admission no. 2026-27
Name of school	
Brighton Aldridge Community Academy	180
Blatchington Mill	300
Cardinal Newman Catholic	360
Dorothy Stringer	300
Hove Park	180
King's	165
Longhill High	210
Patcham High	225
Portslade Aldridge Community Academy	220
Varndean	300

* depending upon decision to close the school in August 2025

Date of Birth / school year	School yr in Sept 24	Grand Total all planning areas from 2023 data	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Permanent places in Year R in 2024	Surplus places or shortfall of places
All planning Areas					
places in each school year from Sept 2024					
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	2,994	2,695		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	2,846	2,561		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	2,834	2,551		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	2,743	2,469		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	2,603	2,343		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	2,435	2,192		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	2,369	2,132	2,550	418
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	2,189	1,970	2,460	490
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	2,170	1,953	2,460	507
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	1,985	1,787	2,460	674

Date of Birth / school year	School year in Sept 2024	Portslade*	Central Hove	West Blatchington and North Hangleton	Central City*	Patcham	City East	The Deans*	City North	TOTALS
All planning Areas										
places in each school year from Sept 2024		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	2550
places in each school year from Sept 2025		240	660	90	480	150	450	210	180	2460
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	249	0	0	0	159	0	0	0	409
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	260	0	0	0	171	0	0	0	431
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	215	0	0	0	171	0	0	0	386
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	231	0	0	0	160	0	0	0	392
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	224	0	0	0	152	0	0	0	376
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	217	0	0	0	123	0	0	0	340
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	176	564	79	423	129	429	164	168	2132
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	180	528	54	424	105	388	140	151	1970
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	167	534	69	376	123	372	162	149	1953
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	158	484	53	361	92	367	128	144	1787

Date of Birth / school year	School year in Sept 2024	BN41 1	BN41 2	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places	*Sept 2024 St Peter's closed
1 Portslade							
places in each school year from Sept 2024		60	180	240			
places in each school year from Sept 2025		60	180	240			
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	84	193	277	249		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	85	204	289	260		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	67	172	239	215		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	75	182	257	231		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	84	165	249	224		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	66	175	241	217		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	64	131	195	176	65	
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	64	136	200	180	60	
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	57	129	186	167	73	
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	51	124	175	158	83	

Date of Birth / school year	School year in Sept 2024	BN3 1	BN3 2	BN3 3	BN3 4	BN3 5	BN3 6	BN3 7	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
2 Central Hove											
places in each school year from Sept 2024		150		90		120	150	150	660		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		150		90		120	150	150	660		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	86	49	136	93	167	170	156	857		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	93	36	116	76	136	131	160	748		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	97	42	99	68	154	145	154	759		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	64	42	133	93	124	115	141	712		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	94	39	113	61	149	127	134	717		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	77	38	97	71	120	131	94	628		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	85	32	96	72	132	82	128	627	564	96
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	80	32	105	50	118	100	102	587	528	132
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	78	39	118	66	122	80	90	593	534	126
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	70	38	111	56	112	64	87	538	484	176

Date of Birth / school year	School year in Sept 2024	BN3 8	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
3 West Blatchington and North Hangleton					
places in each school year from Sept 2024		90	90		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		90	90		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	141	141		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	128	128		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	123	123		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	96	96		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	107	107		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	102	102		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	88	88	79	11
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	60	60	54	36
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	77	77	69	21
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	59	59	53	37

Date of Birth / school year	School year in Sept 2024	BN1 2	BN1 3	BN1 5	BN1 1	BN1 4	BN1 6	BN1 7	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
4 Central City											
places in each school year from Sept 2024		60	150	30				60	510		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		60	120	30				60	480		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	31	63	136	10	51	207	112	610		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	20	65	123	8	57	210	96	571		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	24	80	116	12	64	182	103	581		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	33	52	116	10	60	173	86	530		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	24	69	100	9	42	173	91	508		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	23	69	91	9	58	165	70	485		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	32	62	86	12	43	145	90	470	423	87
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	20	60	99	9	57	145	81	471	424	56
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	28	67	72	7	40	146	58	418	378	104
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	15	60	85	6	61	112	62	401	361	119

Date of Birth / school year	School year in Sept 2024	BN1 8

5 Patcham		Patcham Infant Patcham Junior Carden Primary	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
places in each school year from Sept 2024		150	150		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		150	150		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	177	177	159	-9
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	190	190	171	-21
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	190	190	171	-21
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	178	178	160	-10
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	169	169	152	-2
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	137	137	123	27
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	143	143	129	21
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	117	117	105	45
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	137	137	123	27
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	102	102	92	58

6 City East	School year in Sept 2024	BN2 0 Queens Park Pri St John the Baptist Primary	BN2 1	BN2 2	BN2 3 Elm Grove Primary Fairlight Primary St Martins Primary	BN2 5 St Marks Primary City Academy Whitehawk	BN2 9 Carlton Hill Primary St Lukes Primary	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
places in each school year from Sept 2024		90			150	90	120	450		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		90			150	90	120	450		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	56	55	55	72	153	133	469		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	45	44	45	86	142	127	444		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	61	51	55	94	122	129	457		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	57	58	55	98	140	141	494		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	46	39	55	87	144	133	449		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	42	55	55	99	124	131	451		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	53	63	55	89	143	129	477	429	21
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	42	46	55	94	115	134	431	388	62
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	47	51	55	84	118	113	413	372	78
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	43	59	55	73	125	108	408	367	83

7 The Deans	School year in Sept 2024	BN2 6 Rudyard Kipling Prim**** Woodingdean Prim	BN2 7 Our Lady of Lourdes Pri St Margarets Pri	BN2 8 **** Saltdean Primary	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
places in each school year from Sept 2024		120	60	90	270		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		90	60	60	210		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	128	21	99	248		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	126	34	96	256		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	115	38	93	246		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	122	34	82	238		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	108	32	72	212		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	100	26	82	208		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	90	26	66	182	164	106
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	85	20	50	155	140	71
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	89	30	61	180	162	48
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	75	18	49	142	128	82

2025 *****
Saltdean reduced
PAN 60

**** 2025 R Kipling
variation to PAN 30

8 City North	School year in Sept 2024	BN1 9 Coldean Primary	BN2 4 Bevendean Primary Coombe Rd Primary Moulsecomb Prim	TOTALS	pupils likely to want a school place based on 90% of GP reg data	Surplus places or shortfall of places
places in each school year from Sept 2024		60	120	180		
places in each school year from Sept 2025		60	120	180		
01 September 13 to 31 August 14	6	56	159	215		
01 September 14 to 31 August 15	5	58	162	220		
01 September 15 to 31 August 16	4	52	187	239		
01 September 16 to 31 August 17	3	60	178	238		
01 September 17 to 31 August 18	2	56	136	192		
01 September 18 to 31 August 19	1	45	138	183		
01 September 19 to 31 August 20	R	42	145	187	168	12
01 September 20 to 31 August 21	2025	35	133	168	151	29
01 September 21 to 31 August 22	2026	37	129	166	149	31
01 September 22 to 31 August 23	2027	27	133	160	144	36

Data from Oct 24 school census

Year of secondary entry

school Census by year in May 24								Estimated number going to CN	Number Attending Kings	total/average
R	1	2	3	4	5	6				
2031	2030	2029	2028	2027	2026	2025	places available			

PACA catchment	220	192	257	225	234	228	264	249		
reduced by 2.01%		188	252	220	229	223	259	244		
adjusted for CN & Kings		150	214	182	191	185	221	206	25	13
Surplus/Shortfall of palces	70	6	38	29	35	-1	14			
Number of FSM eligible pupils		37	61	62	70	65	78	81		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		19%	24%	28%	30%	29%	30%	33%		26%
difference in pupil numbers from Oct 2023 forecast		-6	-5	10	4	-8	-23			-28
difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 23 forecast		-4	-3	-0	6	-6	-4			

Hove Park & Blatch catchment area	510	677	662	728	725	760	750	833		
reduced by 5.47%		640	626	688	685	718	709	787		
adjusted for CN & Kings		365	351	413	410	443	434	512	136	139
Surplus/Shortfall of palces	145	159	97	100	67	76	-2			
Number of FSM eligible pupils		91	101	154	153	174	169	206		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		13%	15%	21%	21%	23%	23%	25%		19%
difference in pupil numbers from Oct 2023 forecast		13	-3	-4	-10	4	8			8
difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 23 forecast		19	4	3	-2	11	16			

Stringer & Vardean catchment area	630	645	642	650	674	677	700	658		
reduced by 3.82%		620	617	625	648	651	673	633		
adjusted for CN & Kings		545	542	550	573	576	598	558	68	7
Surplus/Shortfall of palces	85	88	80	57	54	32	72			
Number of FSM eligible pupils		93	146	160	181	178	181	191		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		14%	23%	25%	27%	26%	26%	29%		23%
difference in pupil numbers from Oct 2023 forecast		-9	3	-9	-1	19	-7			-4
difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 23 forecast		-18	-6	-18	-10	9	-16			

Longhill catchment area	270	266	284	289	317	305	327	315		
reduced by 22.61%		206	220	224	245	236	253	244		
adjusted for CN & Kings		150	164	168	189	180	197	188	53	3
Surplus/Shortfall of palces	120	106	102	81	90	73	82			
Number of FSM eligible pupils		69	99	107	122	121	129	106		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		26%	35%	37%	38%	40%	39%	34%		36%
difference in pupil numbers from Oct 2023 forecast		14	1	15	10	0	1			41
difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 23 forecast		10	-0	11	7	-0	0			

BACA catchment area	180	161	129	147	180	175	165	171		
reduced by 7.37%		149	119	136	167	162	153	158		
adjusted for CN & Kings		125	95	112	143	138	129	134	22	2
Surplus/Shortfall of palces	55	85	68	37	42	51	46			
Number of FSM eligible pupils		58	51	80	87	96	84	108		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		36%	40%	54%	48%	55%	51%	63%		50%
difference in pupil numbers from Oct 2023 forecast		-6	1	-4	3	-3	8			-1
difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 23 forecast		-14	-8	-14	-7	-12	-2			

Patcham catchment area	225	214	198	230	237	249	241	234		
reduced by 3.48%		207	191	222	229	240	233	226		
adjusted for CN & Kings		179	163	194	201	212	205	198	26	2
Surplus/Shortfall of palces	46	62	31	24	13	20	27			
Number of FSM eligible pupils		32	19	50	52	42	52	54		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		15%	10%	22%	22%	17%	22%	23%		19%
difference in pupil numbers from Oct 2023 forecast		13	4	-6	-4	-2	10			15
difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 23 forecast		13	5	-4	-2	-1	11			

Total for catchment area Schools	2035	1514	1529	1620	1708	1735	1783	1796
----------------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Total for all Schools	2560	2010	2025	2116	2204	2231	2279	2292
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

difference in final forecast numbers from Oct 22 forecast	-19	-72	-101	-36	-52	-6	38
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	----	----

Number of surplus places	550	535	444	356	329	281	268
% of surplus places	21%	21%	17%	14%	13%	11%	10%

Data from Oct 24 school census

Year of secondary entry	school Census by year in May 24							Estimated number going to CN	Estimated number going to Kings	total/average
	R	1	2	3	4	5	6			
	2031	2030	2029	2028	2027	2026	2025			

places available

PACA catchment	220	192	257	225	234	228	264	249		
reduced by 2.01%		188	252	220	229	223	259	244		
adjusted for CN & Kings		150	214	182	191	185	221	206	25	13
Surplus/Shortfall of palces		70	6	38	29	35	-1	14		
Number of FSM eligible pupils		37	61	62	70	65	78	81		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		19%	24%	28%	30%	29%	30%	33%		26%

Hove Park & Blatch catchment area	480	677	662	728	725	760	750	833		
reduced by 5.47%		640	626	688	685	718	709	787		
adjusted for CN & Kings		365	351	413	410	443	434	512	136	139
Surplus/Shortfall of palces		115	129	67	70	37	46	-32		
Number of FSM eligible pupils		91	101	154	153	174	169	206		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		13%	15%	21%	21%	23%	23%	25%		19%

Stringer & Varndean catchment area	600	637	656	659	688	692	726	681		
reduced by 3.82%		613	631	634	662	666	698	655		
adjusted for CN & Kings		539	557	560	588	592	624	581	66	8
Surplus/Shortfall of palces		61	43	40	12	8	-24	19		
Number of FSM eligible pupils		124	183	187	216	210	210	216		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		19%	28%	28%	31%	30%	29%	32%		28%

Longhill catchment area	210	274	270	280	302	290	301	292		
reduced by 22.61%		212	209	217	234	224	233	226	55	3
adjusted for CN & Kings		154	151	159	176	166	175	168		
Surplus/Shortfall of palces		56	59	51	34	44	35	42		
Number of FSM eligible pupils		38	62	80	86	89	100	81		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		14%	23%	29%	28%	31%	33%	28%		27%

BACA catchment area	180	161	129	147	180	175	165	171	22	2
reduced by 7.37%		149	119	136	167	162	153	158		
adjusted for CN & Kings		125	95	112	143	138	129	134		
Surplus/Shortfall of palces		55	85	68	37	42	51	46		
Number of FSM eligible pupils		58	51	80	87	96	84	108		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		36%	40%	54%	48%	55%	51%	63%		50%

Patcham catchment area	225	214	198	230	237	249	241	234		
reduced by 3.48%		207	191	222	229	240	233	226	26	2
adjusted for CN & Kings		179	163	194	201	212	205	198		
Surplus/Shortfall of palces		46	62	31	24	13	20	27		
Number of FSM eligible pupils		32	19	50	52	42	52	54		
% of pupils in catchment area eligible for FSM		15%	10%	22%	22%	17%	22%	23%		19%

Total for catchment area Schools	1915	1512	1531	1620	1709	1737	1787	1800		
----------------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	--	--

Total for all Schools	2440	2009	2028	2117	2206	2234	2284	2297		
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	--	--

Number of surplus places	431	412	323	234	206	156	143			
% of surplus places	18%	17%	13%	10%	8%	6%	6%			

Proposed Admission Arrangements for Brighton & Hove Schools 2026/27

Admission Arrangements for Secondary Schools

The Council uses a catchment area system with random allocation being used as the tie breaker in each admission priority in the event of oversubscription. Cardinal Newman Catholic School, King's School, Brighton Aldridge Community Academy (BACA) and Portslade Aldridge Community Academy (PACA) have their own admission priorities (please visit www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/schooladmissions or the schools' websites for details).

If a school is oversubscribed, after the admission of pupils with an Education, Health and Care Plan where the school is named in the Plan, priority for admission will be given to those children who meet the oversubscription criteria set out below.

The oversubscription priorities are applied in the context of an equal preference system as required by the School Admissions Code. They are:

1. Looked after children and all previously looked after children, including those children who appear (to the council) to have been in state care outside of England and ceased to be in state care as a result of being adopted. *(note a)*
2. Compelling medical or other exceptional reasons for attending the school. *(note b)*
3. A sibling link applied for those living within the designated catchment area only. *(note c)*
4. Children living within the designated catchment area and eligible for Free School Meals up to the city average. *(note d)*
5. Other children eligible for Free School Meals up to the city average. *(note d)*
6. Children living outside the school's catchment area but within the catchment area for BACA, PACA, Patcham or Longhill up to 20%. *(note g)*
7. Pupils living in the designated catchment area for the school(s).
8. Other children.

Within all these priorities, the tie break is random allocation. *(note f)*

The catchment areas are set out in the below catchment area map. There is information below *(note h)* about which postcodes/addresses are in each of the catchment area.



Admissions Arrangements for Community Infant, Junior and Primary Schools

Parents must make a separate application for any transfer from nursery to primary school and from infant to junior school. If a school is oversubscribed, after the admission of pupils with an Education, Health and Care Plan where the school is named in the Plan, priority for admission will be given to those children who meet the oversubscription criteria set out below.

