



**Below is a themed summary of responses provided in the October 2024 engagement exercise into school admission arrangements**

**Question 6: How much do you support the model proposed in "option C"?**

**1. Travel and Transportation**

- You are stopping children from being able to walk to a school within their area of living
- Our child wouldn't be able to go to the closest school to our house. Our child would no longer be able to walk to school which would be both bad for the environment, the city and him. This change would not fit your sustainable travel policy.
- Again making gentle changes initially. Second plan too much, too soon. Catchments are smaller effecting less children's journey to school and enable many to walk with their friends and maintain independence.
- Have we actually ask free school meals families if they want their children to travel that far?
- Difficult to fully appreciate the implications of this option but would seem to entail similar risk of longer travel times to school for pupils who live on the margins of catchment areas.
- Little choice however keeps journey times to a minimum which is very positive
- Option C would provide a local option to our children and enable them to walk to school.
- Our closest school at the moment is 9 minute walk and we are not in the catchment area of that school for this option either. It doesn't make sense!
- Again, travel where there is no need to. Understand that some children do have to travel, but why is this a good solution to those children who would not have to travel?
- Free school meals is just one factor to consider. We also need to consider children having the opportunity to attend a more local school reducing travel times
- I am concerned about sending children on long journeys to schools across the city and the affect of more traffic and pollution.
- I don't support a model that makes children who live very close to a school ineligible for that school and requires them to travel much further - for environmental and economic reasons and simply common sense
- I would like to see the implications for traffic. My main issue is the schools are not in the centre of the catchment meaning there will be a lot of additional transportation requirements
- I do not support any catchment proposal that does not incorporate distance to school into its allocation priority As per option A this gives us only 1 choice of school in our catchment - which is 5 times further than my closest school, requires a bus and or a significantly higher risk route to school Neither of my closest schools are available to me in this catchment the catchment changes proposed for Patcham High reduce the projected FSM rate from the current (22%) to 17% which completely contradicts the aim of the initiative. Health and wellbeing / safety: there is significant and avoidable risk to children living in our road introduced due to distance, road use and transport

requirements. This includes the safety implications of traveling distances especially in winter, in the dark, and where public transport is a necessity - waiting unsupervised. Both routes down to Patcham High for example pass multiple accident spots on both the London Road and Braybon Avenue down to the Carden Avenue junction.

Environmental Impact: since the majority of children located in schools outside of their area will be taking transport, a significant increase in vehicles, particularly private vehicles will be taken on already congested roads, increasing the carbon emissions, with hundreds (potentially thousands) more journeys during rush hour.

As Surrenden Crescent sits on one of the entry points to Varndean and Dorothy Stringer, we will bear the impact of high traffic, congestion and pollution on our road as many parents will choose to drive their children. As a resident, this will incur a "salt in the wound" level aggravation if in addition, we are unable to attend these schools.

Impact to friendships and child social development: this catchment changes means we will be isolated from the school friends at Balfour. This would effectively represent the equivalent of moving to an entirely new area, against our choice and starting afresh with friendships at a such crucial age of social development, placing unnecessary strain on our children. Also noting this would be applied to a generation of children already surviving the impact of COVID and lockdown measures which halted their social development during their fundamental development foundation years.

- Again, a very long commute for our child when he could walk for 10-15 minutes to a school in his community.
- Again there doesn't seem to have been consideration of distance travelled to schools, though it appears the impact might not be quite as bad as in option B.
- As long as the schools that need extra help to get to where they need to be then this wouldn't be a problem Schools like Longhill currently are lagging behind so wouldn't be right unless they were brought up to a level where parents wanted their children to go there.
- Again, this would leave many children faced with multiple bus journeys, as the direct routes are not available, as they will be unable to walk the hour plus to school. The carbon footprint of this would be very high and unnecessary when they could have previously walked to school. This is costly and has a negative impact on childrens health and the environment.
- Again, there appears from the colours on the map to be some long travel distances but I don't know the road layout in Brighton to know how easy travel would be from home to school.
- At lease with this model you know which school you'll be attending and the potential of traveling large distances is removed.
- Children living opposite Varndean (surrenden crescent)and stringer with a 2 minute walk and 1 road are being sent on a 20 minute walk crossing 2 dangerous roads where there have been serious accidents (old farm road and carden ave)
- Much fairer system. Doesn't penalise those living in poorer areas. Allows us to choose the best school for our child and there needs. I can now choose the closest schools to my address and not the only school in my catchment which is a 45 min walk away.
- Better than option B but again, stop making the "problem" travel longer to tick a box for you. Invest in children and schools that are underperforming. No child wants to travel ages to school. Let's also look after the environment as opposed to everyone havnn in g. To drive or get a bus to school
- It looks like a reasonable way of planning and doesn't seem to impact travel too much
- Causing large numbers of children to have to travel across the city is not the answer to inequalities in educational opportunity. Building new schools that are well funded and have good consistent standards for all children is the only solution

- I disagree with this model because the changes to boundaries would mean that children in my road which is 5 mins walk to Dorothy Stringer would instead have to walk 30+ minutes to go to Patcham.
- It limits choice but atleast it is not shipping kids all over the place in some reckless experiment.
- Having Varndean and Stringer in the extreme corner of catchments is bizarre. Roads immediately next to those schools would be bussing kids across the city. Huge disruption to families based on these massive changes. Way too much too soon.
- Much further travel times for my child, and they wont be able to be with siblings
- Reduced environmental impact of travelling across the city.
- Lowers environmental impact and parental pressure trying to get kids to school across town when a local school would be easier.
- This grossly disadvantages children who live a walkable distance to their local school who are not entitled to free school meals or have ehcp plan. Road traffic on Balfour already out of hand. Road changes have not helped and signs largely ignored by parents dropping off children on Balfour Road & surrounding
- Shorter travelling times to schools across the city seems to be present under this option but it is a step backwards from the current arrangement.
- Seems to limit parents' and childrens' choice quite radically. But it would be the best approach if your main objective was to control travel distances.
- This does not seem like a good option. Again with many children travelling far and it is also splitting up communities and a sense of choice.
- This option means personally our child would not be travelling a long way to their secondary school. The school in the catchment area is currently graded as good. So this is preferable to the previous option. However the current catchment areas are better personally for our family!
- This at least reduces travel times but does really cut fiveways down the middle which is sad. Better than B.
- A lot more children would need to be walking or getting transport for schools across the city
- Due to transport networks some students would have to take multiple buses each day to get to and from school safely. Disadvantages some students dramatically.
- B&H not a big city - with better transport and active travel to schools perfectly possible for teenagers to travel out of immediate areas.
- Reduces choice and will be making young people travel further. This risks reducing attendance further.
- Removing the choice from all families doesn't help anyone, some schools are in a small geographic area meaning children can walk to either school so why not give them a choice
- Still in porthall area, this wouldn't give my child a local school they could walk to, we are not a religious family, I don't want my children attending a catholic school and the next school is a bus commute away
- Students will not be sent to schools as far away from their homes
- Less travel involved for most pupils.
- It takes us longer to get to the school in our catchment area than it does to get to the school in the neighbouring one.
- It gives certainty to houses for which school they would attend, reduces unnecessary and excessive travel time.
- I guess if this levels up levels of free school meals this is the more sensible option but surely you need to apply some common sense so please living minutes from a particular school should get some sort of priority on proximity rather than being sent to a school much further away

- I don't think there should be a change in catchment areas until the council has improved travel for children in Brighton. The bus system does not serve the community and this needs to change before anything else does.
- This is another example where it increases distances children are forced to travel (as opposed to "have to travel" where there is no local school so travel is unavoidable), and burdens the city's transport network, negatively impacts pollution levels, energy usage, mental health and physical health, as well as increasing the chances of accidents on the way to school.
- I live in an area where the boundaries are moving, and this will result in my child have to travel a LOT further, to a school we are less familiar with, away from their friends. It's crazy that we'd so live close to a school - in walking distance, yet we'd have to go somewhere further away. The commute will change from one they'll be able to walk to my needing to drive, or a long walk/bus/walk combination. Longer commute, less healthy exercise - unimpressed.
- There are already kids travelling long distances and I'm not sure this helps
- You could have children traveling to the other side of the city each day. Displacing children to different areas around the city which could be very damaging and cause a lot of children to have lengthy travel each day
- This does not seem like such a good option as A but is far better than option B. At least in this option children will not have to travel far to get to school.
- This is probably the fairest option as children get to go to a school close to them.
- This is the best option smaller catchment areas. Meaning less travel for students. They can access before and after school clubs as well as not get lost on the way to school on a long commute. Have pride in their area and community.
- This will lead to pupils travelling further distances to school than they do currently. Some students may have to travel long distances to reach their assigned school, depending on the north/south boundary lines. This could create practical and financial challenges for families, especially those with limited access to reliable transportation, and it might disproportionately affect children from lower-income families. Greater travel distances will cause more pollution and damage to the environment, so it is concerning that the council sees this as a viable solution.
- This model would mean that potentially vulnerable children will have to travel across Brighton on 2-3 buses to get to school. This model does not encourage good attendance if pupils have to potential 2-3 buses to get to school.
- This option means children living close to schools will now have to travel in a car or bus across the city to a school out of their community. This increases danger (traffic) and pollution. Less healthy lifestyle.
- It will mean having to go to a school further away. Our child should be able to walk to his school.
- Again we have schools perched on the very edge of their catchment areas, meaning many children who live on the doorstep will not get a place at the local school. Environmental concerns need to be considered, and those who live within walking distance should be in the catchment area.
- This option leaves no opportunity for choice. It also means long distances to travel for those at the perimeter of the catchment areas.
- This option probably suits our particular family ok, the school we would be allocated would not be our first choice but would be walking distance from our house and is decent enough. But we would be the lucky ones, for plenty of other families in the city this would be an unacceptable lack of choice.
- This proposal seems to balance competing needs, avoiding pupils needing to travel excessively far in most cases.
- This is better, however, than Option B. It does not ask our daughter to commute for 10,000 hours of her secondary education and allows needed time for clubs, friends and family etc.

