

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

CABINET

10.30am 16 JULY 2026

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Sankey (Chair) Taylor (Deputy Chair), Alexander, Allen, Daniel, McGregor, Muten, Robins, Rowkins and Williams

PART ONE

19 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

19a Declarations of interests

19.1 There were none.

19b Exclusion of the press and public

19.2 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

20 MINUTES

20.1 Resolved- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 June 2026 be approved as the correct record.

21 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

21.1 The Chair provided their communications.

22 CALL OVER

22.1 All items on the agenda were reserved for discussion. Item 34 concerning Covenant on Plot 2 and 3 in West Saltdean was brought forward on the agenda and taken as the first substantive item.

23 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(A) Petitions

There were none.

(B) Public Questions

23.1 The public questioner was not present to put their question on Item 27 - More recycling less waste

23.2 Jenni Lloyd read the following question:

Item 33 - Asset Strategy

As members should be aware, Friends of New England House nominated NEH as an Asset of Community Value in May, although we have yet to get a response and there is no mention of the nomination as pending either on BHCC's list of ACVs, or in the cabinet paper. What consideration has been made of the energy and expertise of the creative community in formulating the options and the potential for a community-led redevelopment of the building, similar to that of the successful Observer Building in Hastings, and enabled by the new Community Right to Buy established in the Devolution & Community Empowerment Act 2026?

23.3 Cllr Taylor provided the following reply:

A successful application to list New England House as an Asset of Community Value [ACV] would grant the nominating group a 6-month period from accreditation to make the first offer for purchase of the site

The ACV application is pending and is now included in the ACV list on the council's website. Since the temporary closure of New England House, officers have been considering options to directly retrofit or redevelop the site, and we have not actively sought offers to purchase the site.

As a direct retrofit or redevelopment by the council is not financially feasible, this report seeks a decision to dispose of the site and begin active engagement with external organisations. Since deciding to close the building we have acknowledged all proposals from outside organisations in relation to New England House and have supported requests for information where possible.

We would welcome a direct discussion at any time with the Friends of New England House on their proposals, but we not been contacted by them and were not aware of the group's existence before being notified of an ACV application.

23.4 Alex Morisson read the following question:

Item 33 - Asset Strategy

The City Deal's flagship proposal is to renovate and expand New England House, the centrepiece of Brighton's creative-tech cluster, and to establish the surrounding area as Tech City South. This investment will provide the flexible space, infrastructure and connectivity that Brighton's most exciting businesses need to grow, while nurturing a new wave of entrepreneurs and business models. It will also put Brighton on the map as

one of the UK's most important tech clusters, one which operates on an international stage.

BHCC committed in the City Deal to a project budget for renovation of New England House of £24.53m made up of £4.9m from City Deal plus £9.8m from the council and £9.8m from the private sector.

How will this further decision, i.e. to abandon the New England House element of the City Deal, be communicated to the relevant parties and what will become of the £4.9m grant that sits in the council's accounts?

23.5 Cllr Taylor provided the following reply:

In 2014, a City Deal for the Greater Brighton City Region was agreed with government to be put towards the refurbishment and expansion of NEH to create a 'technical hub' for the South-East area. The planned project needed a total investment of £24.53m, which in addition to the £4.9m grant from government, would also require £9.8m from the private sector and £9.8m from the council.

The conditions of the grant were that it was used for capital expenditure. The council put the £4.9m government grant into our Capital Investment Programme in 2014/15 and the money spent on the refurbishment project was funded through capital reserves and borrowing over subsequent years.

Following the closure of NEH in September 2025, and pending decisions on its future, the refurbishment project's budget was reallocated to cover costs related to closure, safety mitigations, compensation for businesses and preparation for the next steps.

There is currently no requirement to report the outcomes of the City Deal to government, but the council has acted in accordance with the grant conditions at all times when spending the funding.

(C) Deputations

23.6 Paul Roughsedge presented the Deputation concerning Covenant on Plot 2 and 3 in West Saltdean

23.7 Councillor Taylor provided the following response:

Paul. I thank you for your deputation, which is a very eloquent deputation, and thank you for the briefing that you sent, which I've read and I know cabinet members have read. If you just take a step back, the report is a slightly strange report for a couple of reasons. In that ordinarily it wouldn't be a cabinet report, but because we like Council officially and Councillor Earthey so much, we agreed to the nom and to your representations to make it a cabinet report. I think also, you know, cabinet reports, you know, generally set out recommendations and so perhaps the very nature of having a cabinet report has pushed it in the direction somewhat of a recommendation. However, that said, Well, two things. I think the report does substantively respond to the norm, although I understand, you know, your view and Councillor officially view that sections of it may not have been as you expected or hoped for, but I think substantially it does respond to the

norm and try to set out the considerations, the process, timelines are difficult because that's sort of subject to other things out of control, but it broadly does do that. However, I think the really important thing is that the recommendation in the report doesn't agree or recommend to revoke the covenant. What it does say is that council proposes not to seek to take over the land at this time, which I think is an important distinction. Now, as you pointed out in your submission, there is a live planning application on plot 2 for which the planning policy team have suggested that it is not recommended to proceed. Now, it's still live and we wait to see what the Office of recommendation is, but I know that the planning policy team often is given a high amount of weight in planning. So I think let's see what happens with that planning application. I'll address a few more of the points substantively in the report that we will come to 1st on the agenda. But I think to be clear, we have not revoked and ruled out fully the option to invoke. Let's see what happens with the planning application and I think there's more to come. I absolutely commit via also with Councillor Rowkins to work with you as the group and ward councillors on the matter.