The oversubscription priorities are applied in the context of an equal preference system as required by the Admissions Code. They are:

1. Looked after children and all previously looked after children, including those children who appear (to the council) to have been in state care outside of England and ceased to be in state care as a result of being adopted. *(note a)*
2. Compelling medical or other exceptional reasons for attending the school. *(note b)*
3. Sibling link. *(note d)*
4. For junior schools only: children attending a linked infant school. *(note e)*
5. Other Children.

Within all these priorities, the tie break is home to school distance which will be measured by the shortest route from the child’s home to the nearest of the school’s gates. This will be measured by specialist computer software based on Ordnance Survey data. It measures using the road network supplied by Ordnance Survey and some other public rights of way which are paved and lit. Routes across public parks or open spaces will not be accepted. When using roads for measurement purposes the computer measures along the middle of the road. It measures from the address point in the property to the nearest point on the road network and from there to the nearest of the school’s gates to the child’s home. No other measurement systems will be used for school

admissions decisions. Where the home addresses of two or more pupils are an equal distance from the school (e.g. two children living in the same block of flats) and only one place remains available at the school in question, the place will be allocated randomly by computer to one of these pupils. (note f)

Late applications

If an application is returned after the closing date without good reason it will be considered after all the on-time preferences have been dealt with and school places allocated to them.

If there is a good reason for the application being late, such as a recent house move to Brighton & Hove, it will be considered as on-time if it is received by 22 January (Secondary) or 8 March (Infant, Primary & Junior) and is accompanied by independent supporting evidence demonstrating why the form is late, e.g. solicitor's letter confirming exchange of contracts or a recently signed tenancy agreement.

Applications submitted after the closing date listing revised preferences will only be considered from mid-June onwards **unless** there has been a house move. This is to ensure that parents and carers who do this do not gain an unfair advantage over others by having the opportunity to list more than three preferences.

Home Address - The school admissions team will allocate school places using the address at which a child lives on the closing date for applications 31 October (Secondary) or 15 January (Infant, Primary & Junior) although late changes of address will be considered if proof of address is received by 22 January (Secondary) or 8 March (Infant, Primary & Junior).

Only one address can be used for admission purposes, and this will be taken as the address where the child spends most of their time. Where a child's time is divided between addresses, parents must agree which address they would like to be considered for the purposes of the application. In the event of a dispute, in the absence of a relevant court order, the admission authority will make a judgement about which address applies. This will usually be the address where the child is registered with a doctor.

Deferred admission - Children start school in the school year during which they have their fifth birthday. Children are allowed to start full-time in September or can defer admission or attend part-time until they reach compulsory school age. Children become compulsory school age in the term after their fifth birthday. Children whose fifth birthday falls between 1 September and 31 December may defer or attend part time until January. Children whose fifth birthday falls between 1 January and 31 March can defer admission or attend part time until the start of the summer term. Children whose fifth birthday is between 1 April and 31 August don't become compulsory school age until the following September however they can also defer admission or attend part time until the start of the summer term. Where a place is deferred it will not be given to another child provided the place is taken up by the beginning of the school term following the child's fifth birthday and within the school year that the offer was made.

Parents can request for a 'summer born' child to start school **outside of their normal age group**, and be admitted to reception rather than Year 1 as detailed below.

Admission outside a normal age group

Parents may request that their child is admitted outside their normal age group, for example, if the child is gifted and talented or has experienced problems such as ill health. To do so, parents should include a request with their application, specifying why admission outside the normal age group is being requested and which year group they wish their child to be admitted.

Applications should be accompanied with the additional form to request that the child is educated out of year group. Reasons for the request and any evidence to support the case should be included with the form. Evidence could include: information about the child's personal, social, emotional development and academic development; If relevant, medical history and views of a medical professional; whether the child has previously been educated out of year group and whether the child was born prematurely.

The admission authority will consider each case on its merits taking into account the child's best interests and either agree or refuse the request on that basis. Where the council is the admission authority, the views of the headteacher of each school will be sought before a decision is taken. Parents will be made aware of the outcome of the request for admission out of year group before national offer day and reasons for the decision will be shared with them. Late requests will be considered up until 8 March (Infant, Primary and Junior) or 22 January (Secondary) if there is good reason why the request could not be made by the closing date for applications. Requests made after this date will not be considered until after national offer day.

Waiting lists

The council holds waiting lists for community schools, and Bilingual primary school. Pupils who have not been offered one of these schools as their first preference will have their name added to the waiting list for this school. Parents can request that their child's name is also added to the waiting list for their second and/or third preference school by contacting the school admissions team. Waiting lists are held until 31st December at which point pupils' names will be removed from the list. Parents can keep their child's name on the waiting list for the following term by contacting the admissions team in the last week of each term to request this. Pupils are added to waiting lists according to the oversubscription priorities listed above and consequently a pupil's name can move down the list as well as up. Where the home addresses of two or more pupils at the top of the waiting list are an equal distance from the school (e.g. two children living in the same block of flats) and only one place has become available at the school in question, the place will be allocated randomly by computer to one of these pupils (note f).

Waiting lists for secondary schools are called reallocation pools. Each time the council is able to offer a place, or places at a school with a reallocation pool, the list is re-randomised within each priority and the place(s) allocated to the child(ren) at the top of the list.

Late applicants will also be added to waiting lists as soon as possible after they apply. Late changes of preference (revised applications) will be added to the waiting list for the new preference as soon as possible from mid-June onwards. The pupil's name will be removed from the waiting list for the previous preferences.

Notes:

- a) **Looked after and previously looked after children** - A 'looked after child' is a child who is (i) in the care of a local authority, or (ii) being provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of their social services functions at the time of making an application to a school. Previously looked after children are such children who were adopted (or subject to child arrangements orders or special guardianship orders) immediately following having been looked after and those children who appear (to the council) to have been in state care outside of England and ceased to be in state care as a result of being adopted. A child is regarded as having been in state care outside of England if they were in the care of or were accommodated by a public authority, a religious organisation, or any other provider of care whose sole or main purpose is to benefit society.
- b) **Exceptional Circumstances** - This priority applies to pupils with a specific need that can only be met by one school rather than any other. This could include medical or social reasons that make it essential for the child to attend a particular school. Independent supporting information must be provided from a professional, for example a doctor, consultant, social worker or other professionals working with the family which makes a compelling case as to why the child's needs can only be met at the preferred school and no other. A medical condition or diagnosis in itself will not automatically result in priority being given. Advice may be sought from the consultant community paediatrician or other relevant professionals where necessary to determine whether or not the evidence provided is sufficiently compelling to qualify under this category.
- c) **Sibling link** - For the purposes of the school admissions process, children are siblings if they share the same main address and live as part of the same household. A sibling link will apply if the sibling will be attending the school in September 2026. Where separate junior and infant schools are linked (see linked Infant/Junior school below), the sibling link will apply across both linked schools the sibling may be at either school and may be older or younger. If two children, of whom one is due to start junior school and the other infant school in the same September, the junior school child's allocation will be done first and a

sibling link will count for the infant child. A sibling link is only taken into account if children live at the same main address and the sibling has already been allocated a place at the school. Twins or multiple births do not qualify for the sibling link unless one child has already been offered a place. Where a sibling attends a nursery class on the same school site, or a sixth form it will not be counted as a link for admissions purposes.

For areas of the city where the catchment area school(s) have changed, the sibling link will remain valid until the older sibling has left the school even though the address is no longer in the schools catchment area.

- d) **Free School Meals** – children will be considered under this priority if they are eligible for free school meals on the closing date for applications or on the date the application is submitted if it is late or outside the main admission round. The city average will be taken as 30%. The number of places available at each school under priority 4 will be calculated by applying the city average to the schools PAN. The number of places available under priority 5 will be calculated by applying the city average to the schools PAN and subtracting the number of places offered under priority 4.
- e) **Linked infant/Junior Schools** - Children who are attending or have been offered a place at an infant school in the list below will have priority for places at the linked junior school providing the allocation took place by 8 March in the admission year.
- Downs Infant - Downs Junior
 - Patcham Infant - Patcham Junior
 - Stanford Infant - Stanford Junior
 - West Hove Infant Portland Road – Hove Junior Portland Road
 - West Hove Infant Holland Road - Hove Junior Holland Road

There is no link between West Hove Infant Holland Road and Hove Junior Portland Road, or between West Hove Infant Portland Road and Hove Junior Holland Road.

- f) **Random allocation** – Where the random allocation tiebreak is used, every preference is assigned a unique random number by computer. The computer will then list the pupils using this random number. This computer allocation process is audited and overseen by a senior council officer not part of the school admissions team.
- g) **Pupils living in single school catchment areas** – places will be offered up to 20% of a school's PAN to pupils living in a single school catchment area ie. BACA, PACA, Patcham or Longhill. This criterion will not be applied to a preference for Patcham where the home address is in the Patcham catchment area or Longhill where the home address is in the Longhill catchment area.

h) Catchment area postcode lists:

Portslade Aldridge Community Academy (PACA):

BN41 2	BN41 1A
BN41 1DY	BN41 1D except Y
BN41 1FX	BN41 1E
BN41 1GR, S, T & U	BN41 1G except R, S, T & U
BN41 1LD, E, F, G & H	BN41 1H
BN41 1N	BN41 1L except D, E, F, G, H
BN41 1PS	BN41 1OH
BN41 1RX	BN41 1PB
BN41 1S	Part of BN41 1PH
BN41 1T	BN41 1UY
BN41 1UA, B, Q	BN41 1WA, B, E & R
BN41 1WY	
BN41 1X	
BN41 1Y	

Brighton Aldridge Community Academy (BACA):

BN2 4	BN1 9P
BN1 9HW	BN1 9Q except B
BN1 9HX	BN1 9R
BN1 9HY	BN1 9S
	BN1 9B except A,W,X & Z
BN1 9J except S	

Blatchington Mill School / Hove Park School:

BN3
BN1 2
BN1 3*
*Except BN1 3TG (Westcombe)
BN1 3TL (Prestonville Road
north of the railway line - Nos 1-28)
BN1 3TS (York Villas)
BN1 3TT (York Grove)
BN1 3TU (New England Road)
BN1 3TF/3TX (Belmont)
BN1 3TH (Russell Crescent)
BN1 3UG (Prestonville Court)
These are in the DS/Varndean catchment area

Patcham High School:

BN1 5AZ	BN1 9B,X,Y,Z
BN1 5E,F,G,H	BN1 9D
BN1 5JD (even numbers only),	BN1 9E
BN! 5JE (even numbers only)	BN1 5BQ
BN1 5JH, JJ, JP, JX	BN1 9G
BN1 5L except A, B, D, E,	BN1 9HT
R, S, W	BN1 9HU
BN1 8	BN1 9JS
BN1 9A	BN1 9QB
BN1 9BA	BN1 9TN

Tongdean Lane

Addresses in BN1 5JD and BN1 5JE (Tongdean Lane) cross the boundary between the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean and the area for Patcham High: Odd numbers are in the area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean. Even numbers are in the area for Patcham High.

The part of Tongdean Lane which is east of the railway line (ie Windsor Court BN1 5JS and Manhattan Court BN1 6XZ) is in the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean.

Dorothy Stringer School / Varndean School:

BN1 1	BN1 6
BN1 3TG (Westcombe)	BN1 7
BN1 3TL (Prestonville Road north of the railway line - Nos 1-28)	BN2 0 except Y
BN1 3TS (York Villas)	BN2 3
BN1 3TT (York Grove)	BN2 5DT & some of Z**
BN1 3TU (New England Rd)	BN2 5ET & some of F, H & L**
BN1 3TF / X (Belmont)	BN2 5F except A, B & G**
BN1 3TH (Russell Crescent)	BN2 5G except G, H & J**
BN1 3UG (Prestonville Court)	BN2 5H except A**
BN1 4	BN2 5L except J**
BN1 5JS	BN2 5N except A, B & S**
BN1 5A except Z	BN2 5P except some of A & B**
BN1 5B, D, N, P, R, S, T	BN2 5Q**
BN1 5JB, JD (odd nos only),	BN2 5RS**
JE (odd nos only), JF, JG, JL, JN	BN2 5ZG & J**
BN1 5LA, B, D, E, R, S, W	BN2 9

Tongdean Lane

Addresses in BN1 5JD and BN1 5JE (Tongdean Lane) cross the boundary between the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean and the area for Patcham High: Odd numbers are in the area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean. Even numbers are in the area for Patcham High.

The part of Tongdean Lane which is east of the railway line (ie Windsor Court BN1 5JS and Manhattan Court BN1 6XZ) is in the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean.

Addresses in BN2 5DZ, BN2 5EF, BN2 5EH, BN2 5EL and BN2 5PA cross the boundary between the catchment area for Longhill and the area for Varndean/Dorothy Stringer:

BN2 5DZ/BN2 5EF (Manor Way)- even numbers 2-34 are in the Varndean/DS area.

All odd numbers and evens from 36 onwards are in the Longhill area.

BN2 5EH/BN2 5EL (Manor Hill)- odd numbers are in the Longhill area. Even numbers are in the Dorothy Stringer / Varndean area.

BN2 5PA (odd numbers in Wilson Avenue)- 1, 3, 5, 7 & 11 are in the Longhill area. 13 upwards are in the Dorothy Stringer / Varndean area.

NB: addresses on the eastern side of Wilson Avenue (BN2 5PB) are all in the Longhill area.

Longhill High School:

BN2 0Y	BN2 5R except S**
BN2 1**	BN2 5S
BN2 5A**	BN2 5T
BN2 5B**	BN2 5U
BN2 5D except T & some of Z**	BN2 5W
BN2 5E except T & some of F, H & L**	BN2 5X
BN2 5FA, B & G**	BN2 5Y**
BN2 5GG, H & J**	BN2 5Z except G & J**
BN2 5HA**	BN2 6
BN2 5J**	BN2 7
BN2 5LJ**	BN2 8
BN2 5NA, B & S**	
Some of BN2 5PA & B**	

Addresses in BN2 5DZ, BN2 5EF, BN2 5EH, BN2 5EL and BN2 5PA cross the boundary between the catchment area for Longhill and the area for Varndean/Dorothy Stringer:

BN2 5DZ/BN2 5EF (Manor Way)- even numbers 2-34 are in the Varndean/DS area.

All odd numbers and evens from 36 onwards are in the Longhill area.

BN2 5EH/BN2 5EL (Manor Hill)- odd numbers are in the Longhill area. Even numbers are in the Dorothy Stringer / Varndean area.

BN2 5PA (odd numbers in Wilson Avenue)- 1, 3, 5, 7 & 11 are in the Longhill area. 13 upwards are in the Dorothy Stringer / Varndean area.

NB: addresses on the eastern side of Wilson Avenue (BN2 5PB) are all in the Longhill area.

**Addresses in these areas were in a different catchment areas for 2025-26.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

Scheme for co-ordinated admissions to infant, primary and junior schools – Admissions Year 2026/27 (Admissions to Reception or year 3 of Junior School in September 2026)

Introduction

The main purpose of the co-ordinated scheme is to ensure that every parent of a child living in Brighton & Hove who has completed a school application receives one offer of an infant, primary or junior school place. This will be on a set date following the conclusion of the normal admission round for pupils seeking admission to school. The scheme is designed to foster clear communications on school admissions between the City Council, community schools, Academies (for the purposes of this document Free Schools are included as Academies), and voluntary aided schools which act as their own admission authority, and neighbouring Local Authorities (LAs) and admission authorities. It fulfils the requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements (England)) Regulations 2012 and more detailed arrangements set out in the School Admissions Code 2021.

The scheme does not affect the rights of voluntary aided schools and Academies to set their own admission priorities and consider applications on the basis of those priorities. It is intended to set out a process and time scale for the exchange of pupil information between the parties to the scheme, resulting in the offer of a single school place. This should represent a preference listed by the parent /carer following the application of the admission priorities by the Local Authority (LA) or by own admission authority schools. Where it is not possible to allocate a place at any of the preferred schools for a child living in Brighton & Hove, a place will be offered at the nearest school to their home address within the city boundaries with a place available. This will not preclude parents from seeking an alternative place elsewhere if they are unhappy with the offer, nor will it prevent them from lodging an appeal with the admission authority for their preferred school.