- This option reduces the number of children at two schools where there is demand. Children who live nearby should be about to walk to school. Not have to travel across the city.
- Seems fair and considerate to children being able to commute to school on where their house is
- Seems to balance competing needs and avoid excessive travel.
- This option removes the area of port hall/prestonville from the catchment of varndean and stringer making the walk to a non church school at least 50 minutes with very limited public transport options
- I think locality to a school should take some priority. it is mad to send 11 year old long distances in cases where it is entirely avoidable.
- Seems most logical option and easy travel for kids
- This option seems the most fair to me, parents are not given the illusion of choice and pupils are travelling to their nearest school.
- This option would unfairly disadvantage pupils in the Port Hall/Prestonville area who would no longer have access to Dorothy Stringer and Varndean (both a 30-minute walk), and instead be moved to Blatchington Mill School (a 45-min walk).
- Children will no longer be able to walk to their nearest schools (Dorothy Stringer and Varndean), it breaks up the community that attend Stanford schools with the catchment boundaries cutting just north of Porthall. . Unless the council has already launched plans for an affordable and safe transport system to get children to school this is not a viable option.
- This seems like a reasonable option but the disadvantage is less choice of schools for children. Only having one real option could mean if the school is oversubscribed children could end up at a school a long way from where they live.
- More travel would be required which the council have said is not in the plan. This option is totally unfeasible and should be scrapped!
- Unfair on children being forced to travel over an hour to fix broken schools rather than invest in the schools that are struggling, making children from working families pay with their education to fix Brightons school problems
- This would be a major hassle for our family, with our child having to travel significantly further to hove park lower school when blatchington is around the corner.
- This will still see children who live very close to one school having to travel a long way to get to another school.
- It has fewer travel implications however.
- All children should be able to walk to school where they live..
- As long as schools remain viable appears much more sensible in terms of sustainability with children not having to unnecessarily commute to school
- Most children would have access to a local school they could walk to.
- I don't think spreading kids out is the answer. It hasn't worked and causes stress on families with younger children or those that find it difficult to travel. Children will be late for school and with the very strict fines and fears of criminalising parents for it I certainly don't believe that's fair and inclusive as it will affect struggling families the most.
- Better scenario than option B with less pressure of a huge area with just Dorothy stringer and Longhill. Focuses on children being able to access a school that is within walking distance to them or an easy bus route.

## 2. School Quality, Improvement and Resource Allocation

- Will lead to people moving to be in catchments. And doesn't solve issue of underperforming schools.

- There is still a reduction of PAN at varndean and stringer, so local kids unlikely to get a local school.
- Because you don't seem able to sort out Longhill
- Do all mainstream secondaries have to offer the same thing? Maybe a change of purpose for 1 becoming a more practical based education for those students who are not so academically suited?
- Focus should still be on improving underperforming schools rather than driving children on huge commutes. The local school should be the best option with minimal travel required.
- Concerned this limits parent & child choice and specialist offerings at schools
- I believe that the focus needs to be on improving schools which are failing pupils. There are many excellent schools in London which have better pupil outcomes despite having far higher FSM levels than any Brighton school. We should learn from these schools and improve.
- again, not enough information has been provided on the catchments, their pupil numbers and distributions relative to school PANs. All of the proposals appear to impose PAN reductions on schools where demand would indicate a much higher possible PAN. We need far more evidence to make an informed response to the question
- Fundamentally the under performing schools need to be improved and better supported. Pushing more kids towards them without prior improvement will not be a success. Are there any plans or programmes that are being rolled out to improve the less well performing schools? Particularly BACA and Longhill.
- It makes Stringer into virtually a private school by creating what looks like a rich corridor. It doesn't stop the potential closure of Longhill, which seems to be the main aim here. Reducing PAN at Longhill would be a start, 240 is crazy when only 94 have taken it up. Why is reducing that not on the table here? Why only reduce Varndean and Stringer which are the most popular?
- I don't think reducing student intake in highly desirable school is a helpful option to maintain good level of education
- I don't think that this will address the problem of dwindling numbers at Longhill, as more families will choose schools outside of the catchment areas, or out of the county.
- Give higher budget to schools with more pupils having free school meals.
- Good for journey times and potentially traffic, reduces risk of not getting preferred school but eliminates choice as well as the incentive for schools to perform to ensure pupil numbers
- Again I disagree with this. Invest in the schools rather than moving children
- I will not send my child to this school for reasons mentioned in option A. I would be forced to move or homeschool, neither of which I want to do but would prefer it to sending my child to Longhill.
- Assume the schools are viable not assume they are not.
- The only reason for this would seem to be the proposed reduction in size of DS, which I disagree with in principle.
- It provides certainty for the parent and child, and would allow the schools and the council to focus on improving the education offering to their catchment, rather than competing with others and potentially losing pupils to schools that are seen as 'better' in their catchment. It would, however, be a long process to try bring all schools to the same level of attainment, if this was possible, and would not have the more immediate impact of widening access to the 'better' schools that the other options might have
- There are other ways to improve school performance that doesn't involve additional bureaucracy to limit the choice of parents

- I don't understand what benefit this gives over Option A and surely individual schools have no way of ensuring there are enough pupils to remain viable.
- Also - this option does not encourage the schools to continually improve / compete
- It's better as long as funding and support is given to every school to have them functioning and delivering at a similar level.
- Justifications needed regarding PAN reduction distribution across schools
- Large parts of the city still in catchment for schools that require improvement as deemed by ofsted. None of these options address the issue of ofsted ratings.
- Like Option A, Option C needs to be more carefully justified in relation to PAN reduction distribution across schools. I view Option C as worse than Option A as no choice is available
- As per option A, option C includes the reduction of intake places for children at Varndean and Stringer Schools. I do not support support this proposal, for the same reasons provided in the previous question
- I don't see the logic for reducing PANs across over subscribed schools in order to increase the number of pupils at Longhill. I also think the Council needs to wait for national policy changes that could give it greater influence over faith schools.
- i think single catchment is ok. i don't see how this solves anything for BACA or Longhill though.
- I wonder if the schools don't have enough students where will those students end up
- Interesting idea and I can see there is value in giving parents certainty. However, reduces numbers at popular schools which seems foolish.
- Issue is the reduced PAN again
- In the long term, more affluent families will move to similar catchment areas and poorer performing schools will shrink and close, affecting the poorer community members the most.
- Agree in principle but it is hard for children who are in an area with a school which is not as good as others they have no chance of getting into a better school.
- I think this risks schools on the outskirts being closed which would be disastrous and make it even harder for those children who have poor attainment to get a good chance at their education.
- Unfortunately it's hard to erradicate the stigma that certain schools have
- Leave alone. Just invest in Longhill. My nieces are there and the treatment they have had is shocking. Invest in the school! Invest in these children.
- Long Hill needs to be a much smaller school. Its PAN should be reduced.
- No point forcing schools to stay open by sending pupils there who don't want to go. If they don't have enough pupils, either improve the quality of provision or close the school. Or be more creative, and merge schools together or have other ideas.
- Offering pupils no choice in their secondary school will force pupils in certain areas into underperforming schools
- It is illogical to make successful schools smaller - and the schools adjudicator would overturn any of these proposals if those schools object.
- Moves us from catchment for two good schools to catchment for one school known for bullying and bad results. No thanks.
- I don't support any of the models, but this one is Ok, it's just that I don't see the justification in data for reducing the intake at oversubscribed schools.
- Not all schools are suitable for the needs of their children. For example Varndean is known for the quality of the SEN and this is a deciding factor for some parents.
- Parents will just move out of these areas if they perceive the school to be underperforming or the pupils having a bad reputation
- Please don't move the catchment area for Kings school. It's the only good school near Hove Park area. Blatchington school and Hove Park school have bad reputations.

- Object due to reduced PAN at Stringer and Varndean.No parental choice and even if happy with the catchment school, for us, itd be unlikely to get Stringer due to PAN reduction, so we'd be forced to send our child to a school miles away!
- Again , I do not believe in cutting places in schools that are performing with high local demand to forcibly redistribute children like economic units.
- Results in sink schools and a two tier educational system
- Same as model A, this reduces our choice of secondary school to one school which requires improvement. We do not support this option.
- What is being done to improve schools in poorer areas?
- The council wants to reduce PAN in all schools at a blanket number of places. Where is the projected outcome for this? What has this been based on? How will this affect schools which are already doing an incredible job and are something Brighton should be preserving? Where is the data please?Over 1000 students applied for Varndean last year. The school has its reputation for a reason, it is a diverse, rich school with a high rate of FSM and prides itself on its social mix. Please do not compromise this by reducing the number of places, and funding to the school.
- I would like to see the council's work focused on exploring the root causes and not assuming certain schools are the cause of the disparity, instead of other variables. The marginal forecast changes across the models to not justify the wide scale change.
- Single school catchments appear to be worse than Option A as they would presumably make it harder to manage changes in numbers over time in the areas of the city with the largest concentration of school children. As with Option A, it seems perverse to reduce student numbers in the schools that are most heavily over subscribed. Cutting numbers in these schools also means reducing the number of places available for priority FSM admissions.
- Slightly better option - keep BMS at 300 though so it can keep offering a great education and improving year on year - BMS is the hardest hit on all the options, it is crazy to reduce their PAN by 90 - far more than anyone else - it's a great school with great exam results - why distrust that?
- No choice for deprived areas. Same old. Unless this comes with radical plans to improve educational outcomes and experiences for those in currently unpopular schools, it changes nothing.
- So long as all school are of the same standards
- Support the catchment area but do not support reduction in PAN at varndean and stringer which are already oversubscribed and have demand in their local community. It makes no sense to reduce their PAN, other than to allow the council a social engineering project whereby they force children to go to schools far away from their homes, out of their community and likely without friends. Vardndean and syringe must be kept at current PAN and let's see how the FSM situation works out - impossible to measure this impact if you make further changes before you have received and analysed the results. The council must do changes in a methodical step by step process, rather than rushing it just to achieve their targets. It's children's lives, ALL children across the city and the council should represent ALL.
- The extra support should take the form of allocating additional funding to all schools in Brighton and extra funding to those which struggle, rather than reshuffle the pupil population with absolutely no resources and the have the wishful thinking that outcomes will improve automatically.
- This could help reduce the competition between schools which occurs with multiple schools in a single catchment - and hence encourage more collaboration / federation of schools.
- If the problem is improving specific schools that are not thriving AND have more diversity in current schools I completely agree but think this is blunt options when

looking at a very complex problem and more experiments and data analysis needs to take place.