23.8 **Resolved-**

- 1) Cabinet agreed to note the deputation.

24 **ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS**

- 24.1 A copy of the questions received was circulated ahead of the meeting. Responses provided both at the meeting and in writing are as follows:

1. **Cllr Anne Meadows - 27. More recycling, less waste**

6 new managers at a cost of £344,000 are being hired to look after 17 new staff. Surely the focus should be on front line staff. Paragraph 4.4 mentions there is scope to use existing assets to support future delivery - why are so many middle managers required?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

Nowhere in the report does it state that 6 new managers would be tasked solely with looking after 17 new staff. There are new frontline staff included in the recommendations, but we also need additional operational management resource to improve the service. The current ratio of operations management to collection staff is on average 1 Manager to 40 staff.

2. **Cllr Alistair McNair - 27. More recycling, less waste**

Will any of these new managers be employed to respond to residents queries e.g. on the phone?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

The focus of these roles is to improve the day-to-day service that residents receive and reduce the number of missed collections. That, in turn, will reduce the number of contacts made my email and phone, allowing better response times.

We will also continue to make improvements to the website and real time information available to residents.

3. Cllr Anne Meadows - 27. More recycling, less waste

Why is the lack of responsive website not a priority for extra funding?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

The focus of this funding is to improve the performance of the collections. Improvements to the website do not necessarily require such investments, and are being progressed alongside.

4. Cllr Alistair McNair - 27. More recycling, less waste

How confident are you that rubbish can be collected every fortnight without fail?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

No decision has yet been made on potential changes to the frequency of collections. If kerbside refuse collections were to switch to fortnightly in the future, we would want to guarantee that the bins would be collection as planned (or collected quickly in the event of a missed collection). That is the basis for the modeling work, and we will consider all of this before any final decision is made.

5. Cllr Alistair McNair - 27. More recycling, less waste

Is a 5% improvement in recycling a) guaranteed and b) enough of an increase to warrant cutting residents' rubbish collections?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

5% is not guaranteed - it may be higher. No decision has yet been made on the future collection model for kerbside refuse. The latest available data on waste volumes and recycling rates will be considered as part of any future decision.

6. Cllr Anne Meadows - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

Despite so much consultation, 63% of residents were still opposed to moving to one school site. Has anything been identified in how the consultation was conducted to explain the lack of change in opinion?

Response: Cllr Taylor

The second consultation used the same methodology as the first, including online and paper responses, drop-in sessions and direct engagement with parents and residents, and was independently analysed thematically. That analysis shows the level of opposition (63%, compared with 60% in the first round) has remained broadly consistent because respondents' underlying concerns are about the detail of implementation – particularly the location of the 3G pitch, traffic and parking, and SEND provision – rather than opposition to the principle of consolidation itself. Nothing in the analysis points to any aspect of how the consultation was

conducted as an explanation for this. The plans have in fact been revised in response to feedback, including further work on pitch location, traffic mitigation and the School Travel Plan, and the Equality Impact Assessment has been strengthened accordingly. The Council recognises the strength of feeling reflected in the responses; however, consultation is one input into a decision that must also weigh educational need, SEND sufficiency and long-term sustainability of provision, which is why the proposal is recommended to proceed alongside a clear set of mitigations.

7. Cllr Anne Meadows - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

Why are there no mitigations given to residents' concerns outlined in 3.7? Is the consultation just a tick box exercise considering that 63% of residents are opposed yet the move is still going ahead?

Response: Cllr Taylor

The consultation has directly shaped the mitigations set out elsewhere in this report and its appendices, including the draft School Travel Plan addressing journey changes and transport costs, strengthened SEND and pastoral commitments for the consolidated site, and further consideration of 3G pitch siting in response to concerns about noise, light and proximity to homes, to be finalised through the planning process. These are not detailed at paragraph 3.7 itself because that paragraph summarises the concerns raised; the corresponding mitigations are addressed in the Analysis and Equalities sections of the report. This is not a tick-box exercise: every response has been read, thematically analysed and reported transparently, and has visibly influenced the proposals since the first round. However, the Council does not consider that a majority against a proposal automatically requires it not to proceed – Cabinet must balance consultation responses against the educational case, SEND sufficiency and sustainability of provision across the city, and has concluded that consolidation, with the mitigations set out, remains the right way forward.

8. Cllr Anne Meadows - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

Why can't the community have a say in the development of the land (paragraph 3.14)?

Response: Cllr Taylor

The disposal of the Valley Campus will follow the Council's standard property disposal process, and any future development of the site will require a separate planning application. That planning application – covering matters such as scale, layout, design and environmental impact – is subject to its own statutory public consultation under the Town and Country Planning regime, at which point residents and this Council will have a formal opportunity to comment on the specific development proposed. This report and decision relate only to the consolidation of the school and the principle of disposal, they do not fix the detailed design of any future development. Similarly, the final siting of the 3G pitch at the Nevill Campus remains subject to further engagement with

neighbouring residents and to planning consent, so there will be further opportunities for community input as these individual elements progress.

9. Cllr Anne Meadows - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

Why is there no estimate of the money to be raised from the sale of the land?