All residents of Brighton & Hove should apply using the City Council's common application form (online or paper) even if they are seeking a place at a maintained school in the area of another Council.

The time scales set out in the scheme will be broadly in line with the time scales used by neighbouring LAs. **Please be aware that governing bodies for VA schools and Academies will need to meet between 23 February 2026 and 09 March 2026 when the ranking order needs to be returned to the Local Authority.**

Key dates

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------|
| • Online application facility available | 1 September 2025 |
| • Closing date for applications | 15 January 2026 |
| • Preference data exchanged with Voluntary | 23 February 2026 |

- aided schools and other LAs.
- Consider qualifying late applications. 08 March 2026
- Voluntary Aided schools provide Council with provisional ranking order of all applicants. 09 March 2026
- Finalise allocations and exchange offer details with neighbouring LAs Between 23-27 March 2026
- Offer details provided to schools 15 April 2026
- Notification e-mails sent to parents, decisions posted to applicants without an email address 16 April 2026
- Deadline date for acceptance of places 30 April 2026
- Deadline for acceptance of places and appeals to be heard in the main round. 15 May 2026

Process and detailed time scale – infant, junior and primary schools

1. The school admissions guidance published by the City Council is available online and will be distributed on request to parents/carers applying for infant or primary school places. A publicity campaign will be launched in September 2025 encouraging parents to apply online. Posters will be sent to schools, other council services, early years settings, the press and other media to remind parents of those pupils requiring a school place to apply.
2. Parents/carers will be invited to list 4 preferences for a school place ranked in order of priority. These may be at a city community school, an academy, a free school or a voluntary aided school, or any maintained school outside the City of Brighton & Hove. All residents in the city must use the Brighton & Hove school admission to indicate their preferred schools, either the paper or online form. No other form of application will be valid. The LA allocates places on the basis of equal preferences, and each preference listed will be prioritised on the basis of the published admission priorities for community and own admission authority schools. If it is possible to offer more than one place based on those priorities, the one ranked higher on the application will be offered.
3. Parents and carers are strongly advised to apply online through the facility available on the Brighton & Hove City Council website. This will provide them with a response which confirms their preference listing and acts as proof of application. Alternatively, the paper form should be completed and returned to their local infant/primary school or to the Admissions Team at Hove Town Hall, Hove **by 15 January 2026.**
4. Where, as part of its admission priorities a voluntary aided school requires additional supporting information, such as a Supplementary Information form, or proof of denominational commitment, that form or proof should be completed and returned to the school by the same closing date. This is to ensure that target dates for the exchange of pupil information and the notification date for parents/carers can be met.
5. Parents are encouraged to apply online however, if using an application form rather than the online application parents and carers are strongly

advised to return their application via a preferred school or email a scanned copy to the council's admission team. Parents who post the form should understand that proof of posting is not proof of receipt, and they will not have confirmation in the same way as those applying online or returning the form to a school. All maintained infant and primary schools in the city will return paper application forms to the LA as they are received, ideally scanned and sent by email. Schools should maintain a record of the date on which each form was received, and if required will provide proof of receipt to the parent/carer. This ensures that on time applications and late applications are clearly recorded as such. It also provides assurance for parents should the school or the LA subsequently mislay the form.

6. No later than 23 February 2026

- ❖ LA will identify the numbers of preferences (first, second and third) received for each school.
- ❖ Voluntary aided schools, free schools and academies will be provided with details of parental preferences where their school is given as a preference. They will apply oversubscription criteria to prioritise all preferences. Where pupils have an Education, Health & Care Plan (naming the school) and must be offered a place this will be indicated. These pupils must be given a place at the school in accordance with the SEN and Admissions Code. This applies to all maintained schools, free schools and academies.
- ❖ West and East Sussex and other LA's as necessary will be forwarded the details of preferences expressed for their schools by Brighton & Hove parents/carers (first, second and third). Where the pupil has an Education, Health & Care Plan this will be indicated.
- ❖ West and East Sussex will be asked to provide a list of pupils living in those areas who have expressed a preference for a Brighton & Hove school (first, second or subsequent).

7. No later than 9 March 2026

- ❖ Voluntary aided schools, free schools and academies will provide the LA with a list showing children in priority order for places at the school. The list will show which oversubscription criterion was applied to each child, and relevant information to apply any necessary tie-break. The school will advise the LA of such additional information as is necessary to inform parents of the reason for its decision when allocation letters and emails are sent on 16 April 2026.
- ❖ Brighton & Hove will apply its admission priorities to all preferences received for community schools, and where the children are resident in other LAs, will inform that LA.
- ❖ Consideration will be given to qualifying late applications received before 8 March 2026.

8. Between 23 and 27 March 2026

- ❖ Brighton & Hove will establish whether more than one offer could be made on the basis of the application of its own admission priorities and

those of voluntary aided schools, free schools, academies and other LAs. It will determine in each case which is the highest parental ranking.

- ❖ Final lists of school allocations will be prepared.
- ❖ Emails to parents/carers will be prepared.
- ❖ Discussions will take place with other admission authorities as necessary to resolve any remaining unallocated applications.
- ❖ Neighbouring LAs will be sent final details of children living in their area offered a place at a Brighton & Hove school, and for whom they will need to send allocation letters.

9. 16 April 2026

Online applicants will receive their decisions by e-mail. Letters will be sent only to parents/carers who do not have an email address. The LA email or letter to parents will contain the following:

- ❖ If they have not been allocated a school of preference, the reason why not.
- ❖ How places at the preferred schools were allocated.
- ❖ Where it is an own admission authority school, the fact that the offer is made on behalf of the governing body of the school.
- ❖ Where it is a school maintained by another LA, the fact that the offer is made on behalf of that LA.
- ❖ The right of appeal to an independent panel, and how to arrange an appeal for a community school or a voluntary aided school.
- ❖ Details about waiting lists for preferences that could not be met.

10. 30 April 2026

Parents and carers should accept offers of places by this date to allow schools and the LA ample planning time for the new intake. This does not affect their right to appeal if the place they are accepting is not their highest preference.

11. 15 May 2026

Parents should also have exercised their right to appeal by this date if they want to be assured of having their appeal heard in the main round of appeals.

12. Proof of address

The LA may require parents/carers to provide proof of address if they are applying for a community school place. Own admission authority schools may also request proof of address from their applicants.

Appendix A – Changes of address and late applications

New arrivals in the city

Parents/carers moving into the city in the course of the admission process who are making an application based on their new address must provide evidence of either a tenancy agreement of six months or more or an exchange

of contracts if they are purchasing a property. Applicants should where possible, submit their application by the closing date, especially if their move took place before the closing date. Proof of the move should then be provided at the earliest opportunity. If an application is made and evidence of the move provided by 8 March 2026, the application will be considered on-time and included in the main admission round.

Late applications received before national offer day

- I. With the exception of families moving into the area and cases as described at VI below, applications received after the closing date will not be considered by the LA until allocations have been made for those received before the closing date. Any received for an own admission authority school will be forwarded to the school. The school will decide whether there is a good reason to include these late applications in the main admission round but will only consider them if they are received before **8 March 2026**.
- II. Any applications received for community schools in respect of children in care will be included in the main admission round as valid preference at any time up to **2 April 2026**. Where such applications are received after that date, the LA will, if attendance at that school is seen as a necessity for the welfare of the child, seek to offer places at the school ranked highest on the application. If, however, it is acceptable to offer a place at a lower ranked school without going over numbers, the LA will discuss that possibility with the social worker for the child. Applications to voluntary aided schools, free schools and academies received on behalf of children in public care will be considered in line with the published admission policy for each school and the requirements of the School Admission Code.
- III. Applications received after the closing date but before the 8 March 2026 will be sent a letter or email allocating a school place on 16 April 2026 or as soon as possible after that date if the volume of late applications is high.
- IV. Applications received after 8 March 2025 will be sent an allocation letter or email as soon as possible after 30 April 2026.
- V. Parents/carers living in the city who change any preference because of a change of address, and who return the new application by **8 March 2026** will have that change considered in the main round of allocations. They will have to provide evidence of their new address and will not have their changed application accepted without that evidence.
- VI. Other late applications where there is a good reason for this will be considered in the main round of allocations if received by **8 March 2026** where independent evidence is given by a third party (usually a professional source such as a doctor or social worker) to support the reason for the delay.

Late applications received after national offer day

- I. Where an application is received after the allocation date, from a parent/carer living in the city, they must use the Brighton & Hove online application or paper form. If the preference(s) is for a community school,

the LA will allocate a place if the school remains under subscribed. If the school(s) is fully subscribed, a place will be allocated at the nearest school to the home address that has a vacancy. Brighton & Hove will seek to make a decision as soon as possible after receiving the form. Where a preference is given for an own admission authority school or a school in a neighbouring LA, the form will be passed to that admission authority for a decision. They will be asked to reach a decision within fourteen days of receiving the application. Brighton & Hove will endeavour to send a decision to the parent /carer either as soon as possible once it has reached a decision or has been informed of a decision by the other admission authority.

- II. If a change of preference is received following the decision letter on **16 April 2026** and the home address has not changed, that changed preference will not be considered until **mid-June 2026**. This allows reasonable time for the consideration of late first applications and the operation of the waiting list where places have been offered and refused.
- III. All applications received after 31 August 2026 will be regarded as outside this admission round and will be considered under the in-year coordinated scheme.

Waiting List

- I. Brighton & Hove will operate a waiting list system for its community schools. (Own admission authority schools make their own waiting list arrangements). The waiting list ranking will be based on the LA admission criteria. Rankings within each priority will be determined by home to school distance. All children will be automatically placed on the waiting list for the community school for which they have expressed a first preference, although parents will be given the option of also asking to go on the waiting list for a different preferred school when places are allocated on **16 April 2026**. Places will start to be offered from the waiting lists after 30 April 2026. Places will be offered to children from the waiting list as soon as a place becomes available at an oversubscribed school and the admission criteria have been applied. The waiting list will operate until the 31 December 2026.
- II. Parents/carers wishing to keep their child's name on the list for longer than the 31 December they must inform the LA. They must renew the waiting list place each term thereafter.

School Admission Appeals

- I. Parents/carers wishing to appeal against the LA's decision not to offer a place at a preferred school should do so by **15 May 2026** if they want to be assured of having their appeal heard in the main appeal round.
- II. The LA will not arrange an appeal or ask a voluntary aided school to arrange an appeal for a school that was not included on the original application. It will only arrange an appeal for a school which was listed as a preference, as it will not have given a decision to the parent/carers

for schools not included on the form. If a parent/carer wishes to receive a decision for a school not included in their original application, and thus acquire a right of appeal, they must complete a further application. However, unless there is a good reason for a change of preference this new form will not be considered until **mid-June 2026**.

- III. Parents/carers will receive 10 school days' notice of the date of the appeal hearing and will receive copies of any documentation relating to the appeal 7 days in advance of the hearing.
- IV. Appeals for on-time applications must be heard within 40 school days of the closing date for appeals to be lodged. The volume of appeals to be heard and the availability of the appeal panel members, who are volunteers, will have a direct effect on the timing of the appeal hearings.
- V. Appeals for late applications and school transfers outside the normal admission round will be arranged as soon as practicable after the decision to refuse a preference has been conveyed to the pupil and the parent/carer, and in any case within 30 school days.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

Scheme for co-ordinated admissions to secondary schools – Admissions Year 2026/27 (Admissions to year 7 in September 2026)

Introduction

The main purpose of the co-ordinated scheme is to ensure that every parent of a child living in Brighton & Hove who has completed a school application receives one offer of a secondary school place at the conclusion of the normal admission round for pupils transferring from primary to secondary school. The scheme is designed to foster clear communications on school admissions between the City Council, community schools, Academies (for the purposes of this document Free Schools are included as Academies), Cardinal Newman School, which as a voluntary aided secondary school acts as its own admission authority, and neighbouring Local Authorities (LAs) and admission authorities. It fulfils the requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements (England)) Regulations 2012 and more detailed arrangements set out in the School Admissions Code 2021.

The scheme does not affect the rights of the different admission authorities mentioned to set their own admission priorities and consider applications on the basis of those priorities. It is intended to set out a process and time scale for the exchange of pupil information between the parties to the scheme, resulting in the offer of a single school place. This should represent a preference listed by the parent/carer that it is possible to meet following the application of the admission priorities by this LA or by other admission authorities. Where it is not possible to allocate a place at any of the preferred schools for a child living in Brighton & Hove, a place will be offered at the nearest school to their home address within the city boundaries with a place available. This will not preclude parents from seeking an alternative place elsewhere if they are unhappy with the offer, nor will it prevent them from lodging an appeal with the admission authority for their preferred school.

All residents of Brighton & Hove should apply using the City Council's common application form (online or paper) even if they are seeking a place at a maintained school in another Council.

The time scales set out in the scheme work towards the prescribed date (1st March or the first working day following 1st March where it falls at a weekend) on which secondary school place decisions must be notified to parents/carers. It will also be broadly in line with the time scales used by neighbouring LAs.

Key dates

- Online application facility available 1 September 2025
- Provide information for Junior & Primary schools to notify year 6 parents of the need to apply by 12 September 2025
- Closing date for applications 31 October 2025

- Preference data exchanged with own admission authority schools (Cardinal Newman, King's, BACA & PACA) and neighbouring LAs 1 December 2025
- Own admission authority schools provide LA with provisional ranking order of applicants. 19 December 2025
- Consider qualifying late applications. 22 January 2026
- Finalise allocations and exchange offer details with neighbouring LAs 2 - 6 Feb 2026
- Offer details provided to schools 26 February 2026
- Notification e-mails sent to parents, decisions posted to applicants without an email address 2 March 2026
- Deadline date for acceptance of places 16 March 2026
- Deadline for appeals to be heard in the main round. 27 March 2026

Process and detailed time scale

1. Information about the application process and how to apply will be distributed to parents via primary and junior schools at the beginning of September 2025.
2. Parents/carers will be invited to list 4 preferences for a school place ranked in order of priority. These may be at a city community school, an academy, a free school or a voluntary aided secondary school, or any maintained school outside the City of Brighton & Hove. All residents in the city must use the Brighton & Hove school admission to indicate their preferred schools, either the paper or online form. No other form of application will be valid. The LA allocates places on the basis of equal preference, and each preference listed will be prioritised in accordance with the published admission priorities for community and own admission authority secondary schools in the city. If it is possible to offer more than one place based on those priorities, the one ranked higher on the application will be offered.
3. Parents and carers are strongly advised to apply online through the facility available on the Brighton & Hove City Council website. This will provide them with a response which confirms their preference listing and acts as proof of application. Alternatively, the paper form should be completed and returned to the child's primary or junior school in the city, or to the Admissions Team at Hove Town Hall **by 31 October 2025**. Applicants for Cardinal Newman and/or King's School will need to return their supporting information directly to the school as well as submitting an online application or paper form to the Council. If supporting information is returned to the Local Authority, the documents will be shared with these schools.
4. Where, as part of its admission priorities a voluntary aided school, free school or academy within the city or beyond requires additional supporting information, such as a Supplementary Information form, or proof of denominational commitment, that form or proof should be completed and returned to the school by the same closing date. This is to ensure that

target dates for the exchange of pupil information between authorities and the notification date for parents/carers can be met.

5. Parents are encouraged to apply online. If using an application form rather than online application parents and carers whose children attend maintained primary schools in the city are strongly advised to return the form via the school or send scanned copies by email to the admissions team. Parents who prefer to post the form should understand that proof of posting is not proof of receipt, and they will not have confirmation of receipt in the same way as those applying online or returning the form to their child's school. All maintained junior and primary schools in the city will return any secondary paper application forms they receive to the LA as they are received, ideally scanned and sent by email. Schools should maintain a list to record the date on which each form was received, the school preferences, and if required will provide proof of receipt to the parent/carer. This ensures that on time applications and late applications are clearly recorded as such. It also provides assurance for parents should the school or the LA subsequently mislay the form.

