

Residents Questions, 2- star *NORTH* Area

N2.1 - Parking and road/access issues in the North Area

Area in city	North
Star rating	2 star/ Local area issue
Date question raised	26 th June 2025
Week of Area Panel	8 th September 2025
Name of officer responding	Hannah Barker
Officer job title	Senior Community Engagement Officer
Contact Details	Hannah.barker@brighton-hove.gov.uk

N2.1 Question

Issue	There are various ongoing problems concerning roads and parking across the North area, which have been reported but remain unresolved.
Background	Residents raised issues around road conditions and parking at the last two residents' only meetings (3rd April 2025 and 28th November 2024), which are ongoing. Examples of issues are: - Cars parked across dropped kerbs - Poor parking causing obstructions to pedestrians & other road users - Potholes - Dangerous road conditions (manhole covers left open etc) Donna noted that a lot of the problems raised are the responsibility of Highways. If residents spot vehicles parked across dropped kerbs or other vehicles parked where they shouldn't, they should report this in the first instance to: Parking enforcement rapid response: 03456 035 469 Or online: www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/parking/report-vehicle-parked-where-it-should-not-be.
Request or Question	The meeting agreed that they would like to invite both a representative from Highways and Cllr Trevor Muten (Head of Transport and Sustainability) to the next North Area Panel meeting so that issues can be raised and discussed jointly.

N2.1 Response

Response
Cllr Muten has accepted the invitation from the Community Engagement Team to attend to provide a verbal update.

Residents Questions, 3-star *NORTH* Area

N3.1 - High-rise blocks being demolished

Area in city	North
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	26 th June 2025
Week of Area Panel	8 th September 2025
Name of officer responding	Harry Williams
Officer job title	Director Housing Peoples Services
Contact Details	Harry.Williams @brighton-hove.gov.uk

N3.1 Question

Issue	Residents are concerned about how residents in these blocks are going to be re-housed and the Council's lack of transparency around the safety of these blocks.
Background	Residents were informed that some of the high-rise blocks in the city are being pulled down following reports that these have now been deemed unsafe. People (3000+) living in those blocks will need to be re-housed. There are concerns around how and when this is going to happen, and whether people currently on the waiting list for tenancies are going to be affected. There was also concern around why these high-rise blocks are now being considered unsafe, when residents were previously told that they were safe.
Request or Question	• Why did the Council previously claim that these high-rise blocks were safe, and are now saying they aren't? • How will the Council re-house people living in those blocks? What is the plan and timescale for this? • Will people being re-housed take priority over people on the waiting list for tenancies?

N3.1 Response

Response
Why did the Council previously claim that these high-rise blocks were safe, and are now saying they aren't? Resident safety is our priority. We have been in regular contact with residents living in the 8 council-owned large panel system (LPS) high-rise blocks in the city since July 2024

with important building safety updates following a series of structural surveys. The 8 LPS blocks are:

- Dudeney Lodge and Nettleton Court in Hollingdean
- Falcon Court, Heron Court, Kestrel Court, Kingfisher Court and Swallow Court in north Whitehawk
- St James's House in Kemptown

We have acted on the advice of our independent consultants to secure the safety of the buildings for all occupiers. We have put in place and regularly reported upon additional safety measures, including:

- A temporary ban on e-bikes and e-scooters in all areas of the building.
- Alternative e-bike and e-scooter storage with an electrical supply has been installed away from all 8 blocks.
- Monitored CCTV 16 hours a day with onsite security providing eight-hour security for the 8 LPS blocks to mitigate the risk of banned items being taken into the building.
- Chapel Street car park, under St James House remains closed.
- A temporary halt to all vehicles parking underneath the building remains in place for the foreseeable future at the North Whitehawk blocks.
- A temporary suspension of the use of the garages behind Nettleton Court and Dudeney Lodge remains in place for the foreseeable future.
- Temporary heating plant has been put in place for St James House to allow for the relocation of the communal heating supply from under the block in the car park.
- Removal of refuse / bin storage areas from under the blocks and regular clearance of bulk waste.
- Resources are now in place to provide 7 day a week, 9am to 5pm floor walks to support fire health & safety and to maintain clear common ways, including entrance and exit ways across all 8 blocks. Housing Estates Service staff are undertaking these floor walks during the week. SES Security at weekends.
- As a precautionary measure, waking watch is also in place for St James House, Nettleton Court & Dudeney Lodge.
- All building safety measures are kept under regular review.