- This also seems an odd choice. Given the spread of children and where they live across the city. How will you manage over subscription in each school?!
- This exacerbates the existing problem which is what if there is some reason that your 'local' school doesn't suit
- This feels like some schools will have a very limited socio-economic cohort. Can't see much social mixing. It also constitutes the biggest shift for families all across the city. However, I do think it would remove some of the stress of school choice for families. Obviously, this may massively increase the applications to the two faith schools in Hove too.
- This is fairly inoffensive and works well in other parts of the country, but still does not address the issues of the under performing schools
- This is probably the stupidest suggestion of the three. Reducing the options for a large percentage of children in Hove to two schools would be unworkable.
- This is reducing choice for parent and children, thus forcing pupils to attend failing schools. This option is cynical and reduces the need for schools to perform well as they are guaranteed pupils. This would most probably have the opposite effect as parents with means will move. Disaster.
- This option also seeks to artificially increase numbers at schools with lower demand which could thrive on lower numbers.
- This option is a net negative for the children and the future of Brighton and Hove. Reducing choice and options will only act to entrench standards, both positive and negative, across the city.
- This option needs to be more carefully justified in relation to PAN reduction distribution across schools. I view this as a worse option than 1 as no other suitable choice is available.
- This leaves no choice at all, when this is meant to be a core value of the school system
- This limits choice which I'm not in favour of. If all schools were equal this would be fair - they are not. Resources should be put into making schools of equal standard.
- This option needs to be more carefully justified in relation to PAN reduction distribution across schools. I view this as a worse option than 1 as no choice is available to any children or parents.
- Are there any plans or programmes that are being rolled out to improve the less well performing schools? Particularly BACA and Longhill.
- This option completely removes choice for families, thus creating frustration in children and parents. DS and Varndean are both brilliant schools that offer something quite different. Part of the reason they are thriving is because families are able to exercise some choice in selecting the school that is the best fit for their child.
- Would it not be better, cheaper, safer and far less onerous to simply reduce the PAN of Longhill which is vastly overinflated versus the demand reality and then assess the results of the implementation of the FSM priority which have yet to be determined?
- I don't think that popular, oversubscribed schools like Dorothy Stringer and Varndean should be forced to reduce their numbers and I worry about the loss of jobs that will result from these changes for teachers and school staff.
- It also removes the critical element of competition. Schools must compete for applications. This helps drive up standards.
- Much better than B but still focus should return to improving poor performing schools, reviewing academisation by learning from models elsewhere and embedding existing new policies.
- This will likely result in the closure of Longhill and families opt out of catchment as they are already doing

- This will not help schools that are already struggling, those such as BACA and Longhill.
- This would prevent oversubscription and schools would be able to plan for their numbers
- This proposal needs reconsidering and brought to families for more input. None of these options will benefit people if the places don't get taken up and other people lose them. We have successful schools for a reason and we must look at teacher/management relationships and school ethos and values to understand why some are nurturing learning environments and some are not.
- Furthermore, this option enhances predictability in student numbers and budgetary requirements, which is crucial during a time when financial stability is needed to relieve pressure on already stretched budgets.
- Those schools should be supported to thrive with funding and provision of good teachers and guidance. There are plenty of schools in London with high FSM % who are getting great results, so it is possible with the right support and personnel. Whitehawk primary for example, which I would assume has a high FSM % is rated Outstanding by Ofsted for 4 out of 5 categories. So getting children to thrive in education is not just about FSM%, this is one variable and the analysis is therefore very limited, and should not be used as a basis for action. Factors such as environmental impact, expected impact of a break-up of social/support networks on adult and children mental health and welfare, population density of school age children for the 2026 intake by area, should all be assessed and combined to arrive at the most sensible path forward.
- This is the best one. Everyone knows where they stand as long as all children in catchment are guaranteed a place. Should be easy to guarantee that if you're reducing PAN, if schools are 7 or 12 kids over and those kids live in catchment they should get a place e.g Varndean taking 279 for example. Otherwise what's the point?
- This gives 0 choice. If a school is failing one has to put their child there.
- The levelling up of north and east Brighton to Hove should be a priority for the council
- Rationale for reduction in PANs is not clear.

### **3. Criticism of the Question's Design**

- This option is leading and not compliant with the Gunning Principles
- Doesn't solve any of the state objectives. I believe this option has only been put in so that it can be used as an example by the council to say they are considering other options when in fact they would never consider this.

### **4. Community and Social Impact**

- Would mean that children cannot attend a school that they live very close to.
- With a child in year 11 currently and a child coming up in the next 4 years I favour this option as more local
- Kids who live nextdoor to a school should go to that school eg Varndean.
- This will mean children that have grown up together will no longer be able to go to school together.
- Again this option will do nothing to support with breaking the social segregation that exists as is shown in the FSM figures which are largely unaffected.
- again would be so negatively impactul on children and lifelong groups of friends. Children a 2 minute walk from certain schools would no longer be able to attend
- Again you are dividing the Whitehawk community in half and pushing Kemp Town and East Brighton out of Brighton to attend a school in Rottingdean. This model is

very beneficial if you were to live in Stringer / Varndean / Patcham catchments but does nothing to address the issues with two schools which require improvement. Again the result would be a movement of families into the desired catchment which would just exacerbate the problem.

Emphasis should be placed on the councils looking to improve all schools across the region to ensure that there is equitable access to outstanding education no matter where they are and who attends. Rather than moving children around to different communities in an attempt to even out the numbers. It should not be the role of children and families to leverage improvement in schools which are underperforming but in the council and the schools themselves to address the underlying issues and make change. This has been done successfully in Primary Schools and the same approach should be taken.

- As with option B, this creates situations where children living close to one school - eg Stringer or Varndean - could end up going to neither and instead be allocated a place at a school much further away. Not only does this create big logistical issues in terms of simply getting to school, it's also a huge social problem as they're likely to be separated from their friends.
- Clear and defined - Students can walk to their local school, have local friends, parents can move house years beforehand to plan ahead - less pollution from cars and buses ferrying kids around and clogging up roads. Teenagers can have more time in bed...
- Better option than b. Would stop the endless speculation and create more equal
- Children will receive schooling in a familiar locality
- Children would have a "local" school to go to
- Sibling impact: My children will end up in primary and senior schools in separate areas of the city - I will inevitably need to use a car to drop off / collect since the bus does not cover the full route. Sibling impact: Many residents of Surrenden Crescent have children in the local junior schools Balfour, Downs and Westdene, as they would reasonably expect this is their catchment. The consequences of siblings placed in schools across the city will result in additional transport and most likely cars required, a financial burden of unnecessary childcare support or potential safety risk to children waiting around in the dark on winter evenings. As the sibling link has been confirmed by the Council as crucial and retained within any future change – so should this association with geographically linked primary schools.
- I don't see how this would work in parts of the city that have huge student numbers.... I have just moved to the area that currently has two very popular schools; I used to think that was unfair and to a degree it is but then I moved here and saw how many children those schools serve. If we moved to a single school there would be a high chance that my children wouldn't get a spot at that school. There is then no way they would get their second choice which would be the other local school. So they would be sent to an undersubscribed school that is unsubscribed for a reason (not just less pupils there). They would then likely have to travel an hour each way across Brighton, be away from the community and friends they have built up through primary school. I think one of these options (B or C) literally cuts my road in half. I can't fully tell as the maps provided are terrible. So my children wouldn't get to go to the same school as their neighbours? Seems mad to me and I couldn't support that.
- If parents and carers do actually send their children to the school in their catchment then this could be a good solution creating schools that communities invest in and are proud of, this has worked well in Phollingdean/westdean with Patcham high, but does it create enough of a mix in schools or will long hill and baca still struggle and have a higher number of disadvantaged students?
- If the catchment areas change to this map for us personally I would reluctantly agree but WITHOUT reducing PANs. Also I would like some confirmation that if you live in catchment you would definitely get a place at the catchment school even if you are

the lowest priority. However this is not the most equitable model as there is no choice and it does split communities, but in the long term I guess primary schools will be linked with particular secondary schools so that would work.

- If this is feeding from primary schools at least everyone can plan ahead
- In principle this options seems okay however, it means that parents who already have a child at one school may mean their other child now attends a different school. For example, older child currently attending Dorothy Stringer and the younger child is solely in the Varndean catchment area. As a parent, there is already far too much admin from the schools to keep on top of without having two children in two different schools.
- Keeps communities together, it is more comprehensive with everyone having the same level of choice but that choice is extremely limited
- More balanced journey distances, schools for each distinct community, and removes the lottery of places caused by the current system, which just gives the illusion of choice.
- relatively small catchment areas supporting community but it reduces choice of provision for parents and students
- Removes 'lottery' element and associated stresses on families
- The lack of choice is a problem, as well as the lines drawn which intersect established catchments for primary and secondary schools. This area would be destructive for right communities particularly around the ditchling road area
- The main problem with this option I'd that some schools are just too close, so you would still have socio economic divide potentially.
- The only way to break our current highly unequal and ineffective school selection system is to embed schools in the direct communities they serve and to allow young people to better understand and engage in the diverse reality of their areas. This model mirrors the most successful education systems in the world. We have to live up to our values as a progressive city.
- For my own family, I would prefer if my Y5 daughter could benefit from a 'legacy' sibling link and attend the same school as my Y7 daughter (Varndean) as this option would force her into a different school.
- the fiveways community is quite strong and access equally from right and left of Ditchling rd the primary schools of the area (for instance Downs Junior) and pupils now can access both Stringer and Varndean. This amendment would change this, meaning pupils could not be with their friends in secondary school.
- The problems with this model are that it divides communities and doesn't take in to account the catchment areas for primary schools
- The slices the close-knit Fiveways community in two, bad idea. I doubt the Kemptown chunk for Longhill will work, people won't want to bus their kids to Rottingdean so people will move or go private. Again Patcham has hoovered up the Friar area and those roads back onto Varndean school fields, that is madness and would hugely and adversely affect those children, removing them from there friends and support networks which are in Fiveways ward. Looking at just two variables, FSM % and PAN is overly simplistic. Need a more in depth analysis of children population density by intake by year by road. Also estimate commuting distance/time and effect on pollution. Also collateral damage caused by each proposal in terms of removing children (and adults) from established community support networks and the effect on mental health and wellbeing. The effect of the new FSM out of catchment area policy should be modelled and observed over the next two years to see how this affects equality in the city before altering catchment areas. Invest in Longhill and BACA and bring them up to standard. FSM children are still bright and ambitious but need the right teachers, initiatives, and facilities to thrive, on their LOCAL area so they are embedded in their community and benefit from a short commute, ideally walking to school.