No later than 1 December 2025

- ❖ LA will identify the number of preferences (first, second or third) received for each school.
- ❖ Own admission authority schools will be provided with details of any parental preference where it gives the school as a preference (first, second or third) received by the LA. It will apply its oversubscription criteria to prioritise all preferences. Where pupils have an Education Health & Care Plan naming the school and must be offered a place this will be indicated. (These pupils must be given a place at the school in accordance with the SEN and Admissions Codes of Practice.)
- ❖ West and East Sussex and other LA's as necessary will be forwarded the details of preferences expressed for their schools by Brighton & Hove parents/carers (first, second and third). Where the pupil has an Education, Health & Care Plan this will be indicated.
- ❖ West and East Sussex will be asked to provide a list of pupils living in those areas who have expressed a preference for a Brighton & Hove school (first, second or subsequent).

No later than 19 December 2025

- ❖ Own admission authority schools will provide the LA with a list showing children in priority order for places at the school. The list will show which admission criterion was applied to each child. The school will advise the LA of such additional information as is necessary to inform parents of the reason for its decision when allocation letters and emails are sent on 2 March 2026.
- ❖ Brighton & Hove will apply its admission priorities to all preferences received for community schools, and where the children are resident in other LAs, will inform that LA.

Between 2 and 6 February 2026

- ❖ Brighton & Hove will establish whether more than one offer could be made based on the council's admission priorities and those of voluntary aided schools, free schools/academies and other LAs. It will determine in each case which is the highest parental ranking.
- ❖ Final lists of school allocations will be prepared.
- ❖ Emails and letters to parents/carers will be prepared.
- ❖ Consideration will be given to late applications received before 22 January, as set out in Appendix A below.
- ❖ Neighbouring LAs will be sent final details of children living in their area offered a place at a Brighton & Hove school, and for whom they will need to send allocation letters.

2 March 2026

Online applicants will receive their decisions by e-mail. Letters will be sent only to parents/carers who do not have an email address. The LA email or letter to parents will contain the following:

- ❖ If they have not been allocated a school of preference, the reason why not.
- ❖ How places at all Brighton & Hove schools were allocated.
- ❖ Where it is an own admission authority school, the fact that the offer is made on behalf of the governing body of the school.
- ❖ Where it is a school maintained by another LA, the fact that the offer is made on behalf of that LA.
- ❖ The right of appeal to an independent panel, and how to arrange an appeal for a community school, a voluntary aided school, and in the case of Academies, Free schools, and schools in other LA's who to contact.
- ❖ Details about waiting lists and reallocation pools for preferences that could not be met.

16 March 2026

Parents and carers should accept offers of places by this date to allow schools and the LA ample planning time for the new intake. This does not affect their right to appeal if the place they are accepting is not their highest preference.

27 March 2026

Parents should have exercised their right to appeal by this date if they want to be assured of having their appeal heard in the main round of appeals.

Proof of address

The LA may require parents/carers to provide proof of address if they apply for a place at a community school. Own admission authority schools may also request proof of address from their applicants.

Appendix A – Changes of address and late applications

New arrivals in the city

Parents/carers moving into the city in the course of the admission process who are making an application based on their new address must provide evidence of either a tenancy agreement of six months or more or an exchange of contracts if they are purchasing a property. Applicants should where possible, return their application by the closing date, especially if their move took place before the closing date. Proof of the move should then be provided at the earliest opportunity. If an application is made and evidence of the move provided by 22 January 2026, the application will be considered on-time and included in the main admission round.

Late applications received before the 22 January 2026.

- I. With the exception of families moving into the area and cases as described at V below, applications received after the closing date will not be considered by the LA until school allocations have been made for those received by the closing date. Any applications received for own admission authority schools will be forwarded to the school, which will decide whether to include the application in the main admission round.
- II. Any applications for community schools received in respect of children in care will be included in the main admission round as valid first preferences at any time up to the allocation date on **21 February 2026**. Where such applications are received after that date, the LA will, if attendance at that school is seen as a necessity for the welfare of the child, seek to offer places at the school of first preference, if necessary, negotiating with that school to admit beyond the published admission number in order to do so. If, however, it is acceptable to offer a place at a lower ranked school without going over numbers, the LA will discuss that possibility with the social worker for the child. Applications for own admission authority schools and schools in other LA areas for children in care will be considered in line with the admission arrangements for those schools and the requirements of the Admissions Code.
- III. Applications received after the closing date but before the 22 January 2026 will be sent a letter or email allocating a school place on 2 March 2026 or as soon as possible after that date if the volume of late applications is high.
- IV. Parents/carers living in the city who change a preference because of a change of address within the city, and who submit the new application and evidence of the address change will have that change considered in the main round of allocations if it is received by **22 January 2026**. They will have to provide evidence of the address change. Those applications received after that date will be considered as late applications.
- V. Other late applications where there is good reason for the delay will be considered in the main round of allocations if received by **22 January 2026** where independent evidence is given by a third party (usually a professional source such a doctor or social worker) to support the reason for the delay.

Late applications received after the 22 January 2026.

- I. Applications received after 22 January 2026 will be sent a letter or email allocating a school place as soon as possible after 27 March 2026.
- II. Where an application is received after 22 January 2026, from a parent/carer living in the city, they must use the Brighton & Hove online application service or paper application form. If the preference(s) is for a community school, the LA will allocate a place if the school remains under subscribed. If the school(s) is fully subscribed, a place will be allocated at the nearest school to the home address that has a vacancy. Brighton & Hove will seek to make a decision as soon as possible after receiving the application. Where a preference is given for a free school, an academy, a voluntary aided school or a school in a neighbouring LA, the form will be passed to that admission authority for a decision. They will be asked to reach a decision within fourteen days of receiving the application. Brighton & Hove will endeavour to send a decision to the parent /carer as soon as possible once it has either reached a decision or been informed of a decision by the other admission authority.
- III. If a change of preference or preference order is received following the decision letter on 2 March 2026 and the home address has not changed (and there has been no other relevant change of circumstances), that changed preference will not be considered until mid-June 2026. This allows reasonable time for the consideration of late first applications and the operation of the reallocation pool where places have been offered and refused.
- IV. All applications received after 31 August 2026 will be regarded as in-year applications and outside this admission round.

Re-allocation Pool

- I. Brighton & Hove will operate a re-allocation pool system for its community schools. The ranking of re-allocation pools will be based on the Brighton & Hove admission criteria. All children will be automatically placed in the re-allocation pool for all un-met first preferences for community schools. Parents/carers will be asked to indicate if they also wish to be placed in the re-allocation pool for a different preferred school when the allocation emails and letters are sent on 2 March 2026. Places will be offered to children from the pool as soon as a place becomes available at an oversubscribed school and the admission priorities have been applied. This LA will notify other LAs as appropriate if it offers a place from the pool at a Brighton & Hove school to a pupil living outside the city. The pool will operate until the 31 December 2026.
- II. Own admission authority schools (BACA, PACA, Cardinal Newman and Kings) and schools in other local authorities will operate their own waiting list/reallocation arrangements. If they can place a child resident in Brighton & Hove in one of their schools, they are asked to notify this LA at the earliest opportunity.

- III. Parents/carers wishing to keep their child's name in the reallocation pool beyond the 31 December must inform the LA. They must renew the position on the reallocation pool at the end of each term thereafter.

School Admission Appeals

- I. Parents/carers wishing to appeal against the LA's or a voluntary aided school's decision not to offer a place at a preferred school should do so in writing or using the online appeal facility by 27 March 2026 if they want to be assured of having their appeal heard in the main appeal round.
- II. The LA will not arrange an appeal or ask an own admission authority school to arrange an appeal for a school that was not included on the original application. It will only arrange an appeal for a school that was listed as a preference, as it will not have given a decision to the parent/carer for schools not included on the application. If a parent/carer wishes to receive a decision for a school not included in their original preferences, and thus acquire a right of appeal, they must complete a further application. However, unless there is a change of address or other change of circumstances leading to the change of preference this new form will not be considered until mid-June 2026.
- III. Parents/carers will receive 10 school days' notice of the date of the appeal hearing and will receive copies of any documentation relating to the appeal 7 days in advance of the hearing.
- IV. Whilst the City Council, other LAs and the Governing Bodies of Academies and voluntary aided schools will make every effort to hear appeals within 40 school days of the deadline for submitting appeals, as suggested in the Appeals Code, they cannot guarantee this time scale. The volume of appeals to be heard and the availability of the appeal panel members, who are volunteers, will have a direct effect on the timing of the appeal hearings.
- V. Appeals for late applications and school transfers outside the normal admission round will be arranged as soon as practicable after the decision to refuse a preference has been conveyed to the parent/carer or if appropriate to the student, and in any case within 30 school days of the appeal being lodged.

General Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Form

Support:

An [EIA toolkit](#), [workshop content](#), and guidance for completing an [Equality Impact Assessment \(EIA\) form](#) are available on the [EIA page](#) of the [EDI Internal Hub](#). Please read these before completing this form.

For enquiries and further support if the toolkit and guidance do not answer your questions, contact your Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Business Partner as follows:

- Economy, Environment and Culture (EEC) – [Chris Brown](#),
- Families, Children, and Learning (FCL) – [Jamarl Billy](#),
- Governance, People, and Resources (GPR) – [Eric Page](#).
- Health and Adult Social Care (HASC) – [Zofia Danin](#),
- Housing, Neighbourhoods, and Communities (HNC) – [Jamarl Billy](#)

Processing Time:

- EIAs can take up to 10 business days to approve after a completed EIA of a good standard is submitted to the EDI Business Partner. This is not considering unknown and unplanned impacts of capacity, resource constraints, and work pressures on the EDI team at the time your EIA is submitted.
- If your request is urgent, we can explore support exceptionally on request.
- We encourage improved planning and thinking around EIAs to avoid urgent turnarounds as these make EIAs riskier, limiting, and blind spots may remain unaddressed for the 'activity' you are assessing.

Process:

- Once fully completed, submit your EIA to your EDI Business Partner, copying in your Head of Service, Business Improvement Manager (if one exists in your directorate), Equalities inbox, and any other relevant service colleagues to enable EIA communication, tracking and saving.
- When your EIA is reviewed, discussed, and then approved, the EDI Business Partner will assign a reference to it and send the approved EIA form back to you with the EDI Manager or Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service's approval as appropriate.
- Only approved EIAs are to be attached to Committee reports. Unapproved EIAs are invalid.

1. Assessment details

Throughout this form, 'activity' is used to refer to many different types of proposals being assessed.

Read the [EIA toolkit](#) for more information.

Name of activity or proposal being assessed:	Public consultation on School Admission Arrangements 2026-27
Directorate:	Families, Children & Learning
Service:	Education and Skills
Team:	School Organisation
Is this a new or existing activity?	Existing – although with proposed amendments

Are there related EIAs that could help inform this EIA? Yes or No (If Yes, please use this to inform this assessment)	No – although EIAs have been produced in the past for other school organisation matters that have gone through committee/cabinet processes
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Contributors to the assessment (Name and Job title)

Responsible Lead Officer:	Richard Barker, Head of School Organisation
Accountable Manager:	Jo Lyons, Assistant Director Education and Skills
Additional stakeholders collaborating or contributing to this assessment:	Saul Johnston, School Admissions Manager Carolyn Bristow, Service Manager – Policy and Business Support

3. About the activity

Briefly describe the purpose of the activity being assessed

Admission Authorities are required to determine their admission arrangements annually. Where changes are proposed, the admission authority must first publicly consult on those proposed arrangements. The council is proposing to hold a public consultation on the city's school admission arrangements for the academic year 2026/27.

The consultation will run from 6th December 2025 until 31st January 2025. The council will be asked to formally determine the arrangements in February 2025 as they are required to be set around 18 months ahead of taking effect.

This EIA and action plan will consider the accessibility and impact of the consultation as well as reflecting on the proposed changes to admission arrangements.

A summary of the proposed changes are:

- To consider Published Admission Number (PAN) changes at four schools
- To amend the Secondary school admission priority criteria to introduce a new 'open admission' priority and to make some amendments to the existing criteria around Free School Meal eligible applicants.
- Changes to the catchment area lines between the catchment areas for Longhill School and for the area for Dorothy Stringer and Varndean School
- To increase the number of preferences an applicant can express.

Reasons for these changes are set out in the accompanying Cabinet report but aim to support disadvantaged children in the city and part of the approaches taken to tackle the issue for falling pupil numbers across the city.

The aim of the consultation process is to seek the views of other admission authorities, adjoining neighbouring local authorities, schools' governing bodies, parents of children between the age of 2 and 18 and any other people who are interested in the admission arrangements.

Pupil numbers in the city have been falling and are forecast to continue to fall over the next few years. Too many spare school places in the city will result in some schools not getting enough pupils

What are the desired outcomes of the activity?

To ensure that a thorough, robust and sound public consultation takes place to enable Council Members to make an informed decision in February 2025. The desired outcomes of the changes in school admission arrangements are detailed in the accompanying Cabinet report.

Which key groups of people do you think are likely to be affected by the activity?

Pre-school and school aged children, and their families/carers, across all protected characteristics, could be impacted by the proposed changes, plus schools and their communities in the affected areas.

4. Consultation and engagement

What consultations or engagement activities have already happened that you can use to inform this assessment?

- For example, relevant stakeholders, groups, people from within the council and externally consulted and engaged on this assessment. **If no consultation** has been done or it is not enough or in process – state this and describe your plans to address any gaps.

The Council undertook a pre-consultation engagement activity to help to inform these proposals. Three illustrative models were presented for comment and the Council outlined objectives including:

- A school system where all pupils get access to a great education
- Improve the education offer for disadvantaged pupils by reducing some schools' barriers to success.
- Use all available options to maintain a broad curriculum and holistic school experience for all pupils.

In addition, the proposals put forward were designed to include:

- Better equality of outcomes – results not driven by economic advantage.
- Deliver a 'comprehensive' offer from our city schools as a more mixed pupil intake creates better outcomes for disadvantaged pupils.
- To deliver change whilst ensuring a genuine alliance of city schools that considers the 'city child' and works in effective partnership.
- Maintaining the geographic spread of secondary schools in the city. Losing a school in the West, North, or East of the city would be a strategic mistake (future growth in population).

4 public meetings were held during the engagement exercise, with hundreds of attendees. Over 2600 people replied to an engagement survey and send views in directly via email.

The responses to the engagement exercise have informed the proposals that the Council are proposing to address the original intentions.

A summary of that feedback is available within the Cabinet report which accompanies this EIA and further details are available on the council's engagement portal Your Voice: [\(49\) Project: Secondary school admission arrangements | Brighton & Hove City Council](#).

We are now seeking to run a public consultation between 6th December 2024 and 31st January 2025. As part of the consultation there will be further public meetings held and a new survey available on the council's Your Voice platform. Details are provided within the accompanying Cabinet report.

5. Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this activity?
Consider all possible intersections.

(State Yes, No, Not Applicable as appropriate)

Age	YES
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	YES
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	YES
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	YES
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	NO
Gender Reassignment	NO
Sexual Orientation	NO
Marriage and Civil Partnership	NO
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	NO
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	NO
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	NO
Carers	NO
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	YES
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	NO
Socio-economic Disadvantage	YES
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	NO
Human Rights	NO
Those who have English as an additional language	YES
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	NO

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy, numeracy and /or digital barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery

- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this activity?

Where no was answered this is where it is not relevant to the age of the impacted group we are considering, school aged children and pre-school aged children and their families.

What are the arrangements you and your service have for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this activity?

School census data, data we hold on children currently attending year 5 of a primary school in the city, pupil forecasting and patterns of parental preference are all key to understanding what the demand may be, and where within the city. It also enables us to consider demographics and how any changes may affect different protected characteristics in our city residents.

We have multiple years worth of school census data to inform our proposals and to consider the demographic make up of children and their families across the city.

We have conducted an engagement exercise which asked equalities questions of respondees – we had over 2600 responses.

Analysis of the engagement exercise reveals important insights about representation. Of the 54% of respondents who answered demographic questions, there is a notable overrepresentation of White British responses at 36.7%, with all Black and Racially Minoritised ethnic communities comparatively significantly under-represented at less than 2% each (in the context of Brighton’s city-wide demographics).