Our approach to ensure the safety of our homes in the blocks has been set out at regular resident meetings, in newsletters, Housing Area Panel Updates and Cabinet reports. More details can be found on the Council's website, including access to the survey information: [Large panel system high-rise building safety](#)

We carried out a detailed review of the future options for the buildings, and a report approved at the council's Cabinet on 17 July recommended that we develop plans to regenerate the sites.

The other options looked at were to strengthen and refurbish the buildings. However, our research found that strengthening work would only guarantee the building's safety for a further 20 years and requires significant investment. It would also be seriously disruptive for residents.

The Cabinet report sets out that strengthening the building is not seen as a viable or affordable long-term solution for residents or for the council.

How will the Council re-house people living in those blocks? What is the plan and timescale for this?

We understand that residents moving out of the homes that they have created is unsettling, and that the buildings have happy memories, in some cases for 3 generations of families.

We are committed to working with residents every step of the way throughout the rehousing process. Our priority is to provide support every step of the way and to do everything we can to help tenants remain within their local communities, where they want to.

Through our newly established Resident Advisory Groups, we are developing a Local Lettings Plan and Rehousing Policy, which will outline how we intend to help residents living in the LPS blocks to move, and the support available to them.

Consultation on these plans, which will be informed by the Resident Advisory Groups, will begin later this autumn. Residents of the LPS blocks—as well as those from across the city—will be invited to share their views and help shape the final approach.

Rehousing will begin in the new year and will be carried out in phases:

- St James House will be prioritised first
- Followed by Nettleton Court and Dudeney Lodge
- Then North Whitehawk

This process will take several years to complete. In the meantime, residents who wish to begin the process sooner can apply to join the Housing Register and will be placed in Band B: Management Transfer, if not already on the Housing Register.

Will people being re-housed take priority over people on the waiting list for tenancies?

The Local Lettings Plan will outline the rehousing priorities for residents of the LPS blocks. It will consider all available options, including the potential to award the highest level of priority and management transfer.

We recognise that this approach may have wider implications for the Housing Register and for those currently waiting to access social housing. The upcoming consultation will provide an opportunity for all residents to share their views—including any concerns about how the proposed plan may affect them.

N3.2 - Allocations policy

Area in city	North
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue

Date question raised	26 th June 2025
Week of Area Panel	8 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15 th August 2025
Name of officer responding	Harry Williams
Officer job title	Director of Housing People Services
Contact Details	Harry.williams@brighton-hove.gov.uk

N3.2 Question

Issue	Residents have deep concerns about the way in which people are being allocated tenancies, particularly those who have a history of anti-social or criminal behaviour, those with drug/alcohol issues and/or those with serious mental health issues. The current allocations system is having a detrimental impact on residents' day-to-day lives, and in extreme cases, putting their lives in danger.
Background	There have been various and ongoing reports of how tenants' lives are being severely and negatively impacted by the behaviour and actions of other tenants. Some of the concerns raised were around anti-social behaviour (arson, harassment, bullying, threats of violence, drug use, drug dealing, noise), while other concerns were around the lack of support for people with serious mental health issues. Residents expressed frustration that the Council's allocation policy doesn't take into consideration existing residents and the demographics of a block or neighbourhood before housing people with known issues next to them (e.g. housing people with a history of ASB next to a family with children or elderly people). Furthermore, when issues are reported or complaints are made, tenants are made to feel like they're exaggerating the issue, that they're 'just complainers' and are subsequently treated in ways that makes them feel like they have been black-listed or fobbed off. Sylvan Hall recently experienced a fire in their blocks, suspected to be arson. The tenant who is suspected to have set the fire in their flat has apparently done this before. She has also threatened to kill the tenants in the flat below. The tenant's history would have been known by Allocations, and yet the tenant was re-housed at Sylvan Hall, endangering the lives of existing tenants. This tenant has now been re-housed, in spite of having caused vast amounts of damage to their flat. Sylvan Hall resident also noted that fire safety guidance signs went up only <i>after</i> the fire happened. Moulsecoomb residents reported that a particular tenant has been very aggressive towards them: he has threatened them, used their XL Bully dogs to intimidate them, and has threatened a young female resident with

