

Post 16 Consultations Feedback

The consultations were promoted on a number of occasions throughout 6 week consultation period to:

- Existing parents and carers currently using home to school transport across all ages
- Known potential future users of the service
- Heads and SENCOs of schools and and Post 16 settings the service currently transports to and from
- The SEND Partnership Board
- The Adult LD Partnership Board
- Through PaCC social media channels

The survey link was recirculated following comments within the survey that the draft policy was hard to locate. This was added to the front page which could be open at the same time as the consultation questions. The consultation took the format of a save and return survey.

Responses

- 58 responses
- 39 parent carers
- 14 pupils
- 2 learning settings (Northbrooke and Brighton MET)
- 2 responding on behalf of a parent carer (T21 and Amaze)
- 1 unknown

Of which

- 35 respondents currently use HTST for a young person over 16 years of age
- 11 respondents currently use HTST for a young person under 16 years of age
- 3 are looking to use home to school transport
- 9 said N/A

2023-2024 post 16 Transport Policy Statement

Please note **no significant changes** were proposed for the **2023-2024** Policy Statement.

1. Do you think the Transport Policy Statement is clear?

- 40 say very or fairly clear – 69%
- 10 say not very clear
- 1 said not at all clear

Very or fairly clear comments included

- Good information
- Straightforward
- Set out in clear sections with good explanations. A lot of information has to be included so it will never be perfectly clear for all readers, but it is in plain English and avoids jargon.

Not very clear comments included

- The statements in the bullet pointed section are not so easy to understand for a person with dyslexia or difficulties understanding complex sentences.
- No one has ever spoken to me about transport - everything I have had to find out by asking lots of questions, and usually other parents are more helpful.
- The council will misrepresent any text to avoid assisting families with transport despite a clear need. Any text should be assessed legally. We have lost all confidence that the council will act in good faith
- I think it needs to be formatted a bit more clearly as there's a lot of new information and it's quite a big policy.
- Long and concerning for our young people
- There is a lot to read
- Evidence of LD from medical practitioner could incur cost. What does registration with LA mean in terms of providing evidence of LD? Is it sufficient to be known to social care? This needs to be made clearer in the guidance
- The Policy should have good links to all the other documents that show how the transport service runs, especially how the service is kept safe, as this is important information for families. It feels like there's not enough clarity around Independent Travel Training and who can get it, what it is and how it affects eligibility. It also sounds like a family's young person might be pushed into travelling independently, just at the time when they're dealing with loads of transition. The school won't be involved once the student is leaving (especially if it's a mainstream when they're too keen to wash their hands of our kids) and the new college won't yet know the student and what their abilities/triggers/risks are. I worry this is a gap that families could be pushed through, and if their school doesn't offer any support for independent travel training during their final year, then where will that training come from?
- I think the Low Income section(2024-25 policy) needs to make it clearer that this is relating to students without EHCP's who are applying for HTST on the basis of Low Income/distance. And maybe there can be some kind of diagram/critical path visual or 'distance map' link that helps people to understand if they meet the criteria around distance (which is measured differently by council versus using a 'real journey').

2. Is the new information about active travel initiatives useful? (*mindful that the transport policy is not just for post 16 pupils with SEND*)

- 35 very or fairly useful – 60%
- 13 not useful
- 10 don't know

Not useful comments included

- Not so useful because it's not clear
- Don't know what it is
- Does not apply in our circumstances
- Most of it is common sense
- it is just a way of taking more away from disabled children, young people
- Because you will change the process and it will discriminate
- Not relevant. You are shifting your role to signposting so this is a slippery slope

'Don't know' comments included

- I feel you are asking us to comment on something that has not been published yet
- What are these/ where are these
- Not sure

3. Is the information about the Disabled Person's bus pass useful?

- 34 very or fairly useful- 59%
- 11 not useful
- 9 don't know

Not useful comments included

- I'm not disabled
- Does not apply in our circumstances
- It is way too catagorical. My young person simply cannot use the bus.
- Not needed on a policy document.

'Don't know' comments included

- Not seen any information about this. It is not applicable in my son's case.

4. Is the additional information about the 16 to 19 Bursary Fund (also available to adult learners over 19) a helpful addition?