The age profile of respondents skews significantly towards those aged 35-54, who made up 46% of responses, while younger parents under 35 represented only 3.2% of respondents. A significant gender imbalance is evident with 38.6% female versus 11.7% male responses. Participation from disabled community members was low at 9% combined, and particularly concerning was the minimal input from care experienced individuals at just 0.5%.

These participation patterns highlight gaps in representation in voice that informs our decision-making compared to known city demographics. This indicates a need for targeted engagement strategies during the formal consultation period and careful interpretation of feedback to ensure decisions don't inadvertently favour majority voices (who are still key consultees and impacts on the majority still need collecting, analysing and responding to). The council acknowledges these limitations and commits to implementing additional engagement approaches to address these gaps.

The council will continue existing arrangements to monitor data collected about allocations, school life and the experiences of children to understand impacts across all diverse communities with intersectional lived experiences . The following points will be considered during and beyond the consultation period.

These points will also be factored in to the action plan provided towards the end of this document. :

- Consider the intersectionality of children, young people and family needs within the city. Ensure that consultation responses are encouraged from a diverse range of residents and stakeholders and, where needed, seek expert advice and help e.g. from EDI officers and from organisations that support working with experts by lived experience
- Ensure that monitoring of survey responses takes place across the consultation period so additional efforts can be made during the consultation window if further representation is to be enabled from communities within the city
- Conduct further work on identifying and understanding barriers before, during and after the consultation particularly for disabled, intersectionally complex diverse families and children from

culturally diverse, local and international backgrounds. This must be done with lived experience holders (often minoritised with needs under-represented and misunderstood in system design)

- Take learning from this and previous consultation activities to consider a widening of monitoring and tracking activity available to the local authority to monitor any impacts of this policy change – particularly around barriers to inclusivity and attainment, social mobility indicators, community satisfaction, impacts on school choices, and effects on local community networks. There is an importance of this work being done intentionally and from an intersectional/EDI- informed expertise lens

For implementation of the proposed changes, specific attention will be paid to monitoring impacts on minoritised groups using available data to track application patterns and preferences, success rates in securing preferred schools, travel times and accessibility, educational outcomes and progress, family engagement levels and appeals data, feedback on barriers faced by parents, families and pupils across diverse backgrounds and lived experiences.

Transparency and accountability will be strengthened and maintained through:

- regular public updates,
- clear communication about changes made in response to feedback, including the consideration of accessible language, targeted communications and EDI expertise advice
- published monitoring reports, and
- oversight from a community reference group.

This approach will be supported by a continuous improvement mindset, capturing insights to inform future policy development and strengthen community relationships. It will ensure the council:

- maintains active dialogue with communities throughout the process,
- demonstrates how feedback influences decisions,
- continues to be flexible and adapt approaches based on emerging impacts.
- regular reporting on these activities will provide transparency and accountability for our commitment to being a listening council.

These approaches will enable the council to track the effectiveness of both the consultation process and the implemented changes, ensuring we can respond promptly to any adverse impacts identified and demonstrate the tangible benefits of the changes for all communities.

We have previous formal admissions consultations which can inform our thinking and what we may hear back from families and other stakeholders.

We have multiple years of allocation data into primary and secondary schools which can help inform what we are proposing.

We have reviewed local census and demographic data for Brighton produced by Joint Staff Needs Assessment (JSNA) listed in [Census 2021 population groups](#) and [JSNA report on Population and population groups](#).

6. Impacts

Advisory Note:

- **Impact:**
 - Assessing disproportionate impact means understanding potential negative impact (that may cause direct or indirect discrimination), and then assessing the relevance (that is: the potential effect of your activity on people with protected characteristics) and proportionality (that is: how strong the effect is).

- These impacts should be identified in the EIA and then re-visited regularly as you review the EIA every 12 to 18 months as applicable to the duration of your activity.
- **SMART Actions mean:** Actions that are (SMART = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, T = Time-bound)
- **Cumulative Assessment:** If there is impact on all groups equally, complete **only** the cumulative assessment section.
- **Data analysis and Insights:**
 - In each protected characteristic or group, in answer to the question ‘If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?’, describe what you have learnt from your data analysis about disproportionate impacts, stating relevant insights and data sources.
 - Find and use contextual and wide ranges of data analysis (including community feedback) to describe what the disproportionate positive and negative impacts are on different, and intersecting populations impacted by your activity, especially considering for [Health inequalities](#), review guidance and inter-related impacts, and the impact of various identities.
 - For example: If you are doing road works or closures in a particular street or ward – look at a variety of data and do so from various protected characteristic lenses. Understand and analyse what that means for your project and its impact on different types of people, residents, family types and so on. State your understanding of impact in both effect of impact and strength of that effect on those impacted.
- **Data Sources:**
 - **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.
- Learn more about the [Equality Act 2010](#) and about our [Public Sector Equality Duty](#).

6.1 Age

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to any particular Age group? For example: those under 16, young adults, with other intersections.	YES
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

One proposed change will affect parents and children born between 1/09/2021 and 31/08/2022 who are due to start primary school in September 2026 – where they may be seeking entry into Rudyard Kipling Primary School. The proposal is to expand its PAN and therefore it is not considered that there will be any significant negative effects on that cohort as it may increase the chances of gaining a school of preference in that area of the city.

The other proposed changes will impact on the cohort that are due to start secondary school in September 2026. These are children born between 1/09/2014 and 31/08/2015 who are due to start secondary school in September 2026. There are currently 2447 children in this age bracket attending Primary schools locally, and it is estimated 2284 will require a mainstream school place in year 7. There are currently 2560 places available which will reduce to 2440 if the proposed PAN reductions take place. During the public consultation we will be seeking to collect age data from the respondents so we can see continue to monitor the views expressed by different age ranges in the city but also to consider whether there are groups we've not heard from.

During the engagement exercise a slim majority of the 2600 respondees (54%) agreed to answer the standard equalities questions. For the question asking them to state their age, 43% declined to answer the question. Of those that did provide a response the majority of survey respondees were aged between 35 and 54 years of age. Whilst you would expect this to be the case with surveys where the significant stakeholders include parents/carers of school aged children and potentially of school staff, it does raise the question about whether younger parents/carers are engaging in the surveys. Further actions should be taken to ensure the consultation reaches a younger set of survey respondees.

What might the impact be on different ages?

Pre-school and Primary Age (0-11):

The changes may disrupt established childcare arrangements and walking groups for some families. Pre-school parents unfamiliar with the school system may find it particularly challenging to understand the implications of the changes. The public consultation timing means some affected families may not yet have children in the school system, potentially limiting their engagement.

Secondary School Age (11-16):

The increased number of preferences will give students more options for considering secondary school places, potentially reducing anxiety around the application process. The introduction of new priority criteria could help create more balanced and diverse school communities. However, proposed catchment changes may separate existing friendship groups from primary school, potentially impacting social development and wellbeing. Extended travel times could affect participation in extra-curricular activities and reduce independence, particularly for younger secondary students.

Young Parents (Under 35):

The engagement exercise data shows under-representation of younger parents, suggesting their specific needs may not be fully reflected in the proposals. Young parents are more likely to rely on public transport and local support networks, making them particularly vulnerable to catchment area changes. However, the increased opportunity through additional preferences could particularly benefit this group who may have less flexibility to move near preferred schools.

Parents Aged 35-54:

This age group forms most consultation respondents and typically has more established support networks and resources to manage changes. They may benefit from having more experience navigating school systems but could face challenges if house purchases or moves were based on existing catchment areas. The proposals' emphasis on reducing barriers for disadvantaged pupils could create more opportunities for families across different socio-economic backgrounds.

Older Adults/Grandparents:

Many families rely on grandparents/other relatives for childcare and school drop-offs/pick-ups. Changed catchment areas could impact these arrangements, particularly if travel times increase. However, the

focus on maintaining local school provision across the city could help sustain intergenerational support networks. The proposals' aim to create more sustainable schools could benefit future generations, though immediate changes may disrupt existing family arrangements.

6.2 Disability:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Disability , considering our anticipatory duty ?	YES
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

For clarification, Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) who have an Education, Health & Care Plan would be placed in a secondary school under the SEND code of Practice by the SEN team and normal admission arrangements and PANs would not apply. Therefore our attentions in the impact assessment is on children with disabilities but without an Education, Health and Care Plan and disabled consultation respondees.

We know that parents of children with a disability may have more questions or concerns about their child's school application process. There may also be a need to consider a child's individual circumstances under the 'Exceptional Circumstances' criterion within the admission arrangements. This is for the parent/carer to highlight at the point of application and to provide the necessary supporting documentation.

During the engagement exercise a slim majority of the 2600 respondees (54%) agreed to answer the standard equalities questions. For the question asking them if their day-to-day activities were affected by a health condition or disability 46% declined to answer the question. 7% replied 'Yes a little' and 2% replied 'yes a lot'.

This tells us that there are interested stakeholders who are affected by disability so the consultation process should make efforts to ensure their voice can be heard.

In the October 2024 census figures collected showed a total of 22.8% of pupils are receiving SEN Support or have an EHCP:

- 17.2% of pupils are receiving SEN Support
- 5.6% of pupils have an EHCP

Regarding the proposed changes, we know that families affected by disability will be keen to understand any potential impact on their chances of gaining a school of preference.

What might be the impact on those impacted by disability?

The changes proposed do not offer any disproportionate negative impact on families affected by disability as a discrete group. There is a correlation between poverty and disability so a rise, albeit small, in the percentage of FSM eligible places offered increases the chances of a family affected by disability in gaining a place under that priority.

We know that disabled parents/carers may also find it more difficult to respond to an online survey, application process or to attend in person or online consultation meetings. Parents/carers with children who have a disability may not be able to attend a consultation event in person or online.

Therefore, actions will need to be taken to ensure there are a good range of ways diverse disabled families can engage with the public consultation.

To improve consultation engagement with disabled people there should be an intentional, intersectional, neuroaffirmative, and impactful approach that considered the following points – these will also be reflected upon for the action plan provided towards the end of this assessment.

- A combination of accessible in-person and online participation options. For in-person events, venues will be fully accessible with parking options.
- Where needed and requested in advance accommodation should be made for ensuring sign language interpreters, hearing loops, and other assistive technologies will be available
- Online consultations are compatible with screen readers and other assistive technologies. There will also be email submissions and a telephone line available which will ensure people can engage in ways that suit their needs. All digital materials can be available in accessible formats, if requested although advance notice is helpful.
- Consultation times are flexible, offering both daytime and evening sessions to accommodate different schedules and energy levels.
- Partnership with disability organisations and advocacy groups to help reach more people and ensure consultations address relevant concerns. Having facilitators who understand different disabilities and communication needs helps create an inclusive environment where all participants feel comfortable contributing their views.

What [inclusive adjustments](#) are you making for diverse disabled people impacted? For example: D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodivergent people, those with non-visible disabilities, and with access requirements that may not identify as disabled or meet the legal definition of disability, and have various intersections (Black and disabled, LGBTQIA+ and disabled).

For the upcoming public consultation, this is covered in the actions section below.

6.3 Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers):

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to ethnicity?	YES
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

If "YES", what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

The data available for pre-school pupils indicates an increasing percentage of children from Minoritised Ethnic backgrounds for the city in general. There is no comprehensive race/ethnicity data available for the cohort due to start school in September 2026.

Feedback from the Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) from a previous admissions consultation indicated that many parents from ethnic minorities or with English as an additional language found a previous consultation confusing even with assistance. There was a reluctance to participate from some groups as they felt that it didn't affect them partly due to the uncertainty of the housing situations so children may have to move schools anyway and they trust that whatever school parents get it will be a good school. The difficulty of not being able to attend a local school was however identified as a potential problem.

We know that from the 2023 secondary application round 27.9% of all applications were from ethnically minoritised families and there is no ethnicity information for a further 10.3% of applicants. 29.4% of late

school applications were submitted by ethnically minoritised families and for a further 30% there is no ethnicity information. 79.6% of ethnically minoritised families who applied received their first preference school compared to 83.9% of white British families.

In some allocation years a higher percentage of pupils from ethnic minorities apply late or are directed to a school that was not a preference.

There has been an increased percentage of ethnically minoritised respondents who answered the equalities monitoring question in previous consultations about the council's admission arrangements from 19% in 2021 to 22.6% last year.

During the engagement exercise a slim majority of the 2600 respondees (54%) agreed to answer the standard equalities questions. For those that responded to the question that asked them to describe their ethnic origin, the majority of respondees declared themselves as White: English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish, British.

Other responses, all of which were under 2% (but more than 10 people) of responses include:

- White Irish
- Mixed or multiple ethnic groups
- Mixed Asian and White
- Mixed Black Caribbean and White
- Asian/Asian British Indian
- Asian/Asian British Chinese
-

From the January 2024 school census, 31% (9,632) of pupils who supplied their data identified as an ethnicity category other than White British. This is an increase of 163 pupils since January 2023. The three biggest ethnic groups (other than White British) in Brighton and Hove schools were: White - Other 4.9%, Mixed dual background - Other 3.5% and Mixed dual background - White & Asian 3.3%.

We know that the city has a greater proportion of ethnic diversity than is represented in the declared results from the engagement exercise and therefore efforts need to be made to ensure that a diversity of respondees are sought and enabled to participate in the upcoming public consultation.

What might be the impact on those from Black or global majority groups?

The data reveals disparities in school access and engagement for Black and global majority ethnic groups in Brighton & Hove's school system. These families experience lower rates of securing first preference schools (79.6% compared to 83.9% for White British families) and are overrepresented in late applications (29.4% of late applications despite making up 27.9% of total applications). This suggests existing systemic barriers that need careful consideration in any proposed changes to school admissions arrangements.

The engagement exercise highlighted levels of underrepresentation, with each Black and Global Majority communities showing less than 2% response rates compared to 36.7% White British responses. This points to families in the city facing barriers to engaging with the local authority on matters affecting their children and work is needed to ensure understanding and action is taken. This includes taking an intersectional approach around family needs and seeing support and advice from experts by experience and EDI professionals to ensure a wider range of views are heard and captured.

6.4 Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism?	YES
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

There are only Church of England and Roman Catholic church-aided schools within the city. These schools can prioritise children of faith above other children. A number of these schools do prioritise children of other faiths above children of no faith.

None of the faith schools are proposing a reduction in PAN for September 2026. 23% of first preference primary applications for September 2024 were for church aided schools in the city and 77% expressed a first preference for secular schools. 31% of first preference secondary school applications for September 2024 were for church aided schools in the city and 69% expressed a preference for a secular school.

All schools identified for a reduction in PAN are community schools and this could potentially have a disproportionate impact on pupils with no faith.

Church-aided schools in the city are responsible for their own admission arrangements and the council cannot consult on changes to their PAN or their admission arrangements. The council will need to ensure that there are sufficient secular school places available for all residents who require one within a reasonable distance.

Some parents will seek a secular education for their child whilst others will want their children taught in line with their religious belief. Others will be happy to send their children to a church-aided school despite having no set faith at home.

52.5% responded to the Engagement Exercise and answered the equalities monitoring information, from this:

- 32.4% had no particular religion or belief
- 4.2% were Atheist
- 8.2% were Christian
- 2.9% preferred not to say
- A small percentage identified with other faiths (Buddhist – 0.9%, Jewish – 0.5%, Muslim – 0.5% and Hindu – 0.2%)

What might be the impact on those with or without faith?

The proposed changes could impact secular education access in Brighton & Hove. Since all schools identified for PAN (Published Admission Number) reductions are community schools, this could disproportionately affect families seeking secular education.

A key concern is ensuring sufficient secular school places remain available within reasonable distance for all residents, particularly as faith schools maintain control over their own admission arrangements and PAN.

There are potential impacts on religious equality in education access, as some families specifically seek secular education while others prioritise faith-based schooling aligned with their beliefs. The consultation process will need to be sensitive to these different needs, with events planned in secular buildings where possible, except when directly engaging with affected faith / church-aided school geographic communities.