- This gives kids no choice of secondary school, which would be very limiting. This option also splits our primary school up which in turn will split friendships groups up. The move to secondary is a big transition and to be splitting friendship groups up as well, seems unfair.
- I think this will build stronger local communities/relationships between secondary and primary, I really like this option
- This is the best option of the three and more aligned with practices elsewhere in the UK. Small catchments promote strong communities all attending the same school as well as comfort that siblings will not be split up. Also means those schools currently with greater numbers of disadvantaged children will receive more funding to help them better educate our children
- This option reduces choice but is the best of a bad bunch of options provided by the council in that it limits travel time/distance and keeps children educated in the community they have grown up in
- Regardless of the change, it is important to ensure the sibling link is maintained for family cohesion and minimising travel issues of having children in different schools.
- Existing primary school pupils in the current catchment for Varndean/Stringer would be arbitrarily separated from classmates and friends at secondary school, depending where they live on this newly proposed map.
- This looks like the one most likely to divide existing communities. I can't tell from this image which catchment we would be in.
- We are against any changes that will undermine local communities... and all of these proposals are likely to do this. As such we are against the proposed changes.
- This proposal also offers families certainty regarding secondary school placements, alleviating the anxiety that the current process can cause. Additionally, providing a stable secondary school allocation fosters a sense of community and supports a smoother transition for children from primary to secondary education.
- Communities and neighbourhoods build connections with schools, friends, siblings, neighbours attend the same schools - the impact of these decisions has a huge knock on impact on our communities
- Need clarity around retaining of sibling link after the proposed changes.
- We live in Patcham which currently has one school in the catchment area. This makes things simple. It's so important to be able to go to a school near where you live and creates a really cohesive community at the high school.
- My son would have to go to a different school to his sister
- My children go to Longhill School but it is not sustainable if parents who live locally do not continue to send their children there. At present, local families are sending their children to any school rather than sending them to Longhill because they think it is an under performing school and isn't good enough for their children. We believe that children should go to their nearest school.
- We live in Coldean and would be extremely unhappy if BACA was our only 'choice'. Our eldest daughter currently goes to Patcham high school and that's where we want our younger two children to go to as well. We would consider this detrimental to our children's education and would consider moving which is such a difficult position to be put in. This was campaigned against a few years ago and we're in disbelief that it's being proposed as a possibility again. So stressful.
- We like the idea of the community links between the feeder schools and secondary school, good sense of community, better logistics - more walking to school/environmental impact rather than traveling to school further away.
- Catchments aren't centralised around the school and it's splitting communities
- Though I can see the benefits of this option with a smoother transition from primary and closer links with primary/ secondary schools, all it would serve to do is make primary school choice even more competitive, the issues would remain and I fear that the primary schools around the less good secondary's would decline as they would

be less popular. I also note that these schools are all rated 'good' with 'outstanding' elements so they are thriving. They cannot be allowed to decline!

- This would lead to a strong local community being broken up with no choice of options for the children.
- This will divide the socio-economic groups in the city even further
- This will divide my community and my family
- This will divide families and integration across the city.
- This takes away choice but is better than option 2 because children attend a school closer to them. It particularly affects collagen who attend Downs because it splits the likely catchment for Downs in half, meaning many friendship groups would be broken up without a choice
- This seems to have the cleanest, clearest boundaries. It would also aid transition from primary to secondary
- This removes our preferred and closest option, Varndean, from our catchment. Our oldest plans to go to Varndean next year so our youngest would not be able to go to the same school as their sibling based on this change unless sibling link rules are also changed. The sibling rules should change temporarily so that families are not split up. For the Fiveways area, this would cause a new divide in our community.
- This reduces choice. I am also worried about the breaking of sibling links when the younger student finds themselves out of the catchment of the older student.
- This provides little or no choice for parents and children, it will separate friends who have been through primary together, just because they happen to live a few streets away or even on the same street in some cases.
- This provides certainty and community which is what people need. As long as you guarantee all children in catchment will get their catchment school.
- This or option a keeps a community together, reduces travel distance and cost
- This option will create or further entrench socio-economic disparities across the city. Property in 'desirable' catchments will become totally unaffordable moving families away and destabilising school sustainability even more.
- This option seems to serve the intending outcome the best - ensure all schools fill their quota with a greater focus on which school serves which communities but them also ensure children get an education in their local community and avoids the impact both on the individuals and the environment of extensive travel every school day
- This option restricts choice for some areas, whilst for others the proposal is similar to Option A. This gives better opportunity for children to attend a school in a local community with continuation between primary and high schools.
- There is no data included in your proposals to show how many children live in the new catchment areas, so it's not possible for us to know how the reduction in PAN and change in boundaries will impact how many children will have to travel out of catchment, away from their friends and community support network.
- This option does not allow choice when more than one school is in a child's local community. This works if there is only one local school.
- This option does not include a lottery system for any parents. All the schools are local to the communities where the children live, so this means no extended travel times. This option makes it very clear to parents already in or considering moving to a catchment where their child would go to school.
- This model offers the most affluent areas choice to apply for the highest performing schools in the city (Varndean and Stringer). Long term this would cause greater disparity whilst still favouring already advantages communities. I have no idea why this model was proposed as means to help any issues.
- This model divides the children at Downs Junior School which would be very upsetting for all the children. It also divides the children along economic lines with children living on the wealthy West side of Ditchling Road going to Vardean and the poorer East side going to D Stringer.

- This limits school options down to one school for my son and would split him from his peers at the same primary school who mainly live the other side of the boundary line
- This is too restricted. I can see friendship groups being split because they may live slightly further away from each other.
- This is the very worst option for the children living in fiveways, the children will be split from their friends. The community will be split down the middle even though the kids will have gone to earlier schools together. Our daughter is on side of the line and her best friends lives on the other side of the line, for children to be split like this when the schools are so close to each other and the children having grown up in community is really hurtful and especially in such sensitive formative years.
- this is great!! children should be able to go to local schools to build friendship and community bonds . not have to travel far.
- This is crazy! It takes away everything Brighton and Hove Council have ever said about education. No choice and will create house price increases in good school catchment pockets and create a lot of divide amongst communities. This can't be a serious option?!
- What about people that have siblings in schools already?
- This is better than option B as maintains the local links for pupils, along with the community of their primary schools, as there is not the risk that they will have to travel. But removes the element of choice for parents.
- Chance of his friends and community being split.
- This cuts down travelling distances and creates better communities around schools.
- This could create further class divides and segregation
- This change will cause my children to to separate schools due to a breaking of the sibling link, because my eldest will be out of catchment after the change. We live next to Varndean. Option B and C breaks up the downs junior and Balfour communities. It breaks up the Fiveways community. It is absurd.
- This catchment option is just ridiculous, making Varndean and Dorthy Stringer catchments very small compared to the others. Again this isn't taking into account the demand of school placements in certain areas. It is important that children should be able to attend the local school where they live and not be sent to a school outside of their community.
- This at least would make sense from a community and environmental perspective.
- This will be entirely damaging for the city and increase the already established divides between the social classes.
- This again does not solve any problems with those in Socio-economically deprived areas. Wealthy parents would buy in catchement areas with good schools. Areas that are deprived would remain so, with poor options for schools.
- Surrenden Road should be in the stringer and varndean catchment area as their community is Surrenden and Fiveways not Patcham
- Splits communities
- Splits Balfour catchment up completely meaning no one with their friends
- But In contrast to option B: It will still ensure a sense of community for the local schools that they serve, And so is not entirely bad in my opinion
- Sibling link needs to remain
- Seems to work better as schools remain more local to where students live
- Seems fairest balance for accessibility and maintaining community
- Second best option keeps jounrys to a minimum, enables communities to stay together as they do now
- Same comments apply to option B- this proposal stops our youngest child with SEND needs from accessing the same provision as his sibling
- Restricts any choice at all will split families with children already in secondary school

- Community based schools build relationships and increase outcomes, less unsettling for the children who will attend where they have been expecting to.
- Provides a more local solution, perhaps it would be fairer to allow children on FSM to have a higher priority at non-catchment schools?
- Provided communities are still linked geographically
- In the hopefully unlikely event of this went through maintaining sibling links (even when out of new catchments would be crucial).
- In addition, the graphic is unclear but it looks like people living within the Poets Corner area is being split between schools, which is likely to split up neighbours/friends in the local area who currently all attend one school - Hove Junior School.
- One of the stated benefits of this scheme is that "it develops a clear transition link between primary and secondary education". This applies only to some areas of the city. Queen's Park School for example here would find it's community split three ways so there would be no common secondary school.
- Once again will split siblings already in secondary schools. Slightly better plan than B as children would stay in fairly local schools
- More local catchment areas to support children
- More likely to foster a community feel and possibly bring some of the natural diversity to the schools that (some) primary schools have
- More likely for children to be placed in a school close to home, although limits choice somewhat
- Local schools for local communities
- Like B this model doesn't just split our community it entirely cuts us off from it. All of my daughter's primary school class live in the other catchment. Whilst I would be very happy for her to go to Stringer - by cutting off the majority of the Balfour community from this school you have totally fractured that community.
- Just feel like local communities are being washed away with these choices. The children have priority but I just don't think enough thought has gone into the wider impact to society and what other options have been considered even before the boundary changes options were devised.
- it's way better than B - at least kids stay local.
- It enables communities to stay together
- In this option, Elm Grove and Hanover are divided, but I would say they are one community.
- In this option you are taking away any choice from the children. Ultimately they should get to choose which school they want to go to. It does feel like an attack on the pupils of Downs Infants and Juniors school - where the children live either side of Ditchling road. It will split up many friendships that the children have spent years building. I think the class divide would become even bigger with this option. However, on an environmental or community basis, this is more appropriate than Option B.
- I would like to know that the sibling link will be retained for children who are 'displaced' by the changes.
- I understand sibling links will be honoured but this would mean that this small amount of children will end up in a year group with children from a completely different catchment area rather than the children in their local community. This will make transition and being part of the local community very difficult going forward.
- I think this plan provides parents and children with some certainty and allows a community to be built around a school. I sent my children to a requires improvement primary school and the parents and the community all worked hard with the teachers and the head to help improve it
- I think this is the best option. If everyone could be guaranteed their catchment school I think this would be better for everyone. One of the hardest things about B&H

secondary schools is the uncertainty and anxiety about places and where they will end up with oversubscribed/out of catchment situation. It would be better for the community/environment if everyone could have their catchment school.