- 32 very or fairly useful –55%
- 8 not useful
- 1 not answered

- 17 Don't know

Not useful comments included

- Does not apply in our circumstances
- never been told about it before
- Someone still would need to travel with my daughter

'Don't know' comments included

- Never heard of it, and this is after asking and emailing the SEN team about funding.
- I got 'access denied' when I tried the links
- Don't use a bursary
- Not clear what for what would be used and how much

5. Is the new information about the Hardship Fund helpful?

- 28 very or fairly useful – 48%
- 10 not useful
- 16 don't know
- 4 not answered

Not useful comments included

- I don't see mention of the Hardship Fund.
- Does not apply in our circumstances
- you have to earn under a certain amount, but even working parents are suffering with the cost-of-living crisis
- It's not about hardship my daughter has disabilities and she can't travel alone its unsafe
- Most people that are in the cost-of-living crisis which aren't just low-income earners will not be able to afford to contribute, where does that leave their children?
- It is not clear who is eligible or how to receive it

'Don't know' comments included

- Again, asked (SEND) about this but no information given in response.
- What is included in the Hardship fund? I couldn't find this term.
- Don't use that
- The information regarding who would be eligible to get hardship fund is not clear.

6. Are the factors taken into consideration by the Home to School Transport Eligibility Panel when assessing applications for travel assistance for students of sixth form age clear?

- 33 very or fairly clear – 57%
- 15 not clear
- 5 don't know
- 5 not answered

Not clear comments included

- I cannot see that information.
- Mixed with other information
- Don't know what they are? It just says certain circumstances? Where are these listed, in simple straight forward language and words of less than 3 syllables? I don't have time as a 24/7 carer to read and interpret policy let alone try and find the right document you are referring to
- It's not clear, someone with disabilities can't travel alone and needs support
- Needs to be in bullet points
- What constitutes complex health needs?

'Don't know' comments included

- I don't know what information is taken into consideration.
- it is just another way of taking services away from young people

7. Is the new information on eligibility for travel assistance for adult learners (over 19 years of age) and the factors that will be taken into consideration by the Home to School Transport Eligibility Panel when assessing applications clear?

- 28 very or fairly clear – 48%
- 14 not clear
- 15 don't know
- 1 not answered

Not clear comments

- What is the difference between this question and the previous one? It may be clear to you, not sure it will be clear to people filling out this form.
- I cannot see that information.
- It's not clear how someone can get support with disabilities.
- It needs to be made much clearer that Post 19 Provision for eligible students is provided without charge, as there have been mix ups in the past. It also needs to be made much clearer how this Policy works for Post 19 Learners who are in adult education/ life skills settings not managed by the Council as historically there's been lots of confusion and charging from Social Care for some students but not others.

- This needs to be much clearer with a bolder and bigger separate heading and bullet points
- It should be statutory for ECHP and what that details, most of our young adults will need it up to 25
- Not clear about "funding from learning provider" or what is involved if the young person receives the Mobility Component of PIP

‘Don’t know’ comments included

- Don’t need that yet
- Not clear
- The idea of a travel buddy is positive but how will this translate to practice when there is a shortage of PA's generally. Will the costs of a travel buddy be covered? Who will realistically be available twice a day at the beginning and end of the college day to accompany young adults with LD? Practical barriers are likely. Also concerned that there is a presumption of family support with college transport. This is not something that is expected or required of a typically developing 19 year old - there are potentially additional pressures on SEND families arising from this - both practically and financially and impacts to working parents who are trying to sustain employment.

8. Does it help to have listed out what evidence is required in addition to applications for travel assistance?

- 39 very or fairly helpful – 67%
- 8 not helpful
- 11 don’t know

Not helpful comments included

- I cant see information
- Don’t know what that means
- No it’s not clear and as a local authority you are washing your hands of young adults with disabilities
- I don’t understand why evidence has to be submitted again, when my child, who is in receipt of transport, has needs that haven't changed.
- To be honest in the Post 19 space unless you have recently arrived to live in Brighton HST really ought to have a good idea already whether you need Transport and whether someone has an EHCP Plan for example

‘don’t know’ comments included

- Yes for numbers 1 and 2. I am cautious about number 3 which states: where the parent or carer is stated as being the primary carer or advocate for the adult learner, further evidence may be required regarding the support with transport (if any) they are able to provide and when. In the case of adult learners, if the council agrees transport is necessary it will be provided free of charge. My reservations about this again is the presumption of SEND families to support transport for their adult learner for the same reasons listed in Q7:

that this is not an expectation made of typically developing young adults; and there are additional financial and practical impacts to families. There are also equality impacts to working SEND families who may be prevailed upon to transport their adult learner.