6.5 Gender Identity and Sex:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and intersex people)?	NO
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.6 Gender Reassignment:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Gender Reassignment ?	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.7 Sexual Orientation:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Sexual Orientation ?	NO
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.8 Marriage and Civil Partnership:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Marriage and Civil Partnership?	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.9 Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum):

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)?	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.10 Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Armed Forces Members and Veterans?	NO
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.11 Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum seekers, Refugees, those New to the UK, and UK visa or assigned legal status? (Especially considering for age, ethnicity, language, and various intersections)	NO
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.12 [Carers](#):

<p>Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Carers (Especially considering for age, ethnicity, language, and various intersections).</p>	<p>NO</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

6.13 Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people:

<p>Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced children and adults (Especially considering for age, ethnicity, language, and various intersections).</p> <p>Also consider our Corporate Parenting Responsibility in connection to your activity.</p>	<p>YES</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

Children who are in care or previously in care are given a high priority in our school admission arrangements and are highly likely to receive a school of first preference, assuming their status has been confirmed during the application process.

Brighton & Hove City Council have adopted Children in Care and Care Experienced Young People as a protected characteristic. As Corporate Parent, there is a collective responsibility and demonstrable commitment to ensure that children and young people with care experience are enabled to have the same opportunities as any other child or young person.

We know that Children in Care and Care Experienced Young People and adults who were care experienced are more likely to face discrimination.

41% of 19–21-year-old care leavers are not in education, employment or training, compared to 12% of other young people the same age.

There are 66% with SEND and 35% have an EHCP, compared to 12% of the general population.
50% of children and young people in care have a diagnosable mental health condition

51.6% responded to the Engagement Exercise and answered the equalities monitoring information, from this:

- 49.2% had no care experience
- 0.5% had care experience
- 0.3% were not sure
- 1.7% preferred not to say

What impact might there be on those who are care experienced?

Relevant children seeking a school place will be offered the highest priority for admission. However it may be their parents/carers who find they have barriers to accessing the consultation and / or wider school admission process.

The notably low engagement rate of just 0.5% of respondents having care experience highlights a need for better representation in the consultation process. As Brighton & Hove has adopted Children in Care and Care Experienced Young People as a protected characteristic, there is a particular responsibility to

ensure changes don't create additional barriers – specially in enabling potential applicants from expressing their views on the city's admission arrangements.

6.14 Homelessness:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to people experiencing homelessness, and associated risk and vulnerability? (Especially considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections)	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.15 Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, people in vulnerable situations:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Domestic Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)?	NO
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.16 Socio-economic Disadvantage:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to Socio-economic Disadvantage? (Especially considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections)	YES
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

The schools proposed as having PAN changes are in different planning areas and serve different communities within in the city. From the January 24 school census: Rudyard Kipling Primary School has 27.2% of pupils within the 10% most deprived areas of Britain and 29.2% of pupils within the 20% most deprived areas of Britain. Longhill High School has 34.9% of pupils within the 10% most deprived areas of Britain and 37.7% of pupils within the 20% most deprived areas of Britain. Dorothy Stringer School has 11.2% of pupils within the 10% most deprived areas of Britain and 16.6% of pupils within the 20% most deprived areas of Britain. Blatchington Mill School has 0.8% of pupils within the 10% most deprived areas of Britain and 7.7% of pupils within the 20% most deprived areas of Britain.

Responses to this consultation need to be considered based on the content not just quantity of replies as some areas in the city due to the nature of the community will provide significantly more replies and in a variety of ways.

In the October 2024 census figures collected showed a total of 26.3% of pupils were in receipt of Free School Meals.

The key equity concerns raised during the engagement process include:

- House prices surrounding popular schools becoming inflated, potentially creating barriers for lower-income families.
- Some socio-economic groups being better able to lobby and provide cohesive community responses that may disproportionately influence decision making.
- Some communities may not be adequately represented in public meetings or consultation responses.

- Families who cannot afford to move close to oversubscribed schools could face reduced school choices.
- The consultation revealed concerns about the creation of “premium” catchment areas that could increase rather than reduce educational inequality.
- Concerns around areas being limited to access to lower-performing schools based on geography and socioeconomic factors.
- Financial implications for families, including transport costs, highlighted as potential barriers.

What might the impact be on those who are impacted by Poverty?

Based on the engagement exercise feedback, families impacted by poverty could face several significant impacts from the proposed school admission changes. Longhill High School serves 34.9% of pupils from these most deprived areas. The changes could affect access to preferred schools, outside of their catchment area.

The engagement exercise revealed that families experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage may have reduced capacity to engage in the consultation process or lobby for their interests compared to more affluent communities. This is compounded by practical concerns such as transportation costs and access to schools outside their immediate neighbourhood. The consultation should ensure meetings take place in a variety of communities to enable a wider range of participants to join.

The proposed changes to FSM-eligible priority criteria could provide some positive impact, potentially increasing chances for disadvantaged children to access their preferred schools. The same applies for the proposed new criteria around open admissions.

We know that transport and travel considerations will be key for all families, but particularly from those from a lower-income household who may be more dependent on public transport options available to them.

6.17 Human Rights:

Will your activity have a disproportionate impact relating to Human Rights?	NO
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

6.18 English as an Additional Language:

Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact relating to those who have English as an additional language	YES
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

If “YES”, what are the positive and negative disproportionate impacts?

Please share relevant insights from data and engagement to show how conclusions about impact have been shaped. Include relevant data sources or references.

What do we know?

From the October 2024 school census, 16.2% of Brighton & Hove pupils were exposed to a language other than English in their home.

There were 112 different languages other than English (including British Sign Language), recorded in the January 2024 School Census. The three most widely recorded languages, other than English, were: Arabic - 915 pupils, Polish - 409 pupils and Bengali - 273 pupils.

The percentage of pupils with English as an additional language from the October 2024 school census varies across areas in the city from 20.4% in Hove Park and Blatchington Mill School catchment area to 11.1% in the Patcham Catchment area. Within the existing Longhill catchment area 13.9% of pupils speak a language other than English and for the Dorothy Stringer and Varndean catchment area 16.4% of pupils speak a language other than English.

Families with pupils who have English as an additional language are proportionally more likely to apply late which significantly reduces their chance of being offered a place at an oversubscribed school. We understand some of the barriers or different considerations these diverse pupils may face that contribute to late applications. The higher number of families with English as an additional language applying late could be contributed to a number of factors such as these families moving into the city outside the cut off dates for the main admission rounds. This could be due to these families are not being aware of when to apply for school places as they are less likely to understand the promotional information distributed for parents. Families may not comprehend the implication of the proposals or which year they take effect and be able to relate this to their own circumstances.

What impact might there be?

Families where English is an Additional Language are more likely to face barriers to accessing and engaging with consultations and this is heightened when there may be an intersectionality of need within the family. Efforts need to be made within the consultation process to ensure all families are well supported to engage as they wish to in our consultation.

6.19 Cumulative, multiple [intersectional](#), and complex impacts (including on additional relevant groups):

What cumulative or complex impacts might the activity have on people who are members of multiple Minoritised groups?

- For example: people belonging to the Gypsy, Roma, and/or Traveller community who are also disabled, LGBTQIA+, older disabled trans and non-binary people, older Black and Racially Minoritised disabled people of faith, young autistic people.
- Also consider wider disadvantaged and intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers:
 - People experiencing homelessness
 - People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
 - People facing literacy, numeracy and/or digital barriers
 - Lone parents
 - People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
 - Sex workers
 - Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
 - People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
 - People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery

We need to ensure that children and young people accessing school places are not discriminated against and have the opportunity to access inclusive and high-quality school provision. We need to ensure their families can engage well with the public consultation so that a wider range of voices and experiences are heard and captured.

Reducing the number of surplus school places is necessary to safeguard the whole family of schools in the city and to protect schools from financial difficulties as pupil numbers reduce. Without a reduction in school places there is the real possibility that some schools become unable to operate in a financially efficient way with implications for the quality of education provided and the council's own budget.

The proposed changes to admission arrangements are intended to provide greater opportunities for a greater number of children in the city to have opportunities to attend a school that meets their family needs. We recognise that for some families, choosing a school outside of their communities/local area may not be a viable choice for their lives.

The consultation process must be as accessible as possible for all residents to respond to and that events are held at a variety of times and in locations which allow interested residents to participate and the process of receiving responses is also available to all. It must also target outreach to minoritised and groups that face additional barriers in addition to reaching all impacted residents.

7. Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to address the disproportionate and cumulative impacts you have identified?

- Summarise relevant SMART actions from your data insights and disproportionate impacts below for this assessment, listing appropriate activities per action as bullets. (This will help your Business Manager or Fair and Inclusive Action Plan (FIAP) Service representative to add these to the Directorate FIAP, discuss success measures and timelines with you, and monitor this EIA's progress as part of quarterly and regular internal and external auditing and monitoring)

- Ensure the formal public consultation is open, accessible and easy for a wide range of residents and stakeholders to engage and share their views. Considerations are also made throughout this assessment which will inform the approach.
 - Ensure childcare providers and nurseries in the city are communicated with very early in the consultation timeline asking them to share with their parents, to enable engagement with younger parents and parents of younger children
 - Liaise with support services such as Family Hubs to continue encouraging participation from younger parents. Greater use of social media platforms and online promotion to reach younger parents in conjunction with traditional methods of promotion. Consideration of timing of any public consultation events so parents with young families can attend.
 - Consultation documentation should be made available in other accessible formats and languages when requested. Parents/carers who are unable to attend a public meeting will be able to access information online or over the telephone or attend a virtual meeting.
 - If consultation events are held online relevant information should be available to be viewed after the event. Timing of events should also be accessible for parents with working and other caring schedules or non-heteronormative commitments.
 - The council will also liaise with PaCC and Amaze. There needs to be sufficient school places within a reasonable distance of families including those families who have someone with a disability living with them.
 - Explore further other methods of engagement with Black and Global Majority, migrant, diverse and multicultural and non-visibly disabled parents, families, and communities to further increase responses to the consultation. Provide reasonable adjustments as needed and requested whenever possible. Continue Including the use of the EMAS service to reach out to communities to communicate the proposals in the consultation and the potential impact on their community. Highlight that there is a translation function on the council's website and engagement portal so that consultation information can be viewed in different languages. Hard copy consultation materials to be made available in different languages and accessible formats as required if requests are made.
 - Consultation events will take place in secular and LGBTQIA+-safe and welcoming buildings wherever possible except where there is a faith / church-aided school community directly affected by proposals.

- Brighton & Hove City Council have adopted Children in Care and Care Experienced as a protected characteristic the consultation will need to be made accessible to care experienced residents.
- Regarding consideration of potential advantage to families who are in the financial position to move close to oversubscribed schools in order to increase chance of obtaining a place, encourage communities in all areas of the city to engage in the consultation process and provide alternative methods for them to respond. Take consideration of the impact of any change in PAN may have on a school in relation to the composition of pupil cohorts and their families to promote a comprehensive education offer.
- Important to ensure that there are still surplus places in each planning area so late applicants and pupils moving mid-year can be offered a place at a local school. Greater emphasis needs to be made in future to reach these families and make them aware of the school admissions applications process. If this group are unaware of the school admissions timescale it is also likely that they would be less aware of the consultation process. Additional steps should be taken to engage these families with this consultation. Advice and support shall need to be sought from the EMAS team and others with links to various communities where there are a number of families with English as an additional language. For public meetings with a focus on a particular community, explore with individual schools the languages spoken and mitigations/steps normally taken within that community to reduce barriers.

2. Use the consultation to collect and reflect further on a greater range of data, including equalities monitoring, relating to any potential implications of the proposal being implemented (as opposed to the focus on the consultation itself as above). Considerations are also made throughout this assessment which will inform the approach.
- Review responses to the consultation as they are coming in, to monitor any data gaps and take necessary action. E.g. if Black and Global Majority communities representation continues to be low, review existing approaches and take additional and intentional activity. Especially important to consider community members with intersectional needs.
 - Through the establishment of a community reflection group looking at admission arrangements in the longer term, consider the ongoing data gaps and barriers – creating a multi-agency plan to address these. This could assist with gathering more detail from different protected characteristic groups to understand daily routines, childcare arrangements, and support networks. This will provide practical insights into how future proposed changes could affect family life.

Which action plans will the identified actions be transferred to?

- For example: Team or Service Plan, Local Implementation Plan, a project plan related to this EIA, FIAP (Fair and Inclusive Action Plan) – mandatory noting of the EIA on the Directorate EIA Tracker to enable monitoring of all equalities related actions identified in this EIA. This is done as part of FIAP performance reporting and auditing. Speak to your Directorate's Business Improvement Manager (if one exists for your Directorate) or to the Head of Service/ lead who enters actions and performance updates on FIAP and seek support from your Directorate's EDI Business Partner.

These identified actions will both be reflected upon in the next EIA related to these proposals and where relevant taken into service business plans to ensure oversight continues beyond the span of this consultation process and subsequent reports to Cabinet/Full Council.

8. Outcome of your assessment

What decision have you reached upon completing this Equality Impact Assessment? (Mark 'X' for any ONE option below)

Stop or pause the activity due to unmitigable disproportionate impacts because the evidence shows bias towards one or more groups.	
Adapt or change the activity to eliminate or mitigate disproportionate impacts and/or bias.	

Proceed with the activity as currently planned – no disproportionate impacts have been identified, or impacts will be mitigated by specified SMART actions.	
Proceed with caution – disproportionate impacts have been identified but having considered all available options there are no other or proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the activity (for example, in extreme cases or where positive action is taken). Therefore, you are going to proceed with caution with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.	X

If your decision is to “Proceed with caution”, please provide a reasoning for this:

It is not unusual for a Local Authority area to amend and change city-wide admission arrangements and / or changes to catchment areas as demographics and circumstances of a local area changes. It is important that the council are sighted on and take consideration of the implications of those proposed changes and the EIA plus other implications sections of the cabinet report will assist them to do so. We do not have full and comprehensive information at this stage of the extent of this impact and situations of affected families city-wide. Our consultation should draw out more information to help us make decisions appropriately. The report details mitigations that can be made to better support families in the city accessing the consultation to understand that they may have a negative or positive impact as a result of any changes made. Therefore, it is considered, on balance, right to proceed but caution must be taken to ensure impacts continue to be known, identified, understood and where possible, mitigated against.

Summarise your overall equality impact assessment recommendations to include in any committee papers to help guide and support councillor decision-making:

Consider the equalities impacts on different protected characteristics groups and impacts identified, ensuring mitigations and reduction in negative and disproportionate impact as well as targeted outreach and nuanced consultation, ensuring intersectional and wider non-normative considerations and accessibility, communications and diverse requirements of all those impacted. Specifically:

- Ensure that the public consultation is targeted, widely communicated, open, fair and accessible – with officers and partners using many available and newly identified routes to promote engagement from a wide range of diverse stakeholders/ families/ residents affected by the proposed changes, especially those in socio-economically deprived, disabled, Black and Global Majority, and Migrant communities.
- Ensure that the consultation further helps the collection, understanding and analysis of information around any potential impacts of the proposals and of voice and representation based on richer equalities monitoring data – negative and positive, so that inequity and under-representation of voice, access and opportunity can be addressed and improved upon.

9. Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

This will be published as part of the Cabinet paper for 5th December 2024

10. Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Richard Barker, Head of School Organisation	25-Nov-24

Accountable Manager:	Deb Austin, Corporate Director – Families, Children, and Learning	26 – Nov - 24
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------

Notes, relevant information, and requests (if any) from Responsible Lead Officer and Accountable Manager submitting this assessment:

EDI Review, Actions, and Approval:

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

EIA Reference number assigned: [FCL108-26-Nov-24-EIA-School-Admission-Arrangements-Consultation](#)

For example, HNC##-25-Dec-23-EIA-Home-Energy-Saving-Landlord-Scheme

EDI Business Partner to cross-check against aims of the equality duty, public sector duty and our civic responsibilities the activity considers and refer to relevant internal checklists and guidance prior to recommending sign-off.