- I think keeping communities together and entering as many kids as possible keep with their friends from primary school is critical to their development
- I support this option because the areas are kept small so children won't have to travel to far to attend their school and maintain friendships.
- I prefer this, as it will mean that a community will have a vested interest in their local secondary school and provide some certainty. However, unless there is a lot of investment in improving BACCA and Longhill, there will still be an issue of parents choosing schools out of the area or to private school. So overall, I don't think it's a good solution
- I personally like the idea of this, knowing that my child would have a clear transition with her peers to a definite school in the catchment area
- I like that each school will serve a local community. The main disadvantage of this option is that boundaries may need to be updated as populations change
- I have no issue with having one catchment school, but I want the school to be the one that is in our community. However where the boundaries have been changed is simply illogical for where we live. We live on Friar Road, and both Stringer and Varndean would be a short walk for our children. Whilst our house doesn't back onto the fields (as many of our neighbours do) I can see the playing fields from my house, I can hear when it's break time and kids are out playing on the fields or doing PE. In this proposal our house would be in the Patcham catchment. To me, school is about much more than somewhere your kids go to learn. It is an important part of the community, and we feel intrinsically part of the community where Stringer and Varndean are placed, along with Balfour where our children currently go. From what I have heard, Patcham is a decent school but we just don't feel a part of the Patcham community, because it just is not where we live - and the recently redrawn ward maps support this. It feels like an unnecessary slice has been taken out of a community. Forcing our children to attend a school that is outside of their community, away from their friends, and with longer journey times to me just lacks some common sense.
- Friends likely to split up between stronger and Varndean
- I don't agree with the lack of parental choice presented in this model or the fact that children will be split from their communities as they are more likely to be split up from their primary school communities. But I support the maintainance of the ability to walk to school, which is my primary consideration for any school.  
I want to point out that through active and informed choice I sent my children to a primary school rated Requires Improvement by Ofsted. What is important to me is local community in education and being able to walk. Exercise and short commute to school is the best way in which to maintain physical and mental wellbeing in children.
- This model would also remove any choice for children who are not on FSM
- I can't see the model! I live on Shaftesbury road Bn1 4nf. My son is in year 7 at varndean. If my address is no longer in the catchment for varndean my daughter who is 8 won't be able to go to the same school as her brother. The logistics would be insane and I'm a single parent so not sure how we'd juggle it.
- I believe this reduces the current issues with children travelling across Brighton to attend different schools and the panic this creates around school admissions. Whilst this will probably be a tricky option initially, the benefit it will have for the schools is immense.
- Entrenches the socio economic division of the existing catchment areas
- Exclusion of community representation before creating these models.
- how can a school not be in its own a catchment area?

- This also breaks the relationship between Varndean and this area which has existed for decades.
- Doesn't give pupils any choice, maybe this is for the best but it does mean it will split up communities
- At least this appears to allow more local children to attend their closest school
- Definite strengths with this one and agree about stronger links between primary and secondary schools. But less parental choice and the FSM spread is still unbalanced.
- Even more arbitrary for 5ways community
- Every child and parent/carer deserves a choice where possible. This would also pull apart existing primary education communities.
- Children would have to travel miles to their school and could potentially be separated from friends
- As above there is no consideration for the communities created during children's primary years
- Changing school admissions arrangements will disproportionately affect certain communities, particularly those with protected characteristics, those living in poverty, and those affected by the pandemic—specifically children born between 1st September 2014 and 31st August 2015. These children, in their early school years during the COVID-19 pandemic, were among the hardest hit by disruptions, as highlighted in the SEND Review (2022) and Public Health England (2021) reports. Any disruption to their school placement could further worsen their academic and social outcomes
- Again, the boundary movements here will only break up communities that already established. Why do that?
- Although option C would mean it is more likely for my children to get into one of our local schools, I object to this option because it is essentially carving up the community in which we live in. My children attend Balfour school (a 12 minute walk from our house). We walk along with Stringer and Varndean students and I have always proudly told the children that they will attend one of the two schools with friends. Option C sees more divisive lines across the local community and I cannot see how sharp divisions within communities will make for positive social cohesion and community identity.
- Again, this option would mean that my daughter would be unable to go to the same school as her brother.
- Ensure sibling links are honoured in the change over years?
- As per Option C, there are people living near / next to Varndean but unable to attend due to the new catchment area, which seems unfair, disrupts friendship groups. This option also removes choice for people. What is an elder sibling goes to Varndean but their younger sibling now doesn't have that option?
- Children should have access to their closest school
- Also not a good option, will split siblings already in schools and lead to high amounts of stress and anxiety
- Again this does not take into account the travel time for families and forces many communities to travel significant times when they live within minutes of another school.
- Again these models make Baca and Longhill huge. Dorothy Stringer would only service a very small non diverse section of community.
- Again, I can't support this as we are unable to attend our local school and frankly, this maintains the problematic status quo.
- Again, some communities like Whitehawk have an arbitrary boundary. It also will mean that socio economic status will have a greater impact on educational outcomes as areas with higher house prices will be found within certain catchments.

- Children should have the opportunity to walk to their local school - 30/40 mins is a fair walk each way. A 'local' school means local children have a chance to maintain friendships and increase their connection with their local community. Sending a child from Whitehawk to Hove just because a map says they should go makes no sense
- Due to the poor representation in the map I can't actually see where our road falls but in principal this would maintain communities and make travel to school viable for all.

## **5. Broader Educational Equity Issues**

- Yet again PortHall / prestonville has been singled out to fix a percentage of school meals problem by having to travel to schools miles away , when 2 schools are within 25mins walk. Not fair at all. My child will be broken hearted!
- This option removes choice, particularly impacting pupils with SEND.
- With only one parental choice in this option, there is in effect, no choice. See above a It would surely be sensible to wait and see what impact the new Free School Meals policy has before making any other changes. I understand that Dr Greaves, the Council's own adviser has advocated this.
- I can't see how this option will have an impact on disadvantaged children at all. The FSM priority has just been implemented. I think it's important to see the impact of this before any further changes are made
- I find the competition to get your child into the 'good' schools very unfair. This illuminates the completion
- FSM pupils are already prioritised. Are they not already going to their preferred school?
- As with option A, you are reinforcing the inequality of the city. This will not create a mix of advantage/ disadvantage children in each school. This will creat fixed boundaries around the east of the city in particular, making borders which impact on housing prices and enviable/ unenviable roads. This will reinforce cycles of disadvantage with poorer kids only being able to go to the schools with other poor kids.
- Again this model would strongly reinforce that some people can buy their way to their children having a good school experience within the state system whilst others cannot.
- Again this option does not result in seriously equitable outcomes for those in deprived areas as the percentages of FSM recipients are not really affected
- Does not address existing issues regarding inequality of provision across the city.
- Doesn't address the issues with inequalities in East Brighton in particular
- I believe this limits the choice of families to make an informed decision around their child's education as schools excel in different areas that may or may not be aligned to their child's interests and/or talents.
- I can't see how this fixes anything. Again, why is it legal that my child is discriminated for not practicing a religion? This just gives less choice to more children.
- I cant see how this would worl other than to increase inequity between schools serving wealthier vs schools serving poorer local communities
- I don't think narrowing choice further is the correct solution to educational inequality, and also can't see how this model would increase fairness across the city
- In this one it feels like you will have rich people moving into specific catchment areas (ie Stringer and Varndean) and I think it risks make the problem you are trying to solve worse. I do appreciate it's a really difficult task. I think the Hove one is weird - it looks like there's three in one and only effectively one in the big one (as Cardinal Newman is a religious school so can selectively admit).

- This option clearly disadvantages certain areas and children from accessing a good school
- All children regardless of family income need to be given the best opportunities for their future  
Children should not be penalised for their parent's income  
Ignorance is an excuse for poor education choice, poverty is not
- this approach seems to prioritise balancing numbers and not the individual needs of many children - many with extra needs who are diverse in different ways.
- I'm a tad confused as it says the FAM would be equitable but this just doesn't seem possible with some of the catchments.
- More sensible distance wise but I don't see how this meets equitable access objectives
- I do not disagree with this proposal as it does not address the issue of FSM disparity and will exacerbate the current inherent inequalities in the system
- I don't fundamentally disagree with this model, but my concern is that this would further entrench the class divide across the city, keeping children from disadvantaged areas in some schools and affluent children in others.
- I think this is quite equitable and allows short travel time
- I do not feel that this option considers the percentage of FSM in areas of deprivation and social housing. I believe that this option would compound the disparity between children and families in receipt of FSM, not help to increase the educational experience of these children.
- Changing catchment areas won't resolve the problem you're having no wonder more parents are turning to home schooling look at the facts alongside the problem. What is this rubbish!
- In many ways this is a good option as families know which school their child will attend and primaries / secondaries / communities can work together to provide the best educational experience for all. Given 4 not 5 because there is a risk that some schools do not do as well as others due to inequalities in the local communities and lack of expertise / funding in the local school to deal with this. Also concerned that it could increase inequality. However I agree that it could work and it is far preferable to the '4 big catchment areas' proposal.
- It does not make sense to give families no choice in school, given how close some are. This is particularly impactful for students with additional needs, who may not cope well in certain schools.
- Having no choice is not good in my opinion. Many friends from primary school would not be able to apply for the same school because they live slightly outside the boundaries. Children need to have a choice and visit different schools and make a decision afterwards which school would be 1st choice, 2nd etc.
- As with all proposals, wait for FSM admission policy to take effect, wait for Child Wellbeing Bill as that could help solve PAN concerns, wait for the effect of private school VAT moving kids back into state schools. Invest in less popular schools to bring them up to standard supporting their good new leadership.
- It denies parental choice and will widen inequalities
- Less integration of children from around city. No real choice for families.
- Removes all choice and flexibility from parents, and will result in the most advantaged moving house to buy homes in the catchments of the 'better' schools. Will lead to more inequality, not less.
- Schooling becomes a postcode lottery with wealthier families able to buy better education provision. Highly inequitable
- It does not need changing, children with free school meals should not be given priority.
- Seems to create a postcode lottery. FSM pupils will remain focused in specific schools