	rape. While reports have been made to the Council and the Police, nothing has changed. It was noted that, after the threat of rape was reported to the Police, it took the Police 2 weeks to follow this up. Another Moulsecoomb resident reported living next to another tenant who smokes drugs regularly, which then permeates into her flat. Coldean residents reported that a vulnerable tenant had recently killed themselves, and pointed out the lack of support around people who have mental health issues.
Request or Question	• Re the tenant who set fire to her flat at Sylvan Hall: if the Council had access to records of this tenant's previous behaviour/criminal activity (ie arson), why did they re-house her in another block of flats? Given she has repeatedly caused damage to Council property, why has she been re-housed again? • Does the Council not have a duty of care to existing residents of an area/block when allocating tenancies to people with known problems and/or history of certain behaviour? Under the current allocations process, is any consideration given as to the impact a new tenant with a known history of particular behaviours will have on existing tenants? • Request that the allocations process be reviewed in light of the above issues, and for residents & Residents Associations to be involved in this review.

N3.2 Response

Response
We understand the strength of feeling within our communities regarding housing allocations, particularly in cases involving serious anti-social behaviour or criminal activity. We want to assure residents that we take all reports of anti-social behaviour (ASB) extremely seriously, as well as our responsibilities to support vulnerable residents. Whilst we are unable to discuss the individual circumstances around Sylvan Hall, we do recognise the impact that the fire has had on the community. We are sorry to hear about the distress this has caused and acknowledge the concerns raised. Our Housing Allocations Policy includes robust checks to prevent the allocation of council housing to individuals with a known history of anti-social behaviour. Households are assessed on a range of criteria, including any criminal convictions or tenancy breaches. Where there is evidence of serious ASB, including drug-related offences, households may be deemed ineligible for housing. In addition, tenants are required to comply with the conditions of their tenancy agreement, which includes a clear expectation to behave respectfully and lawfully. Breaches of these conditions - such as harassment, nuisance, or criminal activity - can lead to enforcement action. New council tenants are typically granted an introductory tenancy for the first 12 months. This probationary period allows us to monitor behaviour and, where necessary, extend the introductory phase or begin enforcement action if serious breaches occur.

Our Housing Allocations Policy also allows for sensitive lets, which enable the Council to consider the impact of placing a tenant in a particular location - especially where there may be vulnerabilities or risks to existing residents. We recognise the need to create safe and sustainable communities, while balancing the needs of households waiting to access social housing in the city. Sensitive lets are one of the tools we use to mitigate potential issues.

Our Housing Allocations Policy was recently reviewed, and public consultation played a key role in shaping the most recent update. However, we recognise the strength of feeling within our communities and will review our procedures for checks on individuals with a history of anti-social behaviour and tenancy breaches. We will involve Area Panels in this review to ensure that resident voices are heard.

N3.2 Action

Action	Review the lettings process. Invite Area Panel tenant reps to be part of this.
Start date	
End date	

Residents Questions – 3-star, CENTRAL EAST WEST Areas

C3.1 - Protection of vulnerable residents

Area in city	Central
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	3 rd July 2025
Week of Area Panel	16 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15.08.25
Name of officer responding	John Evans
Officer job title	Housing Manager Central
Contact Details	John.evans@brighton-hove.gov.uk

C3.1 Question

Issue	Vulnerable residents are not being protected by the Council
--------------	---

Background	The Council is not taking into account the safety of vulnerable residents when allocating flats and is failing in its duty to provide a safe home. In Ardingly Court a convicted drug dealer has been housed in the same block as vulnerable people. By doing this the Council has made the homes of these tenants unsafe. The police have conducted several massive raids, causing fear and concern in the whole of Ardingly Court. Residents are frightened to go out in the garden, especially once it is dark, and will only do so if they are sure the perpetrator is not about. Some residents are worried about reprisals if they complain or speak to the police. There are a lot of vulnerable residents at Ardingly Court and this is affecting the safety and security of everyone, but particularly those living closest to the perpetrator. Residents feel they have been left to live in a dangerous and frightening situation, with no support and no options. It was noted that although this example is specific to Ardingly Court this is a problem experienced across the city.
Request or Question	What action will the Council take to make sure their vulnerable residents can live safely and securely in their homes?

C3.1 Response

Response
Please see response to C3.2 in relation to allocation of housing. We understand that many residents at Ardingly Court have been deeply affected by ongoing antisocial behaviour, particularly the drug-related disorder linked to one of the properties. This has understandably caused distress, fear, and frustration within the community. The case is currently being managed by our Complex Case Team, and the caseworker is working closely with the police and other professionals to gather the evidence needed to apply for a Closure Order or consider other enforcement options. We know that some residents have been reluctant to engage, and we want to acknowledge how difficult it can be to speak out—especially when there are concerns about safety or reprisals. At a recent multi-agency meeting, attended by housing staff, police, community engagement, and other teams, it was agreed that: The caseworker will reach out again to residents to see who may feel safe and supported enough to provide a witness statement or keep a diary of incidents. The police will increase patrols in the area and share updates with the caseworker to help build a stronger case.