Once the EDI Business Partner has considered the equalities impact to provide first level approval for by those submitting the EIA, they will get the EIA signed off and sent to the requester copying the Head of Service, Business Improvement Manager, [Equalities inbox](#), any other service colleagues as appropriate to enable EIA tracking, accountability, and saving for publishing.

Signatory:	Name:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
EDI Business Partner:	Not in post	N/A
EDI Manager:	Sabah Holmes	26-Nov-24
Head of Communities, Equality, and Third Sector (CETS) Service: <i>(For Budget EIAs/ in absence of EDI Manager/ as final approver)</i>	Emma McDermott (reviewing)	

Notes and recommendations from EDI Business Partner reviewing this assessment:

Notes and recommendations (if any) from EDI Manager reviewing this assessment:

Approved based on a robust and nuanced consultation being conducted with internal expertise informing targeted outreach, and monitoring and transparency of committed actions being carried out. Head of CETS is reviewing but had advised we can proceed based on the current assessment pre-fuller public consultation, ensuring we effect learning and improve our planning and approach in the future, making EIAs a more intentional and systematic process.

Notes and recommendations (if any) from Head of CETS Service reviewing this assessment:

Brighton & Hove City Council

Agenda Item

People Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of meeting: 14th January 2025

Subject: Overview of work carried out by Brighton & Hove City Council in partnership with statutory and third sector organisations to welcome and support refugees and asylum seekers to our city of sanctuary.

Report of: Cabinet Member for Communities, Equalities and Human Rights

Contact Officer: Lucy Bryson, International Migration Manager,
lucy.bryson@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

Key Decision: No

For general release

Contents

1. Purpose of the report.....	2
2. Recommendations.....	2
3. Background and Definitions.....	3
4. Brighton & Hove: update on specific schemes and routes into the city for those seeking sanctuary.....	4
4.1 Homes for Ukraine Programme.....	4
4.2 Afghan Resettlement Scheme – formerly the Afghan Relocation and Assistance Policy (ARAP) and Afghan Citizens Resettlement Scheme (ACRS).....	6
4.3 UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS).....	7
4.4 Community Sponsorship programmes	8
4.5 Commissioned Support Services for Resettled Refugees	8
4.6 Hong Kong Welcome Scheme	8
4.7 Responses to other crises.....	9
4.8 Asylum Seekers – Single Adults and Families.....	9
4.9 Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children and Care Leavers	11
5. Local Authority of Sanctuary Accreditation and Action Plan.....	11
6. Analysis and consideration of alternative options.....	12

7. Community engagement and consultation	13
8. Financial implications	13
9. Legal implications	13
10. Equalities implications	13
11. Sustainability implications	14
12. Health and Wellbeing Implications:	14
13. Other Implications.....	14
14. Procurement implications	14
15. Crime & disorder implications	14
Supporting Documentation	14
Appendices	14

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The report provides a summary to the People, Overview and Scrutiny Committee of Brighton & Hove’s support to refugees and asylum seekers in the city arriving through a range of pathways during recent years. These include national government schemes: the Homes for Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme, the Afghan Relocation and Assistance Programme, Afghan Citizen Resettlement Scheme, UK Resettlement Scheme and Hong Kong British Nationals (Overseas) Welcome Programme. It also includes work to welcome asylum seekers placed by the Home Office in dispersed accommodation (houses) and/or initial contingency accommodation (a hotel) in the city. In addition, the report outlines the provision of holistic care to Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASC) and to care experienced young people who have been through the asylum system.
- 1.2 Since the declaration by the city council that Brighton & Hove was a city of sanctuary in 2015, a more formal and strengthened process has been developed by the national City of Sanctuary organisation to enable local authorities to apply for specific accreditation as a ‘Local Authority of Sanctuary’. The report explains the issues and action that the city council, with city partners, has been focused on to improve the welcome offered to refugees and migrants and how the integration of these communities is being promoted as the council works towards formal accreditation as a local authority of Sanctuary in 2025. The city of sanctuary work is intrinsically linked to the council’s commitment to becoming an anti-racist organisation and supporting an anti-racist city, and its efforts to foster good relations as per the Public Sector equality Duty and commitment to community cohesion.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That Committee notes the council and its partners' work related to refugees and asylum seekers and developments in central government policy and practice over this period.

2.2 That Committee notes the steps being undertaken by the city council to secure accreditation as a Local Authority of Sanctuary in 2025 in accordance with the Council Plan.

3. Background and Definitions

3.1 The legal definition of a refugee comes from the 1951 UN Convention on Refugees. The Convention defines a refugee as someone who "...owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside of his country of nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country"

3.2 Refugees enter the UK through two main routes. They may be selected by the government for 'resettlement.' This is the process whereby refugees are brought to the UK and whereby on arrival they already have permission to remain indefinitely with the right to work and to claim welfare benefits. Their integration in local areas is funded through ringfenced grants to local authorities. Since 2021 most refugee resettlement resources and funding have gone towards resettling Afghan households recognised as needing protection from the Taliban government which came to power in Afghanistan in August 2021. There is a wider UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS) receiving referrals from the United Nations for refugees from trouble spots across the world. However, in recent years routes to the UK through the UKRS have been extremely limited.

3.3 People also arrive in the UK without permission to seek protection (or 'asylum') under the UN Convention using irregular means such as crossing the channel on small boats. If they are unaccompanied minors under the age of 18, their care and support is the duty of local authority social services departments, and the National Transfer Scheme (NTS) distributes children to local authorities around the UK. For those who are adults or in family groups, the Home Office is responsible for housing and providing food and basic commodities while they are awaiting a decision on their claims. In the year ending September 2024, the top five countries of origin of people seeking asylum were Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Bangladesh, and Syria. If someone is recognised as a refugee under the UN 1951 Convention definition, they are given 5 years Leave to Remain, access to UK welfare systems and the right to work, alongside recognition of their formal status as a refugee.

3.4 In recognition of the problems caused by long stays in hotel accommodation (see below), the government is keen to find new ways of housing and supporting asylum seekers, alongside reducing the numbers arriving by small boats.

3.5 It is worth noting that the Ukrainians arriving in the UK on the Homes for Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme (see below) have not been formally recognised as refugees. Their stay in the UK is limited by the conditions of the specific visa

scheme created to offer them temporary admission to the UK to escape the war in Ukraine. Hong Kongers recently arriving in the UK have been able to avail themselves of their rights to live and work in the UK as British National (Overseas) and are not recognised as refugees.

3.6 However, these two recent groups of arrivals in the UK can be seen as ‘refugees’ in the wider sense of the word (i.e. seeking refuge from difficulties in their home countries). As a result, their support and integration is generally included in the wider work of local authorities to welcome and support refugees and those seeking asylum (also known as ‘sanctuary seekers’). This is the case in Brighton & Hove. This work is conducted locally in the wider context of the inclusion of all types of newcomers (or migrants) who may have arrived from outside the UK in our city to work, study or to join family here.

3.7 The co-ordination of the city’s responses to all these categories of migrants is conducted by a small refugee and migrant team within the newly created Community Cohesion Unit. However, the City of Sanctuary approach of ‘Learn, Embed and Share’ (see below) is designed to create a sustainable and joined-up response to new arrivals in the city which is the responsibility of all council departments and that of their partners.

4. Brighton & Hove: update on specific schemes and routes into the city for those seeking sanctuary.

4.1 Homes for Ukraine Programme

4.1.1 The UK government launched the Homes for Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme on 14 March 2022. It is a unique government programme, relying on the accommodation of Ukrainian ‘guests’ in the homes of ‘hosts. Since it started, over 210,000 Ukrainian refugees have arrived in the UK.

4.1.2 703 Ukrainians arrived in Brighton & Hove on the Homes for Ukraine scheme since the start of the programme and 257 were still resident in the city, under the scheme, at the end of December 2024 including 47 children aged 1- 18 years. They comprised 123 households sponsored by the same number of local hosts. After the initial three months of high arrivals (April – June 2022), the numbers reduced progressively, mirroring the national picture. The current arrival rate is very low with only 4 arriving per month.

4.1.3 The city’s response has been coordinated by the Communities, Equality and Third Sector Team (prior to the recent Council redesign) within an agreed governance structure involving other statutory agencies and partners from the community and voluntary sector as well as community representatives. Ukrainians arriving on the programme were initially given three years right to remain, the right to work, study and access public funds, for example, a care assessment, statutory homeless duty, benefits, and a pension. On 19 February 2024, existing visa holders were granted an 18-month extension (Ukraine Permission Extension) to be applied for through a new e-visa process. All subsequent new visas have been granted for 18 months only.

4.1.4 When the programme started, local authorities received £10,500 per head to provide support to new arrivals (including the checking of hosts' properties). The government reduced the per head tariff to £5,900 for all new arrivals from 1st January 2023.

4.1.5 Central government also funded 'Thank you' payments of £350 for hosts with guests in year 1 and £500 for those with guests in years 2 and 3 of the Scheme. Brighton & Hove provided discretionary 'thank you' uplifts to help sustain existing sponsorships as well and attract new hosts. Most local authorities across the country did this. From 1st April 2025, all existing and new hosts will receive a thank you payment flat rate of £350 per month.

4.1.6 In addition to Homes for Ukraine arrivals, we are aware of a small number of arrivals through the Ukrainian Family Scheme and Ukraine Visa Extension scheme. The government does not provide funding for Ukrainians who are here under these schemes. However, most of the city's services are open to all Ukrainians. The council's response centres on the Community Hub (former Covid-19 Response Hub), acting as first point of contact for Ukrainian refugees and their hosts. The Hub has fulfilled a 'welcome' role and ensures that guests are safe through property checks and checks on prospective hosts. It also processes 'welcome' and 'thank you' payments for guests and hosts respectively and provides general advice and guidance on various welfare matters.

The refugee and migrant housing pathway (see below) provides advice on housing sustainment and move-on including to the Private Rented Sector.

4.1.7 Other council support funded by Homes for Ukraine programme has included:

- additional capacity in the Front Door for Families service to provide private fostering support,
- ESOL teacher training programme to increase the number of ESOL teachers in Brighton and Hove
- Additional capacity in Family Hubs with a family coaching service to support Ukrainian families.
- A refugee inclusion programme at Jubilee library.
- Additional capacity in our Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) which provide support to schools with bilingual children to support the increased number of Ukrainian children in schools.
- Home to Schools Transport costs for eligible Ukrainian refugee children
- A home inspector team recruited and trained to carry out the host property checks.

The Homes for Ukraine £1,278,898 funding also supported the community and voluntary sector through a grants programme most of which is now complete: examples include:

Organisation	Project Title
The Trust for Developing Communities (TDC)	ESOL for Ukrainian refugees (non-accredited)
	Multicultural Employability Support Hub - Ukraine
	Information, Advice and Guidance Services for Ukrainian refugees
	Summer Youth Activities

University of Sussex	English Language Scheme for refugees (IELTS 4 – 6.5)
The Launchpad Collective	Start-up support for entrepreneurs, Tailored work and careers support, community & corporate outreach
Network of International Women	Weekly drop-in sessions at a multi-purpose space for the Ukrainian community at All Saints Church in Hove
Sussex Interpreting Services & Together Co.	Social Prescribing, Translation and Pathways for Ukrainian refugees
Conversation Over Borders CIC	Integrated wellbeing support and conversational English
Phoenix Therapy Practice	1-2-1 Therapy & Counselling (adults & children)
Refugee Radio (with Ukrainian Voices, Best Foot Music and Brighton Therapy Centre)	Music, Events, Therapy, Advice and Guidance
Brighton Swimming Centre	Integration through Pool to Pier swimming
	Language and culture classes for Ukrainian refugee children
	Swimming and water safety sessions for Ukrainian refugee children
	Cash Flow for Children
Brighton & Hove LGBT Switchboard	Help & Support for LGBT Ukrainian refugees
Stand for Ukraine (with TDC as accountable body)	Integration through arts and cultural events, family educational outings, drop-ins and online spaces
	Organisational capacity building for Stand for Ukraine by TDC's Community Development Team
Brighton and Hove Chamber of Commerce	Job matching, engagement with employers
The Hummingbird Project	Global Youth Club
Brighton Table Tennis Club	Integration through Sport

4.2 Afghan Resettlement Scheme – formerly the Afghan Relocation and Assistance Policy (ARAP) and Afghan Citizens Resettlement Scheme (ACRS)

4.2.1 In the months following the withdrawal of Western powers from Afghanistan in August 2021, and the subsequent air evacuation of 15,000 Afghans from Kabul under Operation Pitting, the government set up two resettlement programmes for Afghan citizens – the Afghan Relocation and Assistance Policy (ARAP) which resettles Afghans who were working with British forces in Afghanistan and the Afghan Citizens Resettlement Scheme (ACRS) which provides protection to others at risk in Taliban-ruled Afghanistan.

4.2.2 Given the speed and volume of arrivals, the ARAP and ACRS Afghan households were accommodated by central government in 'bridging' hotels around the UK, pending their resettlement in self-contained properties to be provided within the private rented sector through local authorities. The bridging hotel arrangements

ended on 31st August 2023. Thousands more Afghans entitled to evacuation from the region are still waiting to come to the UK from Pakistan.

4.2.3 There were no bridging hotels in Brighton & Hove. Brighton & Hove City Council's involvement in this programme has been to provide settled accommodation for 37 households comprising 168 individuals, many of whom came from bridging hotels elsewhere in the UK. Of these, 87 were children under the age of eighteen on arrival. The national and local Afghan resettlement programmes have evolved over time. Earlier Afghan arrivals moved into properties acquired in the private rented sector, sometimes from sympathetic landlords who contacted the council wanting to assist.

4.2.4 More recently, national government has provided funding to councils under the Local Authority Housing Fund (LAHF) to enable the part purchase of properties specifically for this cohort. Brighton & Hove City Council has received three tranches of funding, totalling £5,760,554 and this has allowed the purchase of up to forty-three properties by the end of this financial year. The remaining costs of purchasing these properties is funded through council borrowing, paid for from the rental income stream. Ten of these flats and houses are now homes for Afghan families on the government resettlement programme with a further six families due to move into LAHF funded properties in the early part of 2025. The remaining properties purchased through this scheme have already or will become part of the general stock of Temporary Accommodation in the city.

4.2.5 Integration funding of £20,520 has been provided to local authorities on a per head basis every time a resettled refugee is welcomed to an area. There have been other housing-specific payments to local authorities in certain circumstances, recognising the difficulties in finding appropriate and affordable accommodation. The funding arrangements have recently been simplified with a new single per head tariff of £24,110. This is paid over a three-year period. A portion of these funds and Homes for Ukraine grant pays for the refugee and migrant team, a dedicated housing pathway for refugees and migrants and the acquisition of new properties in the private rented sector for Ukrainians, Afghans, and former asylum seekers. This funding also pays for the casework, ESOL and integration support provided by Voices in Exile.

4.2.6 There is additional funding for children's education (e.g. £4500 per head for children of school age) and for health care (to date £2600 per head)

4.3 UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS)

4.3.1 The UK Resettlement Scheme, launched in April 2021 has had a slow start nationally and locally due to the urgency of the need to accommodate those arriving on the ACRS and ARAP. Under this scheme, properties are sourced by local authorities and submitted to central government for allocation from a large pool of exceptionally vulnerable households with a resettlement need from across the world. Brighton & Hove city council remains committed to participating in the UKRS. So far three Syrian families and one household from Iraq have arrived in the city on this scheme. The per head funding for beneficiaries of the UKRS is broadly similar to that of those arriving on the Afghan programmes (see above), though to date it has been

spread over a five-year period, in line with the original Syrian Vulnerable Person's Resettlement Scheme which ran from 2015 to 2021.

4.4 Community Sponsorship programmes

4.4.1 Central government has been keen to capitalise on the goodwill of civil society, churches and community groups who want to help refugees. There are two sponsorship programmes which rely upon local people forming groups which take responsibility for sourcing and preparing properties for refugees and then for welcoming and supporting the new arrivals to find their feet in the local area. In Brighton & Hove there have been three such groups of which two continue to support Afghan families. Education funding (of £4500 per head) is provided for children arriving on the sponsorship schemes. The most recently launched *Communities for Afghans* Programme has a hybrid funding model which combines some elements of the Homes for Ukraine programme and some from the Afghan resettlement programmes.