- Less flexibility in choice; schools have distinct ethos and for any child needing to change schools this does little to support that.
- Provides no choice but still ends up with highly divided schools in terms of deprivation/wealth. For instance patcham would have a very low fsm.
- Of the three options presented I believe this is the fairest and best addresses the issue of falling student numbers. I'm not as convinced regarding the FSM distribution, if it is more even then that can only be a positive thing, however schools (and social services!) need more resources to tackle underlying issues leading to the attainment gap.
- Short/medium term would undoubtedly create additional 'catchment wars' for house prices and longer term distribution of FSMs would shift accordingly. Would delay the issue, rather than deal with it.
- This ignores different levels of demand. This needs to be more carefully justified in relation to the children distribution across schools. Why are those options other than changing the catchment not being considered?
- The lack of choice is likely to have a disproportionate impact on lower income families who may be less able to move to another part of Brighton to be within the catchment area for their preferred school.
- I do not understand why you are considering changing the catchment areas at this stage. It feels very premature since you haven't even seen how the new policy to prioritise FSM students for intake of 2025. Surely wait and see how this works even before contemplating changing catchment areas.
- This option is incredibly restrictive and creates a disparity in access to good/excellent educational opportunities. Greatly creating a bigger gap in the same.
- This option seems only to be fairer in making the system worse for everyone - removing choice from all families but entrenching the inequalities that exist.
- wider measures should be considered to achieve the aims here. and in many ways this option continues priveleged access and would be compounded by house values and people moving. not a solution.
- This will mean a lot of children will only have one possible school to attend and will have no choice if that school is performing badly. This will further perpetuate inequalities.
- This option was ruled out circa 20 years ago with a full unitary authority consultation inclusive of residents. An equality impact assessment would show this is not viable.
- This option, doesn't show equality almost the catchment areas. Some areas will benefit from the option of being able to make different choices, while some of lower economic mean are the ones affected.
- This robs parents of choice and picking the right fit for their children. It would be hugely autocratic to force children to specific schools without giving parents to consider which school may be best for them. I am ashamed that a council I voted for is prepared to impose change which will divide up family groups and friendships all in the interests of an agenda which is poor researched and uninformed
- This will just make the current problem worse , u can't force people to send their kids to a certain school, people will move house , use the private sector or send kids to school in another council (e.g. lewes ) and then u get even less range of pupils
- This would be a catastrophe, as it was prior to 2008. It would very clearly result in a very unfair distortion, as it was 15 years ago, with wealthier families exploiting single catchment postcodes by literally 'moving' their 'residences'. House prices in one or two catchments would rise and the more disadvantaged families would be squeezed out, yet again. This is clear from the pre 2008 evidence when postcodes were key for the middle class chosen school(s). We absolutely must not, especially with a new council committed to better education access and distribution, go backwards to this.
- This would create a close link between home and school and increase inequality through house prices in areas with a (perceived) good or bad school.

- This would give schools the certainty they need to plan for pupil numbers that are known ahead of time. It also means that children have a known pathway from primary to secondary education which takes the anxiety away that can be a factor in the current system and will still remain with option A and option B.
- We need to factor in Kings School and Cardinal Newman Catholic School
- I am unsure that ensuring equal distribution of FSM children is the one factor to consider. As I understand FSM children have higher priority choice over schools anyway, so I am not sure why this is a consideration at the moment when you have only just announced the new admission criteria. Surely you need to let this bed in before making other changes???? Surely you just need to give more resources to schools with a higher proportion of disadvantaged children. As a side note, my daughter is eligible for FSM and I do not consider us disadvantaged, she does not struggle with school and so using this one criteria as a basis for significant changes seems arbitrary
- Why does Cardinal Newman get special treatment?
- While this change is the most radical option under consideration, it levels the playing field for school applications across the entire city, creating a fairer and more equitable process. Currently, families in the east of the City have limited school choices, while those in Hove benefit from multiple options, which is not fair.
- While ensuring each school has a distinct catchment area and sufficient pupil numbers is important for viability, it is crucial that the impact on vulnerable pupils, particularly those with SEND or from disadvantaged backgrounds, is carefully considered. The SEND Review (2022) highlights the need for local, stable educational environments for SEND pupils, emphasizing that stability is crucial for their educational and emotional well-being. Simply drawing catchment boundaries to balance pupil numbers or percentages of children eligible for free school meals risks overburdening schools that are not yet equipped to meet the needs of vulnerable students. Schools like Longhill, which is still rated as "Requires Improvement", need time to improve their infrastructure and teaching consistency before taking on more high-needs students. Forcing pupils, particularly those with additional vulnerabilities, to transition into schools that are still developing their capacity could negatively impact their progress, especially when transitioning from primary to secondary school. While ensuring equitable distribution of students across socio-economic backgrounds is important, the quality of support available at each school must also be prioritized. Research shows that vulnerable pupils, including those with SEND, thrive in consistent environments where their educational and emotional needs are met, as noted in the SEND Code of Practice (2015). Thus, these boundaries should also take into account the readiness of schools to support high-needs students, rather than focusing solely on achieving balanced pupil numbers.
- A noble effort to try and balance the issue of free school meals but once again why are these options being presented as the only options? The impression we are being railroaded into something that benefits few is striking.
- While ensuring each school has a distinct catchment area and sufficient pupil numbers is important for viability, it is crucial that the impact on vulnerable pupils, particularly those with SEND or from disadvantaged backgrounds, is carefully considered. The SEND Review (2022) highlights the need for local, stable educational environments for SEND pupils, emphasizing that stability is crucial for their educational and emotional well-being. Simply drawing catchment boundaries to balance pupil numbers or percentages of children eligible for free school meals risks overburdening schools that are not yet equipped to meet the needs of vulnerable students. Schools like Longhill, which is still rated as "Requires Improvement", need time to improve their infrastructure and teaching consistency before taking on more high-needs students. Forcing pupils, particularly those with additional vulnerabilities,

to transition into schools that are still developing their capacity could negatively impact their progress, especially when transitioning from primary to secondary school. While ensuring equitable distribution of students across socio-economic backgrounds is important, the quality of support available at each school must also be prioritized. Research shows that vulnerable pupils, including those with SEND, thrive in consistent environments where their educational and emotional needs are met, as noted in the SEND Code of Practice (2015). Thus, these boundaries should also take into account the readiness of schools to support highneeds students, rather than focusing solely on achieving balanced pupil numbers. Please give your views on how a change in school admissions arrangements could impact different communities in the city? A change in school admissions arrangements, particularly those involving catchment area realignment, can have far-reaching impacts on different communities in the city, especially for those with protected characteristics, those living in poverty, and vulnerable groups like children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Here's a breakdown of potential impacts, supported by research and government policies:

1. Impact on Vulnerable Pupils (SEND)  
 The SEND Review: Right Support, Right Place, Right Time (2022) stresses that pupils with SEND thrive best when they have consistent, localized support. Disrupting this by forcing them to attend schools farther away, especially those still struggling with resources or quality, can severely hamper their progress. Vulnerable pupils often rely on local, familiar environments that are tailored to their needs. A change in school admissions arrangements that shifts these pupils to schools still in the process of improvement, like Longhill, which is rated as "Requires Improvement", could increase their anxiety and worsen academic outcomes, as they face inconsistent teaching and less specialized support. Additionally, the Children and Families Act 2014 emphasizes the importance of ensuring that children with SEND receive appropriate support without unnecessary barriers to accessing that support, and changes in catchment areas could unintentionally create such barriers.

2. Impact on Children from Disadvantaged Backgrounds.

- Where I live, we would be good. We would have Varndean but it is again not really an inclusive fair model. I think the schools and kids in deprived areas will struggle
- We should wait at least 2 years to see how the changes in admissions for children on free school meals impacts the schools before changing catchments. Children and families in the Porthall/Prestonville area are particularly disadvantaged by this plan
- This will mean certain schools would lack diversity
- This will drive inequality by attracting wealthy people to buy houses where schools are more successful pushing their attainment up further. Schools in poorer areas will deteriorate because parental and community support is historically weak in such communities - generating more class and wealth division in borough
- This seemingly only concentrates further affluent areas into the best schools and there is not a significant change in percentage of FSM's.
- In general, I reject the need to review the catchment areas before the full effects of the alterations to change the school admissions criteria to allow greater freedom of those receiving FSM has been seen. I understand that the admissions criteria has been recently changed to allow FSM pupils to apply to schools across the city and have priority. This is a great initiative and should be allowed time to see the outcome.
- This question is deliberately misleading in the context of the much wider debate around the new FSM policy, Catchment Area redesign, SEND provision and the suggestion that a vastly increased number of children may have unacceptable commutes to school, as many already do. We should be focussed on addressing that rather than adversely affecting an even larger group of children.
- This option removes all choice for children, except for those on FSM.

- This option obviously takes away people's choice (except for people on FSM who may get an option if an out of catchment school hasn't filled its quota), which isn't necessarily great, but I appreciate the current model doesn't give everyone a choice. People who can will move to the area of the school of their preference. Again the real solution to inequality is improving the schools that are less desirable, but reducing inequality, but appreciating that is a big challenge.
- This option doesn't improve the social stratification caused by the current boundaries. Moulsecoomb and Bevendean would remain segregated as a low socioeconomic bloc - thus unbalanced and disadvantaged.
- However, parental choice would only really be achieved by moving. I think option A gives better options to Free School Meal/disadvantaged children than option C.
- This model does not support your objective for an even distribution of FSM across all schools.
- Proposal splits the community in Poets Corner; would reduce choice for the many children at the Portland Rd Hove Junior School site and would cause a lot of upset for children who have friendship groups forced apart by postcode.
- Boundaries have been drawn to try and keep their percentages of free school meals children equitable across the different catchment areas.
- This is what is currently in place for my family, so fairness would say it should be the same for all. Except that of course that isn't true because some catchments will be far more desirable than others due to housing and socioeconomic background of intake.
- this doesn't distribute PP evenly across city
- The clarity provided by this model is marginally better, but it removes the element of choice which Brighton is currently offering, and which the council is trying to achieve to close the attainment gap. These are children with potential, with lives to lead, passions to discover, strengths and weaknesses, a future ahead of them. The argument is clearly that there are many who have no choice already, but this outcome closes that possibility. Every school has its strength of provision, whether it is SEND, sport, music, art. The council's entire basis of this exercise is based on outcomes of Maths and English. What about sports, art, music? What about those children who need a school with good sporting facilities in order to fulfil their whole potential? This feels like a very narrow-viewed exercise which is not considering the importance of the curriculum as a whole.
- The change in FSM balance in this option does not seem enough of a benefit for the upheaval of catchment changes.
- Still not a fan. I would choose to have one big catchment area for all of Brighton & Hove, whilst allowing families to have as many back up choices as they wish in order of preference. Not everyone would get their first choice due to demand but with the back up choices you could make sure that every school has enough pupils to keep them going. I would allocate pupils on a distance based model in order to reduce the average distance travelled to school and maximise the amount of children who walk to school and all the health benefits that would entail, whilst at the same time setting aside quotas of places prioritised for children with SEND and also children in receipt of FSM (or if you can come up with a better way of identifying families that live in relative poverty then I would be all-ears).
- FSM still not very equal
- Single school catchment means that the same sort of cohorts attend the same schools. Does not provide the diversity of backgrounds required to rebalance the education spread across the city.
- Shrinking the catchment areas would end up with less diversity and more inequality between the schools (because their intake would reflect the demographics of their area), and those who can moving house to get into the preferred school, so it might actually make inequality across the city worse.