9. Do you have any concerns about the service limitations section?

Noting there are no additional proposed service limitations in the 2023-24 policy.

- 34 very or fairly concerned – 59%
- 12 not concerned
- 11 don't know
- 1 not answered

10. How do you think the Transport Policy Statement could be improved?

- Impact of 2030 on our severely disabled CYP. From reading this, getting away from taxis why aren't we looking at using adapted Big Lemon buses that run on sustainable fuels?
- How about telling us clearly where it actually is before asking us to comment
- Stop having late buses and being packed.
- to include all students
- Make it clearer
- It's very clear
- Make it easy to find on the website
- There are a couple of typos so it needs a quick proofread. Can see the work that has gone into making it clear and expanding information about eligibility.
- Good to have a section about VPAs.
- Not potentially take away vital services that disabled young adults rely upon
- I think that it is yet another way to discriminate against disabled people, how about taking money away from the MP's who run this country, and see how they cope, it is absolutely ridiculous, the government is running its country into the ground.
- I am old enough to see that you will push this discriminatory nonsense through targeting the most vulnerable people in society. A disaster will happen. You will say it couldn't be expected and the unfortunate parents will pick up the pieces. Panel almost always WITHOUT ever meeting the young person or family make decisions which affect the whole family and it is almost always based on wishful thinking. Just because you messed up before now you try and claw money back. I am seething. But I guess no one will take any notice and you will plough on until you have to reverse your decision. I will draw your attention to closing cedar centre, patcham house etc. What a surprise they are needed after all. Every single time the disabled get a raw

deal and they are least able to fight. Services for young adults and disabled older people are pathetic.

- The service is working as it is. Why change it? Parents of SEND children are already exhausted and on the brink of collapse. This is just one more added stressor. The local SEND schools have done nothing to prepare students with SEND for any form of independent travel. Most SEND schools do not even take SEND children out into the community. These children will be going from the frying pan into the fire. It seems to me that there was no consideration of the potential impact of this change on children or their families. Are the SEND schools going to work towards preparing young people for independent travel? Are they going to, at the very least, take children out on the bus as a class? Will there be road-safety training awareness. What role is the LA going to play in ensuring young people are even able to travel safely? Parents with blue badges can pull right up to the school doors -- so can taxis -- but public buses cannot. This plan is not even feasible and should be scrapped. This is another potentially disastrous scheme, not unlike the scheme introduced in 2019, which had to be scrapped, with the taxpayers footing the bill for the council's shoddy decision making. This new policy needs to be aborted, as it is another recipe for disaster, with vulnerable, disabled young people, once again, having to pay the price.
- I'm concerned about the impact on families where there is a co-parenting 50-50 split of time. Often the 'other parent' is the working parent and if there is no transport available it can impact on their ability to hold down their job - which will create financial instability for the whole family. It would be terrible if families were influenced by the Policy to such an extent that the child saw less of their 'other/working' parent because there is no HTS available. When a child goes to their 'other' parent it can be so that the main parent can work/have respite. If there's a way to make some kind of concession offer, e.g. a pick up point that's already on the run route, maybe that might be helpful to families in this situation?
- I think it might be helpful to have some examples of when transport is/isn't offered, based on some of the trickier scenarios.
- I feel worried that we might be offered a PTB if we chose a college that meets our child's needs but it's further away, as a cost-saving measure. But the idea of then having to organise a reliable and safe transport feels like a really big pressure. If we were offered transport by choosing a less suitable in city college but had to take the PTB if we chose the 'better' college that fully meets need, then our son would miss out, based on the Council's financial decision. This seems really wrong given how little choice SEND college students have compared to non-disabled students.
- The ruling around only picking up from main address is challenging for 50:50 care, especially as we do transport to some respite settings. I still feel we need to be clearer on this whole murky area and ensure fairness, particularly as overnight respite is being reduced. If there is any chance of youngsters being able to go to respite with PA's or even family members then arrangements for the youngster to get to/from college shouldn't be an

additional barrier to respite arrangements. Perhaps this could be addressed more creatively such as being funded as part of a YP's Respite arrangements or a discretionary additional payment like a partial PTB to support the Carer/PA to get the YP to/from college if they can't link in to the existing home to college run that the YP is on. Otherwise the risk is that youngsters who have 'formal' arrangements such as Barnardos, or Tudor House/Drove Road are being treated preferentially. The Policy needs some work in terms of its setting out to make it easier on the eye, especially for people with literacy difficulties.