4.5 Commissioned Support Services for Resettled Refugees

4.5.1 Local charity Voices in Exile (ViE) has been providing a bespoke service for resettled refugees since the first Syrian arrivals at the end of 2015. Most recently, after a competitive tender process during 2024, Voices in Exile was awarded the [contract](#) to provide the service until at least 2027. The service provided is holistic, starting with preparing properties for arrival and welcoming refugees into their new homes, followed by two years of casework support including help towards employment.

4.5.2 The English language levels of all adults are assessed, and refugees are registered with one of the city's providers of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) at the appropriate level. Voices in Exile provide ESOL if there is a gap before provision is available from a mainstream college or ESOL provider and they also complement provision with 'top up' classes to ensure that all refugees have access to 8 hours of ESOL if they can take this up. Many of the Afghan households are large families, some with young children so supporting mothers to learn English has been a challenge but a key priority for ViE during the early days of the new contract.

4.6 Hong Kong Welcome Scheme

4.6.1 A new immigration route opened on 31 January 2021, providing British National (Overseas) (BN(O)) status holders from Hong Kong and their dependants with the opportunity to come to the UK to live, study and work, on a pathway to citizenship. This is not a refugee resettlement programme as such, though local authorities have received some government funding to assist the newly arriving Hong Kongers. This is referred to as the Hong Kong UK Welcome Programme.

4.6.2 The council is working closely with the community group formed from the Hong Kong diaspora, 'Hong Konger in Brighton.' Over 900 Hong Kong BN(O)s are currently estimated to live in Brighton & Hove. These households are permitted to

work and study in the UK but do not have access to benefits. There is additional funding from English Language tuition (ESOL) and to cover costs of accommodating and supporting those who may become destitute. To date research into the Hong Kongers arriving in the UK indicates that the newest arrivals have financial resources and can rent or purchase properties.

4.6.3 The city council has used Hong Kong Welcome funds over the past three years to support the development of the local diaspora Hong Konger in Brighton group, to fund English Conversation clubs and resilience training, as well as workshops on employability and starting and growing a business (delivered in the Business and IP Centre in Jubilee Library).

4.7 Responses to other crises

4.7.1 Between 25th April and 2nd May 2023, the British government evacuated around 2200 British nationals and people with permission to live in the UK from Khartoum in response to the deteriorating security situation in Sudan. Brighton & Hove has a large Sudanese community, so it is not surprising that several of the evacuated households (the council estimates around ten households) made their way to join this community here in the city. Most of these had nowhere to live and came without resources. In this case the cross-council response to supporting these newcomers including placements in emergency housing, and the issuing of emergency vouchers and items through the Local Discretionary Social Fund. Officers also liaised closely with the Sudanese community group and attended a welcome event for the new arrivals.

4.7.2 It is important that our future planning around international migration considers the possibility of unexpected and non-programmed arrivals of vulnerable people from overseas such as that described above. In this case the arrivals were largely British nationals or their dependents (rather than refugees as such) but this still raised challenges with regard to access to benefits and the disorientation and trauma of people being forced to flee a dangerous and traumatic situation.

4.8 Asylum Seekers – Single Adults and Families

4.8.1 Many thousands of asylum seekers are housed in hotels across the UK by government contractors as a form of ‘contingency’ or emergency accommodation because there is not enough longer-term accommodation (known as ‘dispersal accommodation’). Clearsprings ReadyHomes (CRH) is the accommodation provider contracted by the Home Office for the Southeast of England. Stay Belvedere Hotels Limited (SBHL) is sub-contracted by CRH to manage the one contingency hotel currently operational in the city.

4.8.2 CRH provides around 100 bedspaces of dispersal accommodation in Brighton and Hove, mostly in Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) for adult men.

4.8.3 There is one contingency hotel which opened in October 2021 that accommodates families and single women. At the time of writing there were 82

residents of whom 16 are children under the age of 18. Full board meals are supplied, and the asylum seekers receive £9 per head per week. The children are enrolled in school and all the hotel residents are registered with a GP. The key challenge is the length of time that the asylum seekers are having to live in the hotel with little agency over their own lives. Food is brought into the hotel from an outside catering company, and this has proved to be particularly testing for the residents as they have no choice over what they eat.

4.8.4 Council officers chair monthly asylum hotel meetings with all the stakeholders, including the Home Office, Clearsprings, Migrant Help and other statutory services, as well as Sanctuary on Sea who represent the wider community and voluntary sector at the meetings to raise and resolve issues faced by the residents.

4.8.5 The Home Office has been seeking to increase the estate of self-contained accommodation available for asylum seekers in the Southeast, thereby reducing the need for hotel accommodation as well as spreading the accommodation more equitably around the UK. However, the shortage of affordable housing in Brighton and Hove has led to CRH being unable to find more than a handful of new properties in the city over the past 12 months.

4.8.6 A one off payment of £3,500 is made to local authorities by the Home Office for each new bedspace acquired by CRH. In addition to this, a one-off payment of £750 is made for every asylum seeker placed in the area. This funding has been used to fund specific items and services requested by the local migrant support groups who provide help to the hotel residents, for example: hire of storage units for donations, room hire at All Saints church in Hove for 'Sanctuary' sessions and English language classes for hotel residents, school uniforms and sun cream which is not provided by the Home Office nor their contractors. Funding has also been allocated to assist the Ethnic Minority Achievement Service's work in schools to settle and support the children who live at the hotels.

4.8.7 CVS groups are well networked through regular meetings (chaired by Sanctuary on Sea) which have continued since they were originally set up to co-ordinate the migrant sector response to Covid. National charity Migrant Help provide remote advice to asylum seekers in dispersal and hotel accommodation via a multilingual helpline and website, under a national Home Office contract.

4.8.8 Those who have been granted asylum are eligible to work, claim benefits and to homelessness assistance under the same rules as any other resident. The notice period between the Home Office notifying a person of its decision and the cessation of Home Office accommodation and support has very recently been increased from 28 to 56 days. This change has been welcomed by all those working with newly granted refugees and will hopefully reduce the instances of homelessness caused by eviction from the asylum system. Staff from the dedicated refugee and migrant pathway (see 4.2.5 above) work with this cohort and have access to an additional small fund for short term emergency placements in hostels and for basic household items to set up home.

4.8.9 There is another small population of asylum seekers in the city housed in 'safe houses' through the National Referral Mechanism for victims of human trafficking.

4.9 Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASC) and Care Leavers

4.9.1 When someone under the age of 18 arrives and seeks asylum in the UK when separated from their parents or caregiver, they do not enter the Home Office asylum support system. They become the responsibility of local authority children's services and are generally Looked After under Section 20 of the Children Act. To relieve the burden that would otherwise fall on Kent County Council and other local authority areas with ports of entry, the government-run National Transfer Scheme (NTS) distributes children to social services departments around the UK. Brighton & Hove currently Looks After 47 unaccompanied asylum-seeking children, some of whom have been transferred to the city under the NTS and the rest of whom were Accommodated following their spontaneous arrival and presentation to authorities in Brighton & Hove.

4.9.2 Between 2021 and 2023, Unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC) were placed in hotels as emergency accommodation due to a lack of placements. One of these hotels was in Hove. After a successful legal challenge by Brighton & Hove City Council, the use of hotels to house children seeking asylum was declared unlawful and they are no longer in use.

4.9.3 Unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC) are typically boys of 16 and 17 though some young women arrive alone too. Those under 16 are placed in foster care but the majority of UASC are placed in semi-independent accommodation which may be in the city or out of area. The holistic accommodation, support and education services provided to young people are led by a dedicated team within the Children, Families and Wellbeing Directorate.

4.9.4 Once a young person reaches the age of 18 and they have been in care for a minimum of 13 weeks, the local authority's duty towards them continues under the provisions of the Leaving Care Act. There are currently 133 former UASC care experienced young people supported by Brighton & Hove, the vast majority being young men. Top countries of origin for UASC and former UASC care leavers in Brighton & Hove are Kurdish and Sudanese.

5. Local Authority of Sanctuary Accreditation and Action Plan

5.1 The Council Plan 2023 – 2027 includes Brighton & Hove's reaccreditation as a City of Sanctuary. To fulfil this ambition, the local authority is working towards accreditation as a Local Authority of Sanctuary. The accreditation process provides a useful [framework](#) by which the local authority's work in this area can be assessed and supported by peers. Brighton & Hove Libraries have already been accredited as

a [Library Service of Sanctuary](#) but now it is time to roll out that approach across the whole council.

5.2 The University of Sussex and Sanctuary on Sea ran a small research project during 2024 to map the effectiveness of the city's culture of welcome in four key areas: Health, Housing, Immigration Legal Advice and Education. This resulted in the report [What does it mean to be a City of Sanctuary?](#) Which was launched at an event in Sussex County Cricket Club in October 2024. The recommendations from the report have contributed to the costed Sanctuary Action Plan (see below).

5.3 A Sanctuary Oversight Group (SOG) of officers from cross the council has met through the latter part of 2024 to support the refugee and migrant team in its submission of the application to the national city of sanctuary organisation. It is expected that the application will be submitted by the end of March 2025. The application will need to demonstrate how the council is meeting the accreditation criteria of having a Learn, Embed and Share approach to its welcoming those seeking sanctuary, and how it works collaboratively with the local City of Sanctuary group (Sanctuary on Sea).

5.4 The key development is the creation of a costed Sanctuary Action Plan which takes learning from the work described in this report as well as priorities agreed by committees in 2022 and 2023. 100% of the funding allocated to seeing through the implementation of the plan comes from government grants for resettlement programmes and asylum seekers which is yet unallocated. The plan offers a cross council, strategic approach to working with sanctuary seekers and includes a proposal for a grants programme for the community and voluntary sector. It will facilitate the council moving towards a more holistic approach to all newcomers regardless of their route to the city and begin to create more equitable access and offer of support to newcomers.

5.5 The action plan has twelve outcomes and objectives with 48 actions which have been costed with costs to be covered from projections of unallocated income from the resettlement and asylum grants. The action plan prioritises the following areas of work:

5.6 The plan is scheduled for presentation at Cabinet in March 2025 for approval, following discussion with the local community and voluntary sector as well as consideration of any feedback provided by the Council's People Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

6. Analysis and consideration of alternative options

No specific alternative options are proposed in this scrutiny report. The purpose of the report is to give the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee information on the routes by which people experiencing forced migration are arriving in the city, and the work that the council and its partners are carrying out to welcome and settle people into the city.

7. Community engagement and consultation

None specifically for this scrutiny report. However, key stakeholders and people with lived experience of forced displacement are involved in the council's programmes of activity in this area.

8. Financial implications

No direct financial implications arise from this report.

The council receives grant through the government schemes as outlined in paragraph 1.1 in order to administrate the schemes discussed in this report. The expenditure against the grant allocations is monitored and reported via returns to the government and through the council's Target Budget Management process.

Name of finance officer consulted: Haley Woollard Date consulted: 07/01/25

9. Legal implications

No direct legal implications have been identified as arising from this report.

Name of lawyer consulted: Victoria Simpson Date consulted 06.01.25:

10. Equalities implications

No equality implications arise directly from this report. Work with people who have experienced forced displacement is closely linked to the council's work to delivery its Anti-racism Strategy.

The report outlines the holistic approach taken across the city to advance equality of opportunity for newcomers. The primary focus of the City of Sanctuary approach is the promotion of good relations between sanctuary seekers and longstanding communities.

The council continues to promote a nuanced and intersectional understanding of the needs of newcomers who may have protected characteristics alongside their country of birth, nationality or first language.

11. Sustainability implications

None specifically for this scrutiny report.

12. Health and Wellbeing Implications

None specifically for this scrutiny report.

13. Other Implications

14. Procurement implications

None specifically for this scrutiny report.

15. Crime & disorder implications

None specifically for this scrutiny report.

Supporting Documentation

Appendices

- Presentation summarising the information in this report.

Brighton & Hove City of Sanctuary:

Our welcome and support for
refugees and asylum seekers



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**Presenter
Date**

**Councillor Pumm
14 January 2025**

Pathways into the city for those seeking sanctuary

'Safe and Legal routes'

- Homes for Ukraine
- Afghan resettlement
- UK Resettlement scheme
- Hong Kong Welcome

Asylum seekers

- Full board hotel for single women and families
- Self-catering 'dispersed' accommodation for single men and some smaller families
- Other asylum seekers living in the community
- Unaccompanied asylum-seeking children
- USCA Care Leavers
- People granted refugee status - employment rights follow along with Recourse to Public Funds

Examples of Recent Key Achievement for Brighton & Hove City of Sanctuary

Numbers of arrivals

- 703 Ukrainians in total arrived on the Homes for Ukraine Scheme of whom 257 remain in hosting arrangements. Circa 100 households have been helped into their own tenancies.
- 37 Afghan Households/168 people welcomed to the city on Afghan resettlement programmes, including many large families. This includes 87 children. 10 of these are in council owned properties, purchased with govt. grant for this purpose
- The council supports local Hong Kong community group which is serving potentially 902 Hong Kong British Nationals (Overseas) across B&H.
- 47 Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking children accommodated and 133 care - experienced young people supported who have been through the asylum system

Enabling Successful Welcome and Integration

- Ongoing and close multi-agency co-ordination to promote the wellbeing of asylum seekers in the contingency hotel and dispersal accommodation
- £3.5 million 3+2 year contract with local charity Voices in Exile for casework support, English language and employment support
- Refugee and Migrant housing pathway comprising homelessness prevention and private rented sector scheme.
- Support for the community and voluntary sector through convening quarterly Refugee & Migrant Forum meetings in person in town hall (since mid 1990s) and funding Sanctuary on Sea group and others.
- Ukraine Impact Day attended by circa 90 delegates

Key Challenges and Opportunities for Brighton & Hove City of Sanctuary

- Rapidly changing, complex policy and funding environment, with different funding rules for different migration programmes
- Shortage of affordable accommodation for move on from asylum system, Homes for Ukraine guests, and for new Afghan households
- Long stays in contingency hotels for asylum seekers (including children)
- Lack of immigration legal advice
- Historically low numbers of asylum seekers dispersed to the city mean there is no physical presence of larger national refugee agencies in the local area

However

- Local community and voluntary sector made up of small local organisations is dedicated, agile, inventive and expert in their field
- This includes local community groups run by refugees who support own communities e.g. Hong Kongers, Ukrainians, Syrians, Sudanese
- National academic migration expertise on our doorstep in our local universities

Draft Sanctuary Action Plan has four key areas of focus

Draft comprehensive strategic Sanctuary Action Plan is evidence based, place based and holistic, aligned with national COS methodology and co-designed with cross council officer group, CVS and people with lived experience. Significant ring-fenced resources now available - £1 million from resettlement and asylum seeker government grant funding

1. Housing and Basic Needs

- Secure housing pathways
- Clear support for those with No Recourse to Public Funds
- Improved access to health services
- Accessible legal advice

2. Community Integration

- Enhanced English language learning opportunities
- Mental health and wellbeing support
- Educational support for children and young people

3. Economic Empowerment

- Employment pathway development
- Business support initiatives
- Skills training programs

4. Organisational Excellence

- Migration-aware council services
- Strong voluntary sector partnerships

Accreditation as a Local Authority of Sanctuary

Partnership Approach:

- Collaboration with CVS including Sanctuary on Sea (SOS)
- Report from SOS in collaboration with University of Sussex: launched October 2024
- Engagement with lived experience representatives
- People, Overview and Scrutiny committee 14th January

Decision:

- Cabinet approval of action plan and allocation of funding 20th March
- Submit application in March 2025
- Accreditation panel meeting summer 2025 (tbc by national City of Sanctuary)

Monitoring and Evaluation:

- Clear outcomes framework
- Regular reporting to an oversight group
- Continuous improvement approach
- Risk assessment to be undertaken

Resource Implications:

- Fully funded from government migration programme
- Continuation/exit plan for 2 years time to be developed