Response: Cllr Taylor

A precise figure cannot be published at this stage because the site is still subject to Section 77 consent from the Secretary of State. Initial valuation advice has been received and this is included in Part 2 of the report. A more detailed valuation exercise is being undertaken. This will be informed by the massing study to confirm the extent of development possible under a planning policy compliant scheme. Valuations are often included in the part 2 report, given they are commercially sensitive and could impact on any future transaction.

The final receipt will depend on market conditions and any outcome from the planning approval process. Any disposal will be subject to the delegated decision process, requiring approval from the Director Property & Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and City Regeneration to approve terms and take any necessary steps to facilitate and complete the disposals of the properties identified and achieve best consideration. Once a sale has been agreed, the actual receipt will be reported through the Council's normal financial governance and reporting arrangements, including budget monitoring reports to Members.

10. Cllr Alistair McNair - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

Will the money from the sale be ringfenced for educational purposes? Or swallowed up in the general fund?

Response: Cllr Taylor

The capital receipt from the disposal of the Valley Campus will be treated as a corporate capital receipt, as government regulations do not allow capital receipts to be used to support revenue budgets, and the Council's budget strategy requires that receipts support the corporate Capital Programme. It will not, therefore, sit outside normal corporate processes. However, it will not simply be absorbed into the general fund either: it is the Council's clear intention that a proportion of the receipt will be used to reimburse the High Needs Capital budget, which is being drawn upon to help fund Phase 1 of the works at the Nevill Campus, recognising that this programme is a SEND sufficiency project as much as a school reorganisation. Any wider application of the receipt will be subject to the Council's usual capital allocation process and Capital Strategy, and will be reported transparently through the Council's normal financial governance arrangements.

11. Cllr Anne Meadows - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

The report mentions that 51 Afghan families have been housed. How many local families exactly are awaiting to be housed in the city and what more can they do to ensure they are housed appropriately?

Response: Cllr Williams

There are 2812 families waiting on the Housing Register to be housed. This figure includes adult only families. The Local Authority is provided with funding to acquire properties for households under the Afghan Resettlement Scheme. Households are matched to available properties and further work may be undertaken to acquire private rented accommodation. The current acquisition plan for the next 3 years is to provide accommodation for 18 new households. Households do not reside in the city prior to nomination to a property and Local Authority is notified of households by the Home Office as required.

12. Cllr Anne Meadows - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

How many families have been on the waiting list for over two years or more?

Response: Cllr Williams

As at 13th July there are 1986 families on the Housing Register, waiting for a two or more bedroom property who have been on the Housing Register for two or more years.

13. Cllr Alistair McNair - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

What's the exact number of households on the housing register (para 3.17)?

Response: Cllr Williams

As at 13th July 2026 there were 5130 active households on the Housing Register.

14. Cllr Anne Meadows - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

3.19 mentions 51 homes 'have been made available for families'. Is this the same 51 homes made available for Afghan families mentioned in 3.16? It is not clear.

Response: Cllr Williams

3.19 mentions 51 homes 'have been made available for families'. Is this the same 51 homes made available for Afghan families mentioned in 3.16? It is not clear.

15. Cllr Anne Meadows - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

When downsizing, renting a three-bedroom house a tenant has occupied for many years may be cheaper for them than moving to a new one-bedroom flat. What is the council doing to mitigate the increased costs of downsizing?

Response: Cllr Williams

The Council provides a Transfer Incentive Scheme which specifically supports Council tenants downsizing to smaller properties. Residents who qualify the scheme are placed in Band A on the Housing Register and are able to access the following payments as set out in the Housing Allocation Policy:

- Downsizing by one bedroom £1,500
- Downsizing by 2 bedrooms £2,000
- Downsizing by 3 bedrooms £5,000
- Downsizing by 4 bedrooms £6,000
- Moving from a wheelchair-adapted property, even if the same size £1,500

The Under Occupation Officer with the Allocations Service and Rehousing Team provide additional support to residents who are downsizing. This can include home visits as well as support to bid and complete application forms. There is also a streamlined process in place with the Revenue and Benefits team to apply for support removal costs.

16. Cllr Anne Meadows - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

It is council policy that all voids are used for temporary accommodation. There has also been an increase of 230 households (para 3.4) moving into Temporary Accommodation for this year. How long is this strategy expected to last?

Response: Cllr Williams

The use of council homes as temporary accommodation is a temporary measure, not a permanent policy. Cabinet agreed that selected empty council homes can be used as temporary accommodation until 1 May 2027, with a maximum of 180 properties and a range of exemptions and safeguards in place.

This approach was introduced because of the significant increase in homelessness and the high cost of emergency and nightly-paid accommodation. It is part of a wider programme to provide better quality accommodation for homeless households, reduce the use of expensive emergency accommodation, and improve financial sustainability.

The council is also investing in longer-term solutions, including preventing homelessness earlier, helping households move on more quickly, increasing council-owned temporary accommodation, and developing supported housing options.

Progress has been made so far. The latest programme update shows that 69 council voids have already been brought into use as temporary accommodation, with further properties in the pipeline, as part of the agreed target of 180 homes by May 2027.

17. Cllr Alistair McNair - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

3.33 mentions the progress with tenant perception of the service. How many residents actually responded to the survey? What is the total number of residents eligible to respond?