- Need to take into consideration how Children/YP allocated Respite will be dealt with. For Parent/Carers to have to pick up and deliver young people to/from respite services (given that respite is available in very limited cases with BHCC) may be impossible in many circumstances and would negate the benefits of respite. It would be giving with one hand and taking away with the other
- Although not relevant to our situation it will negatively impact co-parenting/ separated parents where only one address can be used for transport. Similarly, our cohort of young adult learners are likely to have short breaks and will need drop off and pick up from short break providers.
- There really ought to be something detailing how Young people receiving respite services supplied by Brighton and Hove will be catered for. It looks as if this facility is being removed if Transport can only take place from a single address (home) ever. It would reduce the value of "respite" which is exactly what it is supposed to be. This needs to be taken into consideration within the Policy.

2024- 2025 post 16 Transport Policy Statement

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the removal of wholly free hired transport (taxi's and minibuses) for learners of sixth form age with an EHCP?

- 39 disagree 67%
- 6 neither agree nor disagree
- 6 not sure
- 7 tend to agree (of which 3 are pupils and 3 are parents carers and 1 is not answered)

2. Which option is your preference

- No contribution - 37 respondents – 64%
- Option A – £600 contribution a year (less than 10% contribution towards actual costs) – 8 respondents (of which 1 is a learning provider, 3 pupils, and 4 parents carers)

- Option B - £473 contribution a year (circa 6% contribution towards actual costs)- 13 respondents (of which 1 is a learning provider, 8 parent carers, 2 are pupils, 1 not answered, 1 is a parent carer group)

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the removal of additional drop off and collection times for Post 16 learners?

- 33 disagree - 57%
- 7 agree (of which 2 are pupils, 1 is not answered, 4 are parent carers)
- 7 don't know
- 11 neither agree or disagree
- Both learning providers strongly disagreed.

Comments included:

- Further Education has a much more variable timetable and it will disadvantage vulnerable students to adopt this policy.
- This will only work if a safe environment can be provided for students to be whilst they are waiting for transport. If a student requires a 1-1 for education or medical needs, and is on a part time time table, if that timetable finishes at 2 for example, and they are not picked up until 4, how will they be kept safe during that time?
- For some students college is a stressful environment, sensory wise or socially. They are often much more able and happier studying at home.
- colleges usually operate differently from secondary schools and many students who go to college don't always start college at the start of the college day and finish at the end of the they and this proposal would affect many students negatively if they can not get the transport during the day. some people who don't need a medical professional need to use the transport service such as people with physical and sensory disabilities and learning difficulties and not including them for the transport during the day would also affect them negatively.
- I'm really worried that colleges will start to find excuses not to take a youngster like mine if they know they have to provide all day supervision as they're already at crisis point with staffing and resource issues. It's easy to say "Well that's not our problem as it's outside of our Government Guidance and statutory duties" but it could be really bad news for the students. There's a danger that they will be unstimulated at best and unsafe at worst and I know my son won't cope with a long college day like that. There's a real risk that this will have a bad knock on effect on his challenging behaviour, as well as reducing him to a hot mess by the time the weekend comes round. Burnout is real and he needs structure. College seems to be so different from what I've heard. If he's sitting around and it's in the wrong noisy environment, it's going to go badly wrong, and not only will he suffer and not learn, it will be more challenging at home dealing with the fallout.
- This is a tricky one. On the one hand, by only providing front and end transport it could 'force the hand' of the colleges to actually provide a full

day/week of education and life skills. But on the other hand, our community has long experienced closures and reduced access to college and further learning due to 'shortages' when college staff aren't available due to resource issues or sickness. It's always our YP that are the first to lose out as their staff get redeployed for the 'many'. So there is a very valid concern about what a fuller timetable would actually look like for young people who are on alternative learning and lifeskill pathways and whether they would receive the level of supervision consistently to ensure they are motivated, learning and not exposed to safeguarding issues. It's really important that there is feedback from colleges with respect to this proposal. Whilst HTST might say "not our issue" and yes, from 'your perspective' it isn't, there is a real worry that colleges might say "not our issue" either, once they've provided the 'bare minimum' 15 hours. We all know that there is a severe lack of PA staff who might be needed to ensure that the hours spent between classes are meaningful.