- school 'choice' isn't the most important thing, and where pupils can access a good, local school without the scramble for admissions elsewhere, this would be my preference. However, there are such deeply ingrained, historic inequalities in the school offers in Brighton, so that this would now do little more than the make social segregation permanent.
- Option C will exacerbate educational inequalities in the city, as evidenced by the distribution of FSMs measures in your documentation, and it will further cement selection through house prices. It also further limits access to high-performing schools for those in poorer communities and effectively eliminates choice.
- None of the proposals offer value or tackle disadvantage, but to give parents no choice at all seems to go against everything that you have said you want to achieve.
- More children at local schools they can walk to and less uncertainty for children and families during application process.
- Looks like this option would increase inequality.
- Looking at the catchment areas, this would still mean that schools like Dorothy Stringer and varndean still receive the most amount of privileged children within the city.
- Like option 1, this appears to entrench existing divisions and inequalities within the city and ensures that the choice of school is determined solely by where people can afford to live.
- I've heard that some changes have been made for FSM pupils and a new head at Longhill - why are we not waiting to see the results of this before taking drastic measures?
- Lack of equality
- Keeps the rich kids in access to better schools, and poorer kids with access only to poor schools
- Keeping catchment tight to one school doesn't afford parental choice or mixing of social-economic groups for a fair integration.
- It's what should probably happen. Would stop a lot of moaning about people with 'choice' and people with 'no choice'
- It's better than option B, but not great. Children and their parents should be able to have at least some choice. Under this proposal children on FSM get options that no one else does.
- It seems ok, but only giving one option suggests that all children will be ok in the same school environment, which seems unlikely
- It presumably means kids from that area can only go to that school which is fairer than schools picking and choosing their pupils but worse if your area is all deprived
- It may not give children who have certain educational needs, but without a statement, to be able to access a school that would be best for them. It takes any choice away. Although I would like to agree with it, inevitably, it will push house and rental prices up in certain areas stopping children in families who aren't on FSM meals, but have a low income, to be able to afford to move to an area where their preferred school is. This in turn will create more of a divide between social classes between schools as the wealthier will move to the catchment areas of certain schools.
- I'm not totally against the idea of single school catchment areas in theory, and this keeps the schools more local to their area, but it would need to be undertaken with wider measures to alleviate inequality which I don't think the council has the power to do, such as rent control. This may moderately adjust the percentage of FSM in each catchment area for the current moment, but over time will entrench privilege in certain areas around the highest performing schools, as house prices in those catchment areas shift to correspond to the boundaries. Without other measures to control house prices the demographics will align to the catchment boundaries - and you will probably end up with a worse imbalance than you have now, This already looks like you are defining the most privilege in East/Central area to Dorothy Stringer

for instance. I also don't know why the catchments necessarily have to have contiguous boundaries - with this model there could be more of a patchwork to enable mixed demographics around a school while staying local to the school.

- If anything this creates even more disparity. The richest areas of central Brighton will have Dorothy Stringer to themselves for example.
- I'm not strongly against this model, as it prioritises distance in some respects, but it takes away any school choice - which I understand was one of the key goals of changing boundaries at all. The best option should balance distance and choice - which I think we have done well with the system as it is now. Stop eating money on this and give it to the schools that need it.
- I'm not so opposed to this one but doesn't give parents any choice in certain areas
- I understand the thinking behind this option, however I don't feel it address the issues the council hope to address and further isolates disadvantaged children.
- I think this is the second best of the three options ! I think it is important children attend the school that is closest to their community and home especially if the council is going to use social deprivation indicators such as FSM or family income, protected characteristics etc to determine placements . The worry here is that it lacks choice of an alternative setting for parents.
- I support whichever of these options ensure a more fair and equal distribution of disadvantaged children. I believe we need to make sure schools are equal and not selective and that the disadvantaged should be prioritised.
- I like the idea myself of clear boundaries but if my memory serves me well this city moved away from that previously to avoid divisions. I think it may help some children who prefer clarity and would like this responsibility removed from them. It would be interesting to see if it did help distribute FSM better. My instincts suggest it might make things worse. Those who have little options but to remain in social housing or accept the given school are being penalised for being located geographically near a certain school, whether they are achieving or not.

As a council you have allowed some schools to set their own admission criteria and boundaries, I am not sure how much this exercise will help if that continues. It's already a two tier system where you as a city council allowed this.

- The option as proposed seems to be similar to option A in that it reduces the levels of FSM at Patcham and Hove Park, both of which already have the lowest percentage of FSM, and hence increase the disparities across the city. It also appears to be an option which attempts to offer some level of improvement to the situation of those in East Brighton who are economically disadvantaged, but completely ignores any economically disadvantaged areas of Hove who clearly in the councils eyes aren't deserving of any improvements.
- I agree with the important aim of trying to keep the percentages of free school meals children equitable across the different catchment areas.
- I don't support this option because it does not help make things more equal, which is what changing things should be striving to achieve. Furthermore, as a resident in an area that currently only has one 'choice' of school, I wouldn't wish that on anyone.
- For all the reasons stated in your presentation:
  - Clear arrangements with certainty about the catchment area school.
  - Develops a clear transition link between primary and secondary education.
  - Provides a consistent approach across the city.
  - Schools have catchment areas with pupil numbers that match their revised PANs.
  - Supports the development of comprehensive, community schools who serve a community.
  - The FSM criteria retains some opportunity to realistically express a preference. The FSM range does change slightly (19% - 50% to 17% - 46%).
  - The model can fluctuate to take account of changing pupil numbers. Provides a platform for schools to continue to be sustainable and meet the needs of all learners.

- Fails to address the true cause of inequality and will cause additional pain through disruption of communities and friendship groups
- Children should have more than one option
- All students are meant to have a choice, so how could this be a viable option?
- Any model where you have zero choice in school is an unacceptably negative change. This would still have negative impacts including the fact schools would no longer need to compete, friendship groups will be split up but the ability to still walk to school makes this significantly more palatable than Option C and would not be sufficient to force me to move out of the area
- Again, I just don't understand how this would work. You're, again, splitting some communities, asking children to travel long distances without providing additional transport because you've already said you don't have the money to do this. And what happens if you don't get into the one school in your catchment area? What happens if your child has additional needs, whatever they happen to be, and the one school in your catchment doesn't sufficiently cater to these needs? And why does the orange area have 3 schools to choose from and light pink two, yet brown, pink, blue, dark blue and green have one? How on earth is this equitable for all (ALL) children to thrive? (your words).
- Again no choice for families in some catchment areas - unbelievable this is being considered as completely contradictory to the values you are trying to uphold re access inclusion equality etc
- Again it seems strange that the impact of FSM on the selection criteria isn't having time to embed? How will we know what the results are of this? It seems strange to take away all choice in order to make things fair.
- Choice for individual children is highly important. Single catchments do not work.
- Doesn't solve issue of providing more choice to families in less affluent areas

## **6. Child Wellbeing and Development**

- Would remove the anxiety a lot of yr6s have about which school they will be going to, will they be with their friends, will they escape the bullies from their primary school
- Would mean we would get into school of choice but would mean eldest autistic daughter not with any of her friends (something that would be incredibly detrimental to her.) and also would end our plans of moving house to get a bigger garden for our daughter who needs more space to regulate her body and emotions. We would have to choose between that and a school that we feel would best meet her needs. How is that fair?
- Children living very close to Dorothy Stringer and Varndean are not able to go to their local school. This will impact their wellbeing meaning they have to travel further to school, either by car or public transport, and do not feel connected to their local community, friends or local area. It is wrong on many levels. The wellbeing of ALL children, their connection to their local environment, encouraging them to walk to school and reduce traffic should be paramount.
- for us also a very bad option as our daughter will be forced to go to her 3rd closest school
- Again, we would end up with two children at different secondary school on opposite sides of the city. A complete logistical nightmare for families and would greatly impact the children
- I don't see how this is sustainable long term as the population eligible for school each year will vary too much between these fairly narrow catchments, and parents and kids will have no choice as to where they go. Choice is essential for any child, but particularly those with additional needs, neurodivergence, from underrepresented groups...