Response: Cllr Williams

Our STAR tenant perception survey is completed annually. The minimum required number of responses is 930 but we like to achieve more. As per good practice, we ensured that the profile of the respondents reflected the demographics of the population. They were based on Age Group, Tenure, Ward, Property Type and Property Ownership and the surveys were completed via a telephone call. 1,002 responses plus 48 incomplete surveys were achieved in our 2025/26 survey. █

18. Cllr Anne Meadows - 32. Targeted Budget Management

Why wasn't the HRA overspend mentioned in the previous Housing Strategy report in 31 above?

Response: Cllr Taylor

The TBM report is produced regularly and published promptly so that officers and members can react as quickly as possible to emerging trends. This means that it may well have been drafted after other reports presented on the same day.

19. Cllr Anne Meadows - 32. Targeted Budget Management

How can the council afford to give Whitehawk £1 concessionary fares if concessionary fares have been identified as a risk e.g. the increased costs for Compass which have risen by a third?

Response: Cllr Taylor

Concessionary fares are funded by a mixture of Council revenue funding and Local Authority Bus Grant. Officers recommended a three-month pilot of a £1 targeted adult short hop bus fare in Whitehawk as an equalities-led place based intervention, due to not only the levels of deprivation in that ward but the widespread nature of it. Whitehawk is also a Pride in Place area, which means we are able to align the proposed pilot with wider place-based activity aimed at tackling deprivation and improving access to essential services, including affordable food shopping.

20. Cllr Anne Meadows - 32. Targeted Budget Management

The council is borrowing over £500m. At what figure is our debt deemed unmanageable, especially considering the further borrowing required to fund King Alfred, Withdean Swimming Pool and libraries?

Response: Cllr Taylor

In line with the Council's current financial situation, capital investment – especially large scale projects – undergoes rigorous scrutiny with business cases being reviewed by both the service and central finance to ensure that all additional borrowing required is able to be funded, preferably by the revenue streams generated by the project itself. In such cases, it means that the additional borrowing can be undertaken without adding strain to the Council's revenue budget. It is also worth noting that the large majority of borrowing is related to housing investment – i.e against secure, long-term, rent-yielding assets.

21. Cllr Anne Meadows - 33. Asset Strategy

£55m is quoted as the figure to be gained from properties and assets, but there is no ballpark figure for valley campus. There must be a valuation. What's wrong with the public knowing what the figure is?

Response: Cllr Taylor

Initial valuation advice has been received and this is included in Part 2 of the report. A more detailed valuation exercise is being undertaken. This will be informed by the massing study to confirm the extent of development possible under a planning policy compliant scheme. Valuations are often included in the part 2 report, given they are commercially sensitive and could impact on any future transaction.

22. Cllr Anne Meadows - 33. Asset Strategy

Why is no valuation provided for 1-3 Bond Street? Or for New England House? Would you agree that not providing at least ballpark figures for valuations risks a lack of confidence in the council's ability to sell competitively?

Response: Cllr Taylor

The valuation for 1-3 Bond Street was not available at the time of publishing the report. However, when received this will form part of the delegated decision approval process to comply with our duty to achieve best consideration.

The report sets out the viability challenges for the New England House site. Initial valuation advice is provided in Part 2 of the report. As part of the recommended approach, only at the point where there is a developed planning compliant scheme will it be possible to obtain a realistic detailed valuation for the site.

23. Cllr Hill - 32. Targeted Budget Management

Would you accept that part of the pressure on the care sector which has contributed to average unit cost of care being above budgeted levels is the government's increase of national insurance contributions? These costs are then passed onto people needing care and council taxpayers, with no compensation for councils and other public bodies that lose funding from this as initially promised. I would encourage the administration to use their power to lobby the government on this matter.

Response: Cllr Alexander

Yes, it is reasonable to recognise that increases in employer costs, including changes to National Insurance contributions, are one factor affecting the cost of providing care. However, the primary driver of higher unit costs of care is the complexity of need. Adult Social Care is supporting more people than budgeted for, and the average weekly cost of care is higher than the budget assumption. As from a political point of view. I have every faith that we will be seeing a reform of Adult Social Care coming from the Labour Government in the very near future. It is an area that Andy Burnham has long been passionate about. Andy Burnham reiterated his commitment earlier this month saying: 'It is urgent, the need to fix social care, and I personally would look at all of the implications of that in relation to inheritance tax and care charges. I wouldn't flinch from it.'

24. Cllr Hill - 32. Targeted Budget Management

Increasing complexity of need is also driving higher unit costs in social care. Can the cabinet member for adult social care detail provide detail on what she is doing to address the root causes behind the rise in these increasingly complex needs? A greater understanding of this is needed to move towards a prevention-based approach to adult social care.

Response: Cllr Alexander

Rising complexity of need is a significant factor in Adult Social Care pressures, particularly for working-age adults, but our focus is on preventing people from reaching crisis point and supporting them to remain independent for longer. The council's Adult Social Care Demand Management Programme is specifically designed to address the underlying drivers of demand through prevention, reablement, targeted reviews and reducing avoidable admissions into long-term care.

We are expanding our reablement offer, helping people recover independence following illness, injury or a hospital stay. Evidence shows that effective reablement can reduce the need for ongoing support, delay or avoid residential care, and improve outcomes for residents. We are also redesigning our Adult Social Care front door so that more residents can access information, advice, community support, technology-enabled care and voluntary sector services earlier before their needs escalate.