- Not all students complete a full educational day, this isn't their fault and they shouldn't be penalised for it
- this would discriminate young adult learners who are not in full time, 5 day week placements. Those students who do 16 hours a week will be left to their own devices - there are concerns about their vulnerability and also lack of educational/enrichment input when they will be left to their own devices on college campus. Many young adult learners are not able to do self-directed learning and there are also safety concerns that have not been addressed in this proposal.
- It would surprise me if the colleges were able to provide extra support to cover any time needed before pick up. I only agree with this if the colleges are able to do this, and also if allowances are made for students, who would find this very difficult for whatever reason.
- YP with SEND have a strong need for routine and reliability. They struggle with waiting and transitions. If they have to 'kill time' waiting for their transport this will cause huge distress and related behaviours. The pressure on parents to fill this gap is unfair - especially those without transport or working.
- EHCP are supposed to support outcomes, if the student will no longer have flexibility of drop off and collection there is a risk of unsupervised time at the college or other institution. How will time spent waiting for collection be managed, supervised, assessed for risk etc?
- This would be extremely stressful for young people with autism and social anxiety. If they are in college for 2 full days and 1 half day, it would cause a lot of anxiety for these students who find travel and social scenarios extremely difficult. This is likely to exacerbate their fears and could cause them to withdraw from education.
- Most courses for post 16 do not have a regular school day timetable and full time courses are often only 3 days a week. Colleges will need to ensure that there is adequate provision. Many young people really struggle with attendance due to their SEND - especially those with SEMH needs. It is vital that transport help support these students with attendance and the carefully

organised transition arrangements to help these young people. Such a proposal would really harm this particular cohort.

- We can see the potential value for money reasons for this as it makes it more possible for shared travel options. It also gives parent carers a more predictable timetable and more time without caring responsibilities. On the other hand we worry about what this will mean in practice for some students with SEND. Will colleges commit to offering support, safe spaces and positive activities for the full day? Is there a risk of some students becoming exhausted, getting into risky situations, dropping out or being excluded if they can't cope? Will there be the possibility of discretionary arrangements in exceptional cases? There are issues about the availability of suitable provision locally for many students with SEND. They are so much more likely than other students to go to a college or sixth form that is far from their home. They are not in a position to pop home part way through the day and may not have the skills to study and socialise independently during gaps in their timetable.

Comments made about paying an annual contribution (maximum £600 a year) towards taxi and minibus costs provided by the council

- you do not understand that parents work, they cannot always drop their child off at respite etc, you are living in another world
- How can anyone agree with these provisions? What moral compass do you follow? I am not sure you possess one at all.
- This policy is, at best, ill-conceived not taking into consideration the drastic impact it will have on the most vulnerable members of our society who cannot speak out and advocate for themselves. At worst it is shameful and worthy of scorn.
- This is outrageous, I can't afford this payment and my daughter can't get a bus
- My family cannot afford to pay £600 a month! We are in a recession, and food prices are at an all-time high. Most families are struggling to make ends meet as it is, without adding an outrageous £600 travel fee to the bill. Is the council aware of how much more expensive it is to raise a disabled child? It is well documented, so perhaps some more research is needed. This appears to be a case of extremely gross negligence on the council's part. The scheme is unfair and unfairly impacts upon the lives of the disabled. Any change is going to be difficult to negotiate, especially for disabled children with autism. The difficulties those with autism face with travel are immense, as most do not have sensory systems that can enable them to cope with a range of environmental stimuli, which includes loud noise, noxious smells, close proximity (touch), etc. Many of the autistic children with complex autism and SLD will never be able to use public transport and if they are able, the use of the transport must be used during off-peak hours, when there are fewer people on the bus and seating is assured, preferably in the disabled seats, though these are never a given. Even with the seats, there is all of the

external stimuli and all of the potential triggers, making the situation ripe for a potential meltdown, resulting in serious injury. The policy needs to be scrapped altogether, as it is completely untenable. Thank you.