CCTV and police reports will form part of the evidence

If you are concerned about speaking up, please know that we will do everything we can to protect your identity. Your experiences are vital in helping us take meaningful action.

These cases can take longer than we would like to resolve. The legal framework we must follow is complex, and the courts are currently experiencing delays. We are committed to seeing this through and to making Ardingly Court a safer and more peaceful place to live.

If you have any concerns or would like to speak confidentially with the caseworker, please don't hesitate to reach out.

C3.1 Action

Action	Continue with the case work
Start date	Ongoing
End date	

C3.2 - Firmer action on who gets a secure tenancy

Area in city	Central
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	3 rd July 2025
Week of Area Panel	16 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15.08.25
Name of officer responding	Harry Williams
Officer job title	Director of Housing People Services
Contact Details	Harry.williams@brighton-hove.gov.uk

C3.2 Question

Issue	Secure tenancies are being given to people when they should not be.
Background	Secure tenancies are being given to known drug-dealers, regardless of the problems this will pose for the local community. Secure tenancies are also given to people when they break the terms of their tenancy during the first twelve months, while on an introductory tenancy. This seems to remove the purpose of an introductory tenancy. This issue of drug-dealers being given secure tenancies was first raised some time ago, and residents are still waiting for an answer.

Request or Question	• Why are people given secure tenancies even when they have broken the terms of their tenancy or are involved in crimes such as drug-dealing? • Residents want firmer action to be taken. Can the Council commit to ensuring that secure tenancies are not given out in the above circumstances?
----------------------------	---

C3.2 Response

Response
Thank you for continuing to raise these concerns. We recognise that this issue has been brought up by residents over a long period of time, and we understand the frustration and worry it causes when it feels like little progress has been made. The allocation of council housing is a responsibility we take seriously. Our Housing Allocations Policy includes safeguards to prevent tenancies being granted to individuals where there is a known ongoing risk of anti-social behaviour or criminal activity. Applicants are assessed on a range of criteria, including previous convictions and tenancy breaches. Where there is clear evidence of serious misconduct—such as drug-related offences—individuals may be deemed ineligible. However, a history of offending does not automatically exclude someone from being allocated a tenancy, instead, we assess the risk of reoffending and consider the individual's circumstances. Introductory tenancies are used for the first 12 months of most new council tenancies. This period allows us to monitor whether tenants are able to uphold the terms of their tenancy agreement. If serious breaches occur, we can extend the introductory period. However, to take enforcement action where the tenancy is breached, we must follow the same legal process as we would for secure tenancies. This involves gathering evidence and demonstrating we have tried to work with the perpetrator to change their behaviour. We know that residents are aware of these policies, and that concern often stems from cases where it appears they haven't been enforced or communicated clearly. We acknowledge that we need to do better in explaining what action is being taken in specific situations. To help with this, we are working to improve how we share information, including anonymised case studies that show how we respond to breaches and support communities. We are committed to ensuring our processes are fair, transparent, and responsive. We must balance the need to protect communities with our responsibility to help people find safe and stable homes. We are strengthening our partnerships with the police and other agencies through local Cluster Meetings in areas most affected by anti-social behaviour, and we are reviewing how tenancy breaches are monitored and acted upon. We appreciate your persistence in raising these issues and will continue working to improve how we respond and communicate with residents.

C3.3 - Restructuring of resident engagement

Area in city	Central
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	3 rd July 2025
Week of Area Panel	15 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15 th August 2025
Name of officer responding	Sam Nolan
Officer job title	Community Engagement Manager
Contact Details	sam.nolan@brighton-hove.gov.uk

C3.3 Question

Issue	Central residents are concerned that a restructuring of Residents' Engagement is taking place without proper discussion and involvement of residents.
Background	A presentation on an 'engagement menu' was given at the last Involvement & Empowerment meeting. This was done over Zoom from a noisy café and was difficult to follow. Central residents took from it that they were being told this is what will happen, rather than being invited to look at the way things are working and think about improvements. There was particular concern about the future of the Home Group and the Involvement and Empowerment group. These are groups which Central residents think are useful - providing a direct way to give input and scrutiny, talk to officers, contribute to policy and reviews. The meetings of these groups have been increasingly infrequent, and residents' questions about plans for future meetings have gone unanswered. This has been understood as deliberately allowing them to drift and then shutting them down with no consultation or discussion.
Request or Question	• Ask for the Home Group and Involvement and Empowerment Group to be reinstated. • Ask for agreement that any changes to Resident Engagement will start with discussions with residents, and no proposals put forward until this has been done.