Alongside this, we are increasing reviews of existing care packages to ensure support remains proportionate to people's needs and focused on maximising independence. By working closely with NHS partners, providers, and the voluntary sector, we are strengthening prevention and early intervention across the health and care system. This approach improves outcomes for residents while reducing the growth in demand for more intensive and costly care services. Public Health is also in the process of a deep dive into how better to support the growing complexity of support needs in our city.

25. Cllr Fishleigh - 33. Asset Strategy

The land in West Saltdean identified for disposal is designated as Local Green Space in the West Saltdean Neighbourhood Plan and our community has told BHCC multiple times it wishes to maintain and rewind the plot, however, BHCC has not helped with getting access rights from the farmer BHCC proposes to sell part of the plot to. How would the anticipated future use affect the LGS and will you commit to negotiating access rights as a condition of the sale?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

The land being considered for disposal would continue to be designated as Local Green Space and subject to the same strict restrictions as Green Belt land. We have historically tried to secure access for the Saltdean Climate Action Network (SCAN), however, this was not supported at the time by the owner of the track. Due to the access track not being in the Council's ownership, we cannot guarantee that we would be able to negotiate access rights as part of the disposal, but I want to give a firm commitment that we will attempt to secure this via negotiation with the owner as part of any transaction.

26. Cllr Fishleigh - 34. Covenant on Plot 2 and 3 in West Saltdean

Do you think that the concerns of residents have been properly addressed in the report before you?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

Residents concerns have certainly been considered through this process – albeit I accept that the recommendations in the report may not be what residents were hoping for.

27. Cllr Fishleigh - 34. Covenant on Plot 2 and 3 in West Saltdean

Do you think that this report meets the requirements of the Notice of Motion?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

Yes, because the report sets out the processes, legal considerations, likely costs and implications of invoking Clause 4 of the 1938 Agreement, with further detail on the legal advice provided in the (Exempt 3) Part 2 report.

It is not possible to provide precise timescales, as they would depend on matters outside the Council's control, including legal processes, negotiations with landowners and any ministerial approvals required.

28. Cllr Fishleigh - 34. Covenant on Plot 2 and 3 in West Saltdean

Do you accept what residents said that taking over the land doesn't have to mean acquisition?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

While residents have suggested that "taking over" the land does not necessarily require acquisition, the Council has obtained legal advice on the interpretation of Clause 4, which is contained in Part 2. The recommendations in the report have been made having regard to that advice.

29. Cllr Fishleigh - 27. More recycling less waste

Recycling, general waste and garden bins continue to be missed on a regular basis in Ovingdean, Rottingdean and especially West Saltdean. How can residents be confident that reducing collections will improve the reliability of the service?

Response: Cllr Tim Rowkins

No decision has yet been made on a future model of collection for kerbside refuse. The additional investment contained in the Cabinet report today seeks to improve the reliability of the service we currently have across all waste streams. However, the age of our fleet following years of underinvestment is a well-documented cause of missed collections. If the service were to switch to fortnightly, it would clearly enable us to retire some of the older vehicles. It would also enable us to build in more catch-up capacity, including spare crews during the day, as well as the PM crews, to which recruitment is difficult.

30. Cllr McLeay - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy

The report states at paragraph 3.4 that the council has made progress with "developing Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans (PEEPs) with vulnerable tenants". However, the new legal requirements for residential PEEPs in relevant higher-risk residential buildings came into force on 6 April 2026. Given the importance of these plans in protecting disabled and other vulnerable residents during a fire emergency, can the Cabinet Member please confirm whether all required PEEPs in relevant high-rise council housing have been completed in accordance with the legal requirements that came into force on 6 April 2026, and if not, how many remain outstanding and what is the timetable for completion?

Response: Cllr Williams

The council has made significant progress in implementing the requirements arising from the Fire Safety (Residential Evacuation Plans) (England) Regulations 2025, which came into force on 6 April 2026. These regulations require landlords to use reasonable endeavours to identify residents who may need assistance to evacuate and to undertake person-centred fire risk assessments where required. The council has established dedicated arrangements to identify residents who may require support, including tenancy visits, resident engagement and the introduction of Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans across relevant higher-risk residential buildings. Progress is monitored through a dedicated fire evacuation tracking system and is subject to ongoing review as residents' circumstances change.

As of this month, we have completed 82% of about 1000 residents who are eligible for a PEEP.

31. Cllr McLeay - 31. Progress report about delivering our Housing Strategy |

Paragraph 3.4 repeats the claim made in the Cabinet report of 14 May 2026 that only “two high-risk fire safety actions” identified through FRAs remain outstanding across the entire council housing stock. However, during a recent visit to Theobald House, I observed a number of serious fire safety issues that appear to remain unresolved despite being identified in successive FRAs (carried over from 2024 and 2025 FRAs). Can the Cabinet Member therefore explain how the council determines whether an FRA action is recorded as “outstanding” in reports to Cabinet – specifically, if a serious or high-risk issue identified in an FRA has not yet been physically remediated, but has merely been placed into a future planned works programme, is that action counted as complete or outstanding for reporting purposes?

Response: Cllr Williams

If the councillor has not already done so, I would ask that she reports the issues that she identified to Housing.Firesafety@brighton-hove.gov.uk. This is a inbox which is regularly monitored by multiple officers to ensure that nothing is missed and everything is followed up.