- as always taking money away from the group that need it most
- The duty of this government who we pay is to serve the people as best it can, especially its most at risk and disabled who cannot advocate for themselves like my son. I will do just that and after initiating even higher taxes on the citizenry we the carers of the most disabled in our community are being asked to pay for home to school transport is unconscionable. Our families are at the most financial risk in raising our children with special needs. Many have no financial, physical, or moral support from extended families and many are single parent households. Many families need to provide round the clock attention to our SEN sons and daughters and after a tax hike we are being asked to pay for appropriate transport for our children for safe passage to school? This is horrific--this should be taken care of as a baseline for students to get to school safely and appropriately. This is truly amoral. No other way to describe
- Just offer free transport for all disabled young learners who require.
- Free Transport for all Post 16's with EHCP'S
- Whilst appreciating that there are limited funds for LAs. Families with SEND students are financially impacted far more than non send families. Brighton and Hove is becoming a less inclusive city as it is and policies such as these add another layer to the evidenced increased financial burden for families, and reduced opportunities and poorer outcomes for young people. Please consider fairness within this context, and look to find the money from a fund that affects all not a minority group.
- At £50pcm I would not use the transport option. As parent carers we already support our children that have SEND at specialist schools with money for activities. This is taking its toll on us. The criteria is onerous and would force us as a family into poverty so we will be missing meals, cutting all energy to afford it.
- 16+ education in B&H is appalling so families are forced to look elsewhere for the most basic educational provision. You are now trying to pull transport support which will prevent access. You should be ashamed of yourselves. It is criminal how you as a council are harming children and families.
- Stop cutting up vital services at the expense of others under the pretense of a consultation and then present it as if we the people are in some agreement with your poor decision making.
- i think that it is yet another way to discriminate against disabled people, how about taking money away from the MP's who run this country, and see how they cope, it is absolutely ridiculous, the government is running is country into the ground.
- Not potentially take away vital services that disabled young adults rely upon
- My daughter has learning disabilities and would not be able to get to sixth form without support and a taxi
- My son cannot travel independently

- There are no viable alternatives for my child, who is extremely complex and nonverbal.
- Stop taking away from those who need support the most, even if it is means tested
- What about the families that don't fall into low income but are so tight for money each month something like this will break them?
- If my son qualifies for a free disabled bus pass but can't travel independently to take advantage of this why would I need to pay for htst
- Re the charging - It's not parent's responsibility to 'chip in' on the costs of transporting college students who can't travel independently, when the Council should instead be ensuring that the Budget can support the children throughout their whole education when they have SEND. The odds are so stacked against our kids, this feels like yet another hurdle to have to leap. I'm really worried that this will force us into choosing a setting that's just not right for our child, purely based on the Council wanting to charge. The Law says that councils must actively support choice for 16/17 year olds. This is doing the opposite and reducing the limited choices we already have. The idea that 'not Low Income' families are financially stable has long gone out of the window, but especially since COVID and the worsening Cost of Living Crisis. This is NOT the time to introduce a contribution. The fact that it's just a small proportion of the total average cost is irrelevant. £600 or even £473 is simply money we don't have as a family - this would force us to fall back on credit or family loan - which is humiliating. If our child wasn't disabled he could go to a college in the city and he could walk or cycle. But we don't have that 'luxury' of 'Active Travel'. So either we have to pay or I have to take on even more caring responsibility which stops me ever being able to improve my work prospects as I would at best be able to work 11-2 - just 4 hours every day, and term time only. And those jobs just don't pay the bills, even if they're available. There is also some guidance, I'm sure, that says that if you would get the travel free at 19, then the Local Authority should also provide it free for the 16-18 years as a 'best practice'. So what do we want from our Council? We need best practice not more penalising charges when it already costs so much more to raise our child, and the DLA/PIP doesn't cover that gap or make up for the lost earnings across the whole summer, when our child can't go to holiday club for more than 2 sessions across 6 weeks. So while this is a Policy in isolation, you really need to look at the big picture for the families that these proposed changes would affect. I think these are really retrograde steps and not in keeping with our city values that promote achievement and inclusion for all.
- IF charging was to be introduced, we feel it would need to be AFTER an improvement in the in city Post 16 and Post 19 provision. If it's introduced before that happens (if it ever does) then there is a real likelihood that the HTST will negatively affect Parents and Young People's choice of Post 16 provision as they'll be too nervous to choose the right setting if it's outside of the city, for fear that they won't receive transport and cant manage to transport themselves. There is also the question of what's appropriate for our young people's growing independence. For some young people with Down