C3.3 Response

Response
Thank you for raising these important concerns about resident engagement. I understand your frustration about feeling that changes are happening without proper consultation, and I want to address this directly.

First, let me be clear - we should have done better in how we've talked to you about our engagement review. The presentation you mentioned wasn't meant to be a final decision about what will happen, but rather the start of a conversation. However, I know that wasn't clear at the time, and the circumstances made it difficult to have the proper discussion you deserved.

Your concerns about the Home Group and Involvement & Empowerment group are valid. These groups have provided valuable input over the years, and we appreciate the time and effort that members like yourselves have put in. The irregular meetings you've experienced weren't meant as a way to shut down these groups - they've been affected by our team being stretched and other urgent matters like building safety taking priority.

However, we do need to be honest about the bigger picture. While these groups work well for their current members, we're not hearing from the wide range of voices we need to across our 13,000+ households. Our engagement currently reaches only a small number of tenants, with very few younger residents, disabled tenants, Black and minority ethnic communities, and many others whose experiences and needs may be different.

The engagement menu idea isn't about replacing what works for you - it's about creating more ways so more residents can take part in ways that suit them. Some residents want to attend regular meetings like yourselves, while others might prefer quick online surveys, local chats, or getting involved in specific issues that affect them.

Our commitment is to make sure that:

- Existing engaged residents like yourselves continue to have meaningful ways to influence decisions
- We create opportunities for residents who aren't currently involved
- We make clearer links between local engagement and big decisions
- We're open about how resident input shapes what we do

I'd like to suggest that we arrange a proper discussion session specifically for Central area residents about how engagement might develop. This would give you the chance to share your views on what's working, what isn't, and how we can keep the valuable parts whilst reaching more people.

Would you be willing to work with us on this? Your experience and commitment to tenant involvement is exactly what we need to help design an approach that works for everyone.

C3.3 Action

Action	Proposed Action: The Community Engagement Manager will arrange a dedicated session with Central area residents within the next 6 weeks to discuss the future of resident engagement, including the role of existing groups and new opportunities for wider participation.
Start date	
End date	

C3.4 - Lack of council action to prevent violent attack

Area in city	Central
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	3 rd July 2025
Week of Area Panel	15 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15 August 2025
Name of officer responding	Graham Davies
Officer job title	Housing Manager
Contact Details	Graham.Davies@brighton-hove.gov.uk

C3.4 Question

Issue	Lack of Council action around individuals who posed a serious threat to residents.
Background	On 4/7/25 a resident of Hampshire Court was hospitalised after an attack in the car park. Hampshire Court residents had previously reported concerns about the perpetrators, a group of people who were sleeping rough, but no action was taken. When the attack was reported assessors were sent out, but the rough sleepers remained in the car park.
Request or Question	• Why was action not taken and the rough sleepers moved on as soon as residents raised concerns? This lack of action left residents feeling unsafe in their homes and at risk of violence. • Why were the perpetrators of the violent attack not moved on after it had happened?

C3.4 Response

Response
Thank you for raising your concerns following the distressing incident at Hampshire Court on 4th July. I was very sorry to learn a resident was injured and I know people were felt unsafe or anxious as a result. We understand how upsetting and frightening this situation has been, especially given that concerns about the individuals involved had been raised prior to the incident. Residents should feel safe in their homes and surroundings, and we regret that this incident has left many feeling vulnerable. In response to your questions: Why wasn't action taken sooner? We were made aware of rough sleepers gathering near the laundry room area, but not specifically within the car park itself. A contractor was sent to inspect the area, but at the time, no individuals were found. It's now believed that access to the car park was later

gained by tailgating under the roller shutters—a known issue due to the safety features required on these gates.

Why weren't the individuals moved on after the attack?

As soon as we were informed of the incident, our Car Parks & Garages Manager contacted Sussex Police to request their attendance. Local PCSOs began patrolling the area to monitor and move on individuals. We also engaged the street outreach team to offer support to those sleeping rough, aiming to address the issue with both safety and compassion.