An FRA action is not recorded as complete simply because it has been identified and included within a future programme of works. Actions remain open or outstanding until the council is satisfied that the required risk mitigation has been implemented and verified through the relevant compliance processes. Where works are programmed, they continue to be tracked and reported as live actions until completion.

32. Cllr West - 27. More recycling, less waste

It is a pity that it has taken the Administration so long to find enthusiasm for fortnightly residual refuse collections, the benefits of which have long been widely understood. Over a decade ago previous iterations of this Administration blocked attempts to introduce both fortnightly collections and food waste collections. Given the limited size of the flimsy door-step food waste containers, which are already attracting the interest of clever foxes, and the considerable amount of food waste still going into residual waste, will containers now need to be replaced with bigger ones with better locks?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

The key thing not reflected in your question is sequencing. The rationale we have followed is that you only start to consider reducing the frequency of refuse collections once you have moved a significant amount of waste out of the bins and into recycling. Now that we have weekly food waste collections in place for every resident in the city, and also now accept a wider range of materials in our mixed recycling collections, the amount of waste in the refuse bins is falling, which in turn means it may not be the most efficient use of taxpayers' scarce resources to collect half empty bins every week. That said, we do need to see more data and continued improvements in the service before taking a decision.

On food waste bins, we are currently trialling an alternative unit with a different locking mechanism, which we may choose to deploy in some areas. I would add, however, that reports of foxes accessing the food waste bins are very limited – it does not appear to be a widespread problem.

33. Cllr West - 27. More recycling, less waste

It is refreshing to see the administration admit it hasn't done well enough with its management of waste and recycling over the past two years. Clearly a lot of work remains to be done to improve the reliability of collections to gain public confidence ahead of further major changes. It is a staggering admission of failure that a further investment of £1.3m is required to realise this. Do the administration wish to apologise for their incompetence?

Response: Cllr Rowkins

No. Investing in a crucial frontline services to make continued improvements is not an admission of failure – it's just good governance. We all know there is more work to do here, but really – incompetence? Taking on the recommendations of the KC report, cleaning up the culture, investing in vehicles, bringing in new crews in the evenings to catch up on missed collections, adding capacity to the workshop, digitising an operation that used to run on scraps of paper, providing real-time updates for residents, expanding our recycling? When I started going to the depot in 2023, crews said they hadn't seen a councillor in years. So how about instead you apologise to me for keeping the service at arms length for so long and handing over such a huge workload?

34. Cllr West - 33. Asset Strategy

It was hoped that with the development of the City Downland Estate Plan that the wide benefits of the public asset, the council holds in its trust, had finally been appreciated. I received clear assurances that the administration had no intention to sell land from the City Downland Estate, yet suddenly, without consultation, this is now proposed. There is no suggestion the proceeds of these land sales will even be reinvested within the estate. How do Labour care to explain their betrayal?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

A clear part of the council's overall financial strategy – which is required to protect and invest in front-line public services – is to realise capital receipts where possible. The Council recognises the importance of the City Downland Estate and the City Downland Estate Plan. These pieces of land have been recommended for disposal as they are not seen as critical to existing agricultural holdings, and are mostly fragmented from the estate. These disposals form part of our ongoing work to ensure we are making best use of our assets now and for the long-term.

35. Cllr Barton Ahmad - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

The reduced geographical spread of secondary school provision in proposed changes is concerning, and, as demonstrated in the consultation process, deeply unpopular. How will families in Portslade and West Hove be supported with the closure of the Valley campus, not least with the increased journey length and car travel? How will active travel be encouraged and facilitated for these families making the longer journey?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

I think it's a shame that the Greens are seemingly opposing a proposal that has been brought forward by the governing board and headteacher themselves. The Council recognises that consolidation onto the Nevill Campus will, for some families currently using the Valley Campus, mean a change in route, walking or cycling distance, or bus service, and that this could be a particular barrier for some families. This is why a School Travel Plan is being developed as part of the programme. It will map current and future journeys against home postcodes to identify the pupils most affected, including those travelling from Portslade and West Hove, and will target mitigations accordingly. This includes working with Brighton & Hove Buses on route capacity at school start and end times, identifying cycling and walking route improvements around the Nevill Campus, and providing clear information on eligibility for home-to-school transport assistance under the Council's policy, with particular attention to pupils eligible for free school meals, pupil premium or with an EHCP. This work will be finalised ahead of the September 2028 transition.

36. Cllr Sykes - 32. Targeted Budget Management

The new TBM reporting format is confusing. Please explain the colour coding in Directorate overview and Savings Mitigation and Transformation tables.

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

The new format aims to encourage greater accessibility and engagement for readers who are less familiar with lengthy financial reports by enabling them to easily find and understand information on areas of interest. Each service area has been captured in a one page dashboard showing the forecast, the reasons for it, the mitigations in place, the progress against savings targets and any supporting data that would help to demonstrate the position or increase the understanding of the key drivers of it.

The overarching colour is that used on all of our corporate reports including performance reporting and the council plan.

The Red / Amber / Green RAG status is as you would expect on savings delivery with Green being on track and Red being flagged as a concern. The grey and blue statuses have been added to show "not yet fully planned" and "already achieved" respectively. It's a fair request, and a key will be added from TBM3. We would expect these savings numbers to move towards green as the year progresses but again, this level of transparency is designed to give a more rounded picture of the work being undertaken and the progress being made.