Syndrome it would feel a retrograde step in their Transition to Adulthood to suddenly default to Parent taking them to college when other neurotypical teenagers travel independently. For some of our young people, traveling on HTST IS independence and they need that additional safety net for a few more years. Being asked to organise transport ourselves with a PTB is not for the faint hearted, and families have concerns that they won't be able to find a suitable taxi driver who they feel they can fully trust if they're organising it themselves. And for some parent carers, the 'college years' are the time when they begin to feel like they can reskill themselves or get back to some part time work that may be manageable on a small scale. But if faced with additional carer hours out of their day, this could prevent them being able to work/get back to work. If a family has 2 students with SEND then the potential charging starts to feel very expensive for them. Families don't receive 'extra Carer's Allowance'. What would they do if their young people were in different settings and they couldn't afford to contribute to both HTST provisions? We know there are very few families who aren't being severely affected by the rising costs of living, and this is disproportionately affecting SEND families above and beyond. This feels like a terrible time to be introducing charging. T21 Brighton & Hove would like to see this issue resolved by in depth discussions around Budget and Forecasting and to see the Council uphold 'best practice' set out in government guidance to Local Authorities and keep Post 16 transport free of charge, which is the best way to promote healthier and better outcomes for young people and for the family unit.

- I am concerned about charging. There are many families who's income is just short of the threshold for WFTC or UC, but still have a low income. Charging must look at other issues families face in the city such as the high cost of housing and the current state of the economy (energy and food prices in particular). There is going to be a disadvantaged group here struggling to pay transport contributions.

At Amaze we are very conscious of the financial challenges facing families these days. Although free transport is allowed for families on very low incomes, the reality of the additional costs for households with a disabled member and the very high housing costs in the city mean that there are many more families not on low income benefits who are only just about managing to keep out of debt. DLA or PIP previously used for extras is now routinely used to prop up the most basic household costs. Any extra cost at a time when all bills are rising is a concern. Will they routinely be able to get bursaries to cover the £600 or £473? As a general point we think it is important to remember that students with SEND may have to attend 16-18 settings that are not close to home because there is not a suitable course or provision to meet their needs. This is very often not a question of choice. Their journeys may be longer and more complicated in addition to them having needs that affect their ability to travel. Parents caring for young people with SEND are having to give levels of support to their teenager that other parents would not expect to give at that age. They have been doing this for years by the time

their child reaches college age. Adding to their practical and financial burdens at this time is very negative.

4. We welcome your views on our equality analysis and if you think there is anything we should consider relating to equality and diversity

- You expect families to help with those that have disabilities but actually its the law that children have to go to school until they are 18 and therefore its not a choice for parents its the law. Therefore you must provide transport and assistance for those families with disabilities that need it. The equalities act protects age discrimination and those pupils between 16-18 although not covered by the act, the law states that they have to be educated and therefore you must provide support to get children to school if they are unable to.,I would not use HTST if this was enforced.
- As a single parent, I am the sole provider and carer for my young person. I have had to go freelance as I believe many in my position do to be flexible enough to accommodate all the medical appointments. My income varies as a result - sometimes it is zero. I know will not be able to either afford the time or money to take my son to his educational establishment. It took so long to find somewhere that met his needs and interests and my major concern is that this could be taken away from him if the policy changes. If he is not in education, I will not be in work at all.
- Further education provides disadvantaged young people the opportunity better education and social mobility. By restricting the provision of transport you will undermine this chance to many vulnerable young people. Courses in Further Education have variable timetables that do not adhere to the school hours. Some courses, such as Theatre have hours that change when preparing for a performance. There are so many social and educational opportunities in being part of this, but your proposals could make it impossible for students to participate. In my experience, giving full transport options to these learners has allowed them to develop into confident adults who are able to enter the work force, but your proposals do not take into consideration how vulnerable many of these young people are.
- This will significantly impact the ability of parents/carers to continue working.
- I have no clue what it is talking about
- Don't effectively remove this vital service for disabled young adults. Save your money elsewhere.
- Lack of the equalities act has been taken into account and is unfair
- absolutely stupid policy and discrimination at its finest