Additionally, our CCTV & Block Security Housing Officer arranged for SES security patrols to attend the site for five consecutive days. On 7th July, housing officers confirmed the site was clear, and our estates team removed any remaining debris.

We recognise that the response may not have felt timely or sufficient, and we want to ensure that concerns raised by residents are acted upon more visibly in future. Safety is our priority, and we are committed to learning from this incident to improve how we respond going forward.

E3.1 - Anti-social behaviour

Area in city	East
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	3 rd July 2025
Week of Area Panel	8 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15.08.2025
Name of officer responding	Jan Dowdell
Officer job title	Tenancy Services Operational Manager
Contact Details	Janet.dowdell@brighton-hove.gov.uk

E3.1 Question

Issue	Residents are suffering from the impacts of long-term and ongoing anti-social behaviour in their areas.
Background	Robert Lodge have a long-running problem of anti-social behaviour in their block. One tenant in particular is known to be dealing drugs, and has frequently been apprehended by the Police but this person is always released without charge. The tenant has been reported to both the Police and the Council. This particular problem has also previously been reported at East resident-only meetings and taken to Area Panel. However no visible action has been taken by the Council and the situation has not improved for other tenants. The resident at Rugby Place also reported that they frequently have people smoking drugs just outside their property.

	BELTA also reported frequent cases of ASB in their area. They are piloting a scheme of frequent estate walkabouts and have appointed an 'estate concierge' to keep an eye on things around the estate, which seems to have reduced instances of ASB (fly-tipping, drug dealing, drug taking). Residents discussed options and strategies around ASB, such as installing CCTV in the blocks and a more rigorous implementation of community protection notices & warnings. The following pieces of advice were shared in the meeting: • Report & continue to report every instance of ASB to the Police and/or the Council • When reporting to the Police, remember to get a crime reference number; pass this number on to the Council, if reporting to the Council • Speak to local Councillors about ongoing issues The following article was shared with residents: https://www.brightonandhovenews.org/2025/07/02/hundreds-of-cases-of-bad-behaviour-by-nightmare-neighbours-spur-council-scrutiny/ The People Overview and Scrutiny Committee (who are being asked to set up a task and finish group to scrutinise the issue of ASB in social housing) is due to meet at Hove Town Hall at 4pm next Tuesday 8th July and this meeting is scheduled to be webcast.
Request or Question	• Residents request that an appropriate officer be invited to attend the next Area Panel meeting so that residents can raise these issues around ASB directly and ask questions as and when these arise. Residents would like to know: • How often community protection notices/warnings have been used across the city, and how effective these are (if that data is available). • Why has no action has been taken against the tenant at Robert Lodge who has been dealing drugs and is in clear breach of tenancy rules? Why hasn't he been evicted after years of being in breach of his tenancy?

E3.1 Response

Response
Residents request that an appropriate officer be invited to attend the next Area Panel meeting so that residents can raise these issues around ASB directly and ask questions as and when these arise. Residents are able to raise their issues at the next area panel. As the operational manager responsible for managing anti-social behaviour in council housing, I would

usually attend panel to explain our approach, the legislation we use and the tools and powers available to us. I am unable to attend the east panel this time due to annual leave.

However, following the considerations of the issues raised at Area Panel, I would be very happy to deliver a session with panel representatives on anti-social behaviour. If you would like this to happen, please contact me direct and we can arrange this or let one of my colleagues know at the Area Panel Meeting.

Residents would like to know: How often community protection notices/warnings have been used across the city, and how effective these are (if that data is available).

From April 2024 to April 2025:

Community Protection Warnings (CPW) – 21

Community Protection Notices (CPN) – 6

We use CPWs and CPNs in some ASB situations where appropriate, as part of our stepped approach to enforcement along with Housing Officer visits to perpetrators, informal written warnings, tenancy breach warnings, Notice of Seeking Possession warnings and Anti-Social Behaviour Contracts.

CPWs and CPNs are effective in many cases and provide a lasting improvement in behaviour.

We resolve roughly 75% of ASB cases without the need for formal legal intervention.

Why has no action has been taken against the tenant at Robert Lodge who has been dealing drugs and is in clear breach of tenancy rules? Why hasn't he been evicted after years of being in breach of his tenancy?

Although we are unable to discuss specific cases, we can talk about our approach when dealing with suspected drug dealing, drug activity and potential serious breach of tenancy.