37. Cllr Sykes - 32. Targeted Budget Management

Appendix 2 sets out newly identified risks totalling £17.1m which add enormously to in-year budget pressure. Rather than risks, many of these seem to be actual pressures that have crystallised either following global events (fuel, utility costs), or a re-evaluation of actual projected pressures some of which have increased massively. This all rings numerous alarm bells high amongst which are confusing risk with actual pressure (due to the different management response required) and the extent of under projection of pressures for example in ASC. Or is this merely down to a new presentation of TBM?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

When preparing their forecasts, the services have separated pressures that they feel are certain to happen without intervention, from risks which, while mitigations will be sought and acted upon, are not certain at the point of the forecast. In previous presentations of the report, a similar approach would have been taken but the risks would not have formed part of the published document. This risk table gives greater transparency to the forecasts and to the Council's financial position. As the year progresses, we would expect to see issues move to and from the risk table and between the risk table and the forecast as items are either escalated or removed. The inclusion of the information gives a more rounded view of the current financial situation and therefore greater context for decision making.

38. Cllr Barton Ahmad - 28. Proposed changes to Hove Park School

With the proposed disposal of the Valley campus, and building of a 3G pitch on the Nevill site (not to mention the increased car dependency), these plans have considerable environmental costs. These concerns are reflected by participants in the consultation. How will biodiversity loss and loss of green space be mitigated across both sites with these changes?

Response: Cllr Jacob Taylor

The Council recognises these important concerns. The 3G pitch at the Nevill Campus is intended in part to offset the loss of pitch capacity in an efficient way, within a smaller footprint, and its final siting remains under consideration. There is further engagement planned to minimise impact on neighbouring residents and habitats. As the works at the Nevill Campus and any future development of the Valley Campus progress to planning application stage, both will be subject to the normal planning requirements on ecology and, where applicable, biodiversity net gain under the Environment Act 2021, including appropriate surveys and mitigation or compensation measures. These matters will be considered fully as part of that statutory process.

39. Cllr Sykes - 29. Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Sufficiency Plan 2026-2029

Regarding B&HCC's implementation of government guidance on the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) as applied to all DSG blocks, what is the current position /interpretation across all blocks, how does this impact on SEND funding if at all and has the Schools Forum been involved in discussing the MFG over the past 3 years?

Response: Cllr Daniel

The minimum funding guarantee operates in the Schools Block for mainstream schools and the High Needs Block for special schools. For mainstream schools, the government's operational guidance allows LAs to set an MFG between minus 0.5% and 0.0% per pupil compared to the prior year baseline. This relates to each school's delegated budget and includes notional SEN funding. For 2026/27, Brighton and Hove set a MFG rate of 0.0% per pupil and this was agreed at the October 2025 Schools Forum. For special schools, the government's operational guidance states the MFG to be operated by local authorities for 2026/27 must be 0% using their schools' 2025/26 funding baseline. Schools in Brighton and Hove received a +1% uplift in their top-up funding rates and this was agreed following a report to Schools Forum in January 2026. Reports are provided to the Schools Forum on an annual basis to outline funding arrangements including the operation of the MFG.

40. Cllr Shanks - 30 Adolescent Strategy 2026 - 29

Can you guarantee that the money currently available for youth work through the collective will be kept the same or increased?

Response: Cllr Daniel

The expansion of youth work is funded from specific projects such as Young Futures and SkillMill. Both are 3 year programmes with specific criteria that we must meet to deliver youth work and that funding is secured for this time period. Beyond that time period it will very much depend upon future funding from central government and the outcomes achieved from the projects.

Regarding the existing youth work, this is planned to continue as part of our business as usual. There is a very clear intention from central government to invest in youth work and as per our Adolescent strategy the council is committed to this work and understands its value. However, we are all aware of the financial pressure the local authority is under and we must be fiscally responsible and review all budgets for non-statutory services annually. This will be the case for youth work, as it will for many other services.

41. Cllr Shanks - 29. Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Sufficiency Plan 2026-2029

How will schools be supported to take on new roles for SEND children with limited budgets?

Response: Cllr Daniel

I would like to reassure schools that any new provision commissioned or developed as part of this proposal will be supported by funding to meet the associated staffing requirements. We recognise that schools cannot be expected to absorb additional staffing costs from existing budgets. Funding arrangements will therefore be designed to ensure that any new provision is appropriately resourced from the outset, enabling schools to focus on delivering high-quality support for children and young people without placing additional pressure on their core budgets. Alongside this, additional DfE funding to support the implementation of SEND reforms will include a Mainstream Inclusion Fund, provided directly to schools, and funding for Experts at Hand, giving all schools access to additional specialist support.

25 MATTERS REFERRED TO THE EXECUTIVE

25.1 There were none.

26 REPRESENTATIONS FROM OPPOSITION MEMBERS

26.1 Cabinet received a representation from Councillor Sykes on Item 32: Targeted Budget Management 2 (TBM).

27 MORE RECYCLING LESS WASTE

27.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning More Recycling Less Waste.

27.2 Councillors Allen, Taylor, Robinson, Muten, Robins, Sheard, and Sankey asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

27.3 Resolved-

1) Cabinet agreed to continue work to model and prepare for the introduction of a fortnightly residential kerbside residual waste collection model, with a view to implementation by July 2027, subject to operational readiness and a final decision being taken by Cabinet.

2) Cabinet agreed to the investment of £1.3M being made as set out in 3.16 below in order to improve the service in readiness for a change to fortnightly collections and to achieve the associated savings and efficiencies as detailed in this report.