5. Please add any other relevant comments that you may wish to make on the proposed Post 16 policy statements.

- The individuals who drafted this amoral set of "proposals" need real sensitivity training. This line of questions is completely free of even the most basic ethical concerns.
- I think it's wrong that government don't provide for 16+ transport for free. Lets change the bill.
- Absolute disgrace. You're enforcing a massively impactful decision on one of the most disadvantaged groups in the whole of the city. There are other places you can save money as a council. How about getting rid of inept staff? How about getting rid of all the inept and useless and dangerous managers, just leaving the good ones? That would save you a flippin fortune.
- I hope it will be appreciated that some students are just not able to use public transport, and that these students - especially those with physical disabilities - already have a very limited number of education choices as a result. Reducing transport provision for these students will effectively be denying them access to further education.
- It saddens me that yet again, parent carers are made to fight to get their children with additional needs, the education that they're entitled to without having to make constant compromises and sacrifices. I dislike the idea that all of a sudden when our children turn 16 they should be able to get on public transport just like any other child. There is a pressure put on parents to put their children into unsafe situations because they feel guilty or worried that they won't get the support they need. Our children are vulnerable.
- Having 2 SEND children covering these ages, these new T&Cs and what is proposed is worrying indeed. And with benefits decreasing, services decreasing and more being taken away, all I see is this community being asked to pay and do more. Not fair. Not equitable. Discriminatory.
- I am concerned that we have students with EHCPs who will not be able to access College without transport. They are unable to travel independently and parents do not have the time/money to accompany or pay to bring them. This would mean that our most vulnerable students will not be able to attend College.
- People in education deserve a discount for buses.
- How about some clear information that you've communicated in a way that you've thought about your target audience? What difference will the answers collated actually make, or is it yet more stuff that will get swallowed up in the ether, that we've put time and energy into completing but is pointless because nothing changes anyway?
- The role of home to school transport is about much more than getting a young person from A to B. It provides an opportunity for a window of independence in a safe and secure environment and a vital transition from one setting to another, which can make all the difference to that young person's day and experience. The sense of well-being it gives to the young person and their family is so important, irrespective of distance or ability to fulfil it themselves.

- Yes, I have plenty to say, services including social care are not fit for purpose, you are discriminating as always against the majority of young people who need to use these services
- This is outrageous, my daughter has disabilities and cannot walk down the street on her own, let alone get on 2 buses and walk into college without support. It's your legal duty to provide support.
- It's of huge concern for the future of our young people, this coming year is good then what? have that hanging over families is super stressful
- Stop making parents jump through hoops all the time. It's not fair. Stop with the hidden clauses and adding to our burdens.
- I'm really concerned about the proposed changes for September 2024 because if the transport service is discontinued, I don't know how I would get to college. I'm blind and although I get orientation training to be able to navigate around independently in the future, I'm currently not able to get to college independently and I'm not sure when I will be able to do this. Having a transport to college helped me a lot because it makes me more independent as I can go to college without needing an additional person and support. The road to college is not also safe for me as there are lots of crossings which would make the journey dangerous for me and there is not a direct transport to my college as well, so if I can't get a transport to college I would not be able to go to college independently and I would need an additional person to take me to college. My mum also works in the day and she wouldn't be able to take me to college. I'm not also sure if we can afford the extra contribution to transport. I'm also concerned about having a transport at the beginning and end of the day because pupil's timetables at college is very different from secondary school and I don't always start at the beginning of the day or finish at the end of the college day, so not being able to have a transport during the day would also affect me negatively as I would need to find a different alternative to travel to college.
- It isn't fair. It reduces our choice of the best setting for our children, undermines all the work with transport and transition to date, will make life more difficult for the learner, their carers, their teachers. Surely it will disrupt lessons etc if students are turning up at adhoc times due to transport issues. At least with taxi services the arrival times are mostly consistent for all students.
- If you hadn't wasted so much money in the last few years "improving" the service this would probably be unnecessary. You know what I'm talking about. Parent/Carers confidence in the Council to help support and protect the most vulnerable is I should think at an all time low in any case and this will only make things worse.