When dealing with ASB our intention is to support people to tackle underlying issues and change their behaviour for the long term. This can be highly successful in avoiding potential homelessness for some individuals.

If, however, we need to take further action to bring an end to ASB, we may need to take enforcement action that requires a legal intervention. The court will expect us to have taken a stepped approach before presenting a case to them. We must be able to prove we have tried to help someone keep their tenancy and that we have put in place actions

to help them change their behaviour. We are asked to justify our handling of the case and to prove all reasonable steps have been taken to avoid legal action. The court will also assess if the action is necessary to protect other tenant's rights.

It may appear that we are supporting the perpetrators of ASB far more than the victims and reporters. To some extent that may be true, but we do so, to bring about change and its part of our case work approach expected by our legal services and the court if we require enforcement action.

We must take a measured approach and response to ASB. we do not use enforcement as a last resort but carefully throughout the case.

In serious and urgent situations such as drug related activity we can apply for immediate closure of the premises and this power has proved very effective at reducing harm. This approach takes out some of the early intervention steps, but we still must present the case with evidence that proves the severity of the situation.

Reporters of the ASB at Robert Lodge should have a single point of contact arrangement in place with direct contact details of the Housing Officer leading on the case. Please continue to contact this officer and provide details of incidents which will support and assist with the case investigations.

E3.2 - Estate Development Budget task & finish group

Area in city	East
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	3 rd July 2025
Week of Area Panel	8 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15 th August 2025
Name of officer responding	Sam Nolan
Officer job title	Community Engagement Manager
Contact Details	sam.nolan@brighton-hove.gov.uk

E3.2 Question

Issue	Residents haven't been given a timeline around when EDB task & finish group will be active and what the next steps are.
Background	Residents reported that there had been some discussion around making improvements to the EDB process (including the forms). However, they haven't been given any further information about when this is going to happen.

Request or Question	Residents request more information around the EDB task & finish group – including a timeline as to when and what things are going to happen, such as meetings.
---------------------	--

E3.2 Response

Response
What Happened with the Task & Finish Group The Estate Development Budget Task & Finish Group completed its work in September 2022 after running for over a year. The group made detailed recommendations for improving the EDB process, covering everything from application forms to decision-making and communication. The final report was published in February 2023 and is available in the Area Panel papers from that time. Current Status of EDB Improvements We have completed several of the Task & Finish Group's recommendations: What We've Done: • Leaseholder Information: All EDB documents now include disclaimers that leaseholders may be charged in exceptional circumstances. All bids are assessed for possible leaseholder charges before approval. • Decision-Making: We now allow up to 5 people per area to join EDB panels, plus LAG representatives. • Bid Costing: We add 10% contingency to all bids and can be flexible with costs during delivery. • Ongoing Costs: Projects with ongoing costs are now allowed if they show how they'll be sustained (like WiFi projects). • Area Panel Reports: Each Area Panel now gets up-to-date EDB reports with dates and finances. • Phased Projects: We allow projects to be delivered in standalone phases. • EDB vs EIB: We've clarified that EDB focuses on supporting tenant groups with community projects and activities, while EIB handles larger physical works. What We're Still Working On: • New separate application forms for quick bids and main bids • Online bid tracking system where groups can check status • Email and text updates to residents on bid progress • Participatory budgeting system with online platform • Better evaluation processes What's Happening Next Late autumn 2025: We'll share draft new application forms with EDB Panel members.

Early 2026: New improved forms will be ready for the 2026-27 financial year.

Why the Delay

Some of the recommended changes need new computer systems or significant process changes, which take time to develop properly. We want to get the improvements right.

Keeping You Updated

We understand residents want to know what's happening. We'll provide regular updates through:

- Area Panel meetings
- EDB Panel meetings
- Community newsletters

If you have specific questions about EDB improvements or want to get involved in testing new processes, please contact edb@brighton-hove.gov.uk

E3.2 Action

Action	Late autumn 2025: We'll share draft new application forms with EDB Panel members to get their views before finalising them. Early 2026: New improved forms will be ready for the 2026-27 financial year.
---------------	--

W3.1 - Council contractors not using ID or giving prior notification

Area in city	West
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	10 th July 2025
Week of Area Panel	15 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	
Name of officer responding	Sam Crick
Officer job title	Operations manager
Contact Details	Sam.Crick@brighton-hove.gov.uk