28 PROPOSED CHANGES TO HOVE PARK SCHOOL

28.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning Proposed Changes to Hove Park School.

28.2 Councillors Muten, Robins and Daniel asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

28.3 Resolved-

1) Cabinet agreed to approve the consolidation of Hove Park School onto a single site at the Nevill Campus with effect from September 2028, subject to the completion of the necessary capital works.

2) Cabinet agreed to delegate authority to the Director Property and Finance, to:

- commission the Phase 1 and Phase 2 capital works at the Nevill Campus within the funding envelope

3) Cabinet noted that the Section 77 application in respect of the Phase 2 Internal remodelling and 3G artificial pitch will be submitted to the Secretary of State, and that final approval of Phase 2 will be confirmed on receipt of consent.

29 SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES (SEND) SUFFICIENCY PLAN 2026-2029

29.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (Send) Sufficiency Plan 2026-2029.

29.2 Councillors Rowkins, McGregor and Robinson asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

29.3 Resolved-

1) Cabinet agreed to note the programme of new and expanded specialist provision set out in the latest draft SEND Sufficiency Plan 2026-2029 (attached at Appendix 1).

2) Cabinet agreed the programme of new and expanded specialist provision set out in the draft SEND Sufficiency Plan 2026–2029 and detailed in Section 3 of the report.

3) Cabinet noted that individual provisions set out in the draft Plan which require statutory processes — including prescribed alterations under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 — will be subject to separate decisions and public consultation in due course, and that this report does not itself authorise any such alteration.

30 ADOLESCENT STRATEGY 2026 - 29

30.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning Adolescent Strategy 2026 - 29.

30.2 Councillors Sheard, Taylor and McGregor asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

30.3 Resolved-

1) Cabinet approved the city's Adolescent Strategy 2026/29 and supports the activity detailed therein.

31 PROGRESS REPORT ABOUT DELIVERING OUR HOUSING STRATEGY

31.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning Progress Report About Delivering Our Housing Strategy.

31.2 Councillors Sheard, Alexander, Robinson, McGregor and Sankey asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

31.3 Resolved-

- 1) That Cabinet considered and noted the progress made towards the ambitions set out in the Housing Strategy 2024-29 and agrees actions to be undertaken in 2026-27 as set out at Appendix 1.

32 TARGETED BUDGET MANAGEMENT (TBM) 2026/27 MONTH 2 (MAY)

32.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning Targeted Budget Management (TBM) 2026/27 Month 2 (May).

32.2 Councillors Allen and Alexander asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

32.3 Resolved-

- 1) Cabinet notes the forecast risk position for the General Fund, which indicates a potential forecast overspend risk of £19.882m
- 2) Cabinet notes the additional risks of £17.131m included in the table at Appendix 2 which are not included in the forecast figure above.
- 3) Cabinet notes the forecast overspend risk for the separate Housing Revenue Account (HRA), which is an overspend of £0.482m.
- 4) Cabinet notes the forecast overspend risk for the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant, which is an overspend of £6.643m in year resulting in a cumulative deficit of £8.405m.
- 5) Cabinet approves a request to MHCLG for additional EFS – which is additional borrowing, repaid by further capital receipts - in 2026/27 of up to £30m, to be drawn down if required and discussed in 3.10 below.
- 6) Cabinet notes the current RAG rating of the transformation workstreams at Appendix 3.
- 7) Cabinet notes the Treasury Management update at Appendix 4
- 8) Cabinet notes the Corporate Debtor position at Appendix 5
- 9) Cabinet approves the addition of new projects to the capital programme totalling £272k as set out in Appendix 6.
- 10) Cabinet notes the forecast position on the Capital Programme at Appendix 7 which shows budget variations of £4,283k.

- 11) Cabinet approves the capital budget variations of £6.672m and reprofiling of £8.328m set out in Appendix 7 and discussed at 3.16

33 ASSET STRATEGY

- 33.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning Asset Strategy.
- 33.2 Councillors McGregor, Allen, Rowkins and Muten asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

33.3 Resolved-

- 1) Cabinet agreed to the disposal of the assets identified at paragraphs 3.3- 3.20 of this report and the Part 2 report in the manner set out in the reports.
- 2) Cabinet delegated authority to the Director Property & Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and City Regeneration to approve terms and take any necessary steps to facilitate and complete the disposals of the properties identified and achieve best consideration.
- 3) Cabinet noted the work ongoing to ensure there is sufficient space available for creative and cultural industry in the city.

34 COVENANT ON PLOT 2 AND 3 IN WEST SALTDEAN

- 34.1 Cabinet considered a report concerning .
- 34.2 Councillors Rowkins, Robins and Sankey asked questions and contributed to the debate of the report.

34.3 Resolved-

- 1) Cabinet agreed not to seek to take over/acquire the Land for the purposes of public open space at this time.
- 2) Cabinet is asked to note the contents of Part 2 of this report.

35 ASSET STRATEGY (EXEMPT CATEGORY 3)

- 35.1 As per the Part One minutes.

36 COVENANT ON PLOT 2 AND 3 IN WEST SALTDEAN (EXEMPT CATEGORY 3)

- 36.1 As per the Part One minutes.

37 PART TWO PROCEEDINGS

- 37.1 **Resolved-** That Cabinet agreed that the confidential items listed on the agenda remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 2.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of