W3.1 Question

Issue	Council contractors are turning up at people's homes without any ID or prior notification.
--------------	--

Background	The maintenance and repairs on guttering is sub-contracted by the Council to a company called Kingsley. They are arriving at people's homes without any prior notification or ID, asking for access. One incidence of this was on 9/7/25 to an elderly woman living in Godwin Road. The Council confirmed that council sub-contractors were in the area and doing guttering repairs. Without ID or prior notification residents have no way of knowing if the workmen are genuine and it leaves them, especially the elderly and vulnerable, in a difficult and potentially dangerous position. It also undermines confidence in the Council. The resident has contacted the Council, but at the time of the meeting had not heard back from them.
Request or Question	• Why, when residents have raised this issue before and been assured that the Council takes it seriously, is this still happening? • What monitoring does the Council do? How does the Council know if their contractors and sub-contractors are ensuring that maintenance teams have ID and give prior notification of visits? • What action does the Council take against the contractors and sub-contractors if they are not doing this?

W3.1 Response

Response
1. Why is this issue still occurring despite previous assurances from the Council? It is important to state that all contractors visiting properties to carry out works on behalf of the Council should be carrying clear identification. The Council takes every enquiry seriously and is committed to addressing concerns raised by residents. When issues are identified, we ensure that the relevant operative, team, or contractor is informed and that corrective actions are taken to improve service delivery and meet expectations. 2. What monitoring does the Council carry out? The Council conducts regular review meetings with all contractors to monitor performance, address concerns, and ensure compliance with agreed standards. 3. How does the Council ensure that subcontractors provide ID and notify residents before visits? We hold structured review meetings with all contractors, where identification protocols are discussed. The contractor in question uses a text messaging system to notify residents in advance. However, this system depends on having up-to-date mobile contact details and may not work for landlines. Where possible, the contractor makes alternative arrangements to contact residents who are not covered by the text service. 4. What action does the Council take if contractors or subcontractors fail to meet expectations?

Any complaints or service failures are reviewed during contractor meetings. Persistent issues are escalated, and appropriate actions are taken to ensure accountability and service improvement.

W3.2 - How do residents get action?

Area in city	West
Star rating	3 Star/ City wide issue
Date question raised	10 th July 2025
Week of Area Panel	15 th September 2025
Deadline for officer response	15 th August 2025
Name of officer responding	Sam Nolan
Officer job title	Community Engagement Manager
Contact Details	sam.nolan@brighton-hove.gov.uk

W3.2 Question

Issue	West residents active in their Associations and local areas are increasingly frustrated by the difficulty of getting anything done. They are feeling very demoralised and unsupported.
Background	• It takes a really long time to get even the smallest things done. • Quick, effective action by the Council makes a huge difference but rarely happens. • Unresolved issues go round in circles, with everyone getting increasingly frustrated. • Communication is poor – the process would be much easier if residents were kept up to date with the progress of their issue, and any difficulties and delays explained. Residents understand that sometimes things can be difficult to sort out and take time – what is hard is if they hear nothing, don't know if the issue has been dropped or is underway and have to constantly chase things up. • The lack of action means that residents don't feel respected, listened to or taken seriously.
Request or Question	Residents are working hard to make their homes and area better – it's where they live and it's very important to them. Residents' main concern is that action is taken and problems resolved. Why is this so problematic? What needs to change so the Council acts more quickly and effectively?

W3.2 Response

Response
Thanks for your question.

We recognise that residents are frustrated by:

- Long waits to get things sorted
- Poor communication about delays
- Issues going round in circles
- Feeling unheard and unsupported

We recognise these are serious issues that affect how people feel about their community and council.

What We're Doing

We're using our Better Homes approach to tackle this. Through workshops, residents raised six key areas to focus on with housing services:

1. **Better Customer Service** - improve communication and support
2. **Better Complaints Service** - make it easier to complain and get proper responses
3. **Better Repairs** - do repairs right first time and keep you informed
4. **More Ways to Have Your Say** - give you more chances to get involved
5. **Better Online Services** - improve our website and online options
6. **Safer, Cleaner Areas** - look after all areas properly and make reporting easier

We're now running the "Creating Great Homes Together" survey to understand more. We want to apply the same focused approach to other community issues. We will update at Area Panel how you can take part.

W3.2 Action

Action	Next Steps At the Area Panel meeting, we'll discuss: • How to set up a small working group if there are some specific issues we are tackle together • How to update on progress
Start date	
End date	