- It will keep children going to school more local tomwheee they live, but it gives no choice in school, and some schools may not suit certain children and might not be able to offer the right support for a certain child's needs
- It's a terrible idea to not offer choice to students - everyone will have different preferences and needs - forcing them to one school won't suit them..
- More effort should be made to ensure children are able to go to a school near where they live. Travelling long distances will have a big negative impact on children's physical and mental health.
- I think this has some merits in terms of certainty and reduced transport, however I think it will be unpopular if choice is entirely removed. Not all children are suited to particular schools and it's unclear if, eg children with SEN would be able to access a school better suited to their needs. Some clarification on that would help allay those concerns.
- Absolutely awful proposal. No choice at all! What if the 1 school in your catchment is the least appropriate for your child due to size, SEN provision, transport links, quality of education (I know the aim is for this to be equal but in reality it is not and probably never will be and even if it becomes more balanced it is a long process which means pupils during the transition stage could lose out).  
As a parent of an SEN child this model is really concerning. Those with EHCPs, I assume, will still have a higher preference but there are so many children across the city who do not have this provision in place, either because they do not need the additional support (but still need staff to have a good understanding of SEN), but most likely because they are stuck in the system on waiting lists with CDC's, CAMHS etc. My daughters school is perfect for her but it would be highly detrimental for her younger brother - it's too big and lack of SEN support and understanding and quite Dickensian in its approach. This would not be a supportive environment for him, his anxiety would massively increase and mental health deteriorate but as he is very able and behaves well he does not require additional intervention and therefore doesn't qualify for an EHCP. Where does this model leave children like him?? Likely becoming a school refuser with rock bottom MH!
- My child has autism and this would be particularly difficult in the sense that this proposal would separate siblings, forcing them to attend different schools. This fragmentation is concerning for many reasons. Siblings often serve as each other's support system, helping each other navigate challenges both academically and socially. When siblings are in different schools, they lose the chance to share experiences, collaborate on homework, and provide emotional support to one another. This separation can be particularly challenging for children with additional needs, as they benefit immensely from the familiarity and comfort of having a sibling close by.
- Again all of these options require consultation and exploration around. There are so many factors to consider. I am a qualified social worker and not convinced children's welfare is being prioritised here.
- I think this makes slightly more sense, but makes no sense for the people right next to Varndean who can't go there. For me personally I don't like it as I don't know if my potentially ASD (waiting to be assessed) son would cope in Stringer.
- The uncertainty a 100% ballot system creates is incredibly unsettling for young people at an already disruptive time of their lives. In an age of increasing anxiety and mental health issues I wouldn't underestimate how damaging the uncertainty the ballot system creates.
- I believe some options should be given to children in choosing their secondary schools
- I think this may work but i dont understand why you would close a under subscribed school after deliberately limiting their catchment area, some children will want to

choose their school and they may not want the local one but in this they have no choice really and some schools will be threatened, why cant they have choices?

- I think it could create greater wealth and FSM mix gaps, based on Bristol evidence. There is no evidence based to suggest this would work/be effective. It's a disaster if you have children with different needs and we all know 4/5 SEN children do not have EHCPs. What is good for one child isn't necessarily the right school for another child and it's such a shame. For us personally, a choice of three schools would be reduced to one school - which seems heartbreaking when you have four children with very different needs.
- . All students should have access to multiple quality education options to meet their diverse needs and preferences.
- Strongly disagree with single catchment areas, as not all schools are suitable for all children, and where there is an opportunity for choice it should be maintained.
- Students need to have more choice.
- Secondary transition is hugely worrying for YP and parents. This gives a degree of certainty and helps keep communities and yp's friendship groups together. Helps with out of school friendship activities and parental support.
- Such a limiting structure allowing our child to only have one choice of school. Children and parents need choice to allow them to thrive and choose the best school and education route for their personality.
- This alienates children into areas and doesn't broaden educations
- This feels alarming because parents aren't given any choice based on their child's individual needs
- Lack of choices of different schools would not be good for children with different needs and preferences
- Reducing the options for kids to a single school is not ideal as is not inclusive to all kids needs.
- No ability to make the best choice for you child's education for the vast majority of parents
- The rigidity of this model seems to offer parents even less choice, deplaning on the needs of an individual child, eg additional needs
- The school in the catchment area may not support a child's needs appropriately e.g. good pastoral care for children with particular needs e.g. children with EHCP.
- This feels like segregation across the city and that you can only access a school based on what house you can afford to buy or rent, or where you're able to access social housing. Also, if children have different educational needs (including SEN, but also about temperament, learning style etc) different children even within the family may learn best in different schools, so being able to apply to different schools would be important.
- Reducing the options for kids to a single school is not ideal as is not inclusive to all kids needs. Shorter travelling times to schools across the city seems to be present under this option but it is a step backwards from the current arrangement. Are council just wanting to make a change to show that they are being proactive?
- This model is better than option B, but for us personally, it would create a very upset child so it's not one we can support.
- This option removes any sense of agency from a child's life. They have no say in the style of education they would prefer, there individual needs are homogenised, they are treated like objects. If you were to make one of the most important choices of your life and had specific needs but were told you only have one option, how would you feel? This will cut off friendships formed in primary school, forged during a global pandemic, to take this away is another cruel idea.
- This is the most ill-conceived proposal of all. Having so many smaller catchment areas severely reduces parental choice, forcing students to attend schools that may

not align with their educational needs, extracurricular interests, or logistical preferences

- This provides no choice and there are schools within the city which do not suit some students eg baca is so focussed on sports and their cricket academy at the detriment of educational attainment which will not suit some students at all. This is not fair. There should be choice of a local school for all kids.
- This removes choice. It removes the ability of parents/children to assess different school offers and choose what suits them best.
- This option leaves parents and children with no choice. For neurodiverse/ SEND children (without EHCPs) this would be catastrophic if their catchment school wasn't a good fit / unable to meet their needs. It would likely result in an increase in EHCPs being sought in order to have some control over school choice.
- This seems to give no choice at all to pupils / parents. At the moment the schools in Brighton and Hove offer different environments and facilities suited to the needs of different children. If we want all pupils to achieve their best and thrive then we need to consider what local school will best suit their needs. Interestingly at each of the Headteachers welcome talks at Open Evenings, they have mentioned how important it is as parents and potential pupils to get a real feel for the school and decide what is best suited to the young person's needs. Will they thrive in a smaller, calmer environment? Will they achieve their best in a larger, stimulating environment? Are they neurodiverse and would find a large, busy school challenging? At a time when we are constantly talking about a mental health crisis among our young people, there needs to be some level of choice. Some children get their self esteem and sense of purpose through Sport and so a school with excellent Sporting facilities is important, for others it will be Performing Arts or technology. Our Secondary schools have different things to offer and therefore it should very much depend on individual choice. Restricting catchments in this way doesn't seem to consider the needs and wishes of young people as individuals and therefore they are less likely to thrive and achieve their best.
- This option takes all choice away for parents which is not acceptable as some pupils may fare better in different schools that have different priorities (e.g. well-developed pastoral system, academically focused, strong focus on sport/wellbeing, well-organised support for SEN pupils etc). This option also reduces the PAN in large schools that are currently oversubscribed so makes no sense whatsoever. For us, this option would mean that our son would go to a school with very little pastoral support and is well known for the lack of SEN support. Taking away the choice for pupils who are not considered as priority in the admissions process could therefore potentially lead to more pupils with SEN having to leave mainstream education at a significant cost to the LA.
- This proposal is the best one for ensuring more children can go to a school close to them. Enhancing their opportunities to socialise outside of school, minimising time wasted in travelling supporting students to walk or cycle to school, improving their health. Reducing car journeys and supporting the environment. It is also the only proposal where the free school meals numbers presented are actually relevant.
- Children have varying needs and deserve to have a choice of schools in order to select ones that support their needs and learning methods
- What happens if there are too many children in a catchment area in one year? For example in the first year this is proposed the number of children applying for a place seems to be only 2 fewer than the previous year and yet some schools would be lowering their PAN by a whole Class or more? This could mean children travelling huge distances if their didn't get in on the lottery system and also have mental health consequences if everyone else they know has gone to the school in their catchment but they haven't.

- This solution is preferable to option 2. But it doesn't give children any options, they may be separated from their friends they have had all through junior school. Could be very disruptive.
- Where's the choice here? We want children to be engaged in choosing a school that feels right for them and meets their needs, this completely takes the choice away
- While it's important to aim for equitable distribution of students, moving pandemic-affected children (those born between September 2014 and August 2015) to schools still developing their infrastructure, like Longhill, is highly risky. These children already face significant challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted their early years of education. The SEND Review (2022) stresses that vulnerable pupils require stable, familiar environments, and moving them to schools that are not yet ready to support them could further exacerbate their vulnerabilities. Forcing these children into schools still rated as "Requires Improvement" like Longhill, without fully addressing the school's capacity to handle high-needs students, risks further harming their educational progress and emotional well-being.
- too narrow, doesn't give much option to suit the different child's needs
- This solution again addresses only one factor and while it's better regarding commute to and back from school it takes away any form of choice over what school a child might go. Also what happens when a child moves away to another area while attending certain schools, so they have to change schools?
- This is not progress, this gives every child option of one school and one school only. Every child is different and each school has its strengths in certain areas. Surely in 2025 children should be able to have a preference in the school they attend, one that aligns with their interests and strengths. Educational establishments are not and can't be suitable for every child.
- This is depriving children from the option to find the right setting for them. It creates ridiculous artificial boundaries with pupils living a street away from a school but needing to travel to go to school.
- This gives no choice for children with differing needs and strengths, and as before, splits communities in two.
- This does nothing to bring together the strong and diverse background Brighton has. Option C would not enable children to flourish and have their needs met
- This data & survey are not accurate so should not be used Partucularly for children who live in the 5 ways area who would have to travel across the city at the detriment to their mental wellbeing when 2 incredibly good & schools are on the doorstep.
- Takes a lot of the guess work out of knowing what happens next. Children will go to the same secondary school as their friends.
- Children will be split by location rather than which school caterers best for their needs.
- Single choice is no choice and until quality is equal in all schools this places the outcomes of students and their school experience based on their location not what is best for them.
- Reducing choice for children is hardly in keeping with a process designed to offer opportunity.
- On a personal level, my children would not be going to the same school as the majority of their class/ schoolmates.
- I understand sibling links will be honoured but this would mean that this small amount of children will end up in a year group with children from a completely different catchment area rather than the children in their local community. This will make transition and being part of the local community very difficult going forward
- Not all schools are suitable for different children- you need a few options
- Not all schools suit all children. Reducing choice of schools would have an unnecessary negative impact on children in the area

- No choice for your child. This is not great for children who have had a bad experience at primary school and wish to start a new high school with new peers. 1 school option is basically no choice at all. All "low income" areas are banded together in the same school catchments which in no way helps spread the different type of families/ children around the schools.
- This option takes all choice away for parents which is not acceptable, as some pupils may fare better in different schools that have different priorities (e.g. well-developed pastoral system, academically focused, strong focus on sport/wellbeing, well-organised support for SEN pupils etc). This option also reduces the PAN in large schools that are currently oversubscribed so makes no sense whatsoever. For us, this option would mean that our son would go to a school with very little pastoral support and is well known for the lack of SEN support. Taking away the choice for pupils who are not considered as priority in the admissions process could therefore potentially lead to more pupils with SEN having to leave mainstream education at a significant cost to the LA.
- I'm not sure about this either. I do believe that we should all support our local schools where possible and this model kind of moves towards that but I think that because young people are all so different I think it's beneficial overall for there to be some element of choice. Otherwise you end up with children in schools that don't really suit them despite there being another more suitable one nearby, sometimes in this scenario just minutes away.
- Forcing friendships apart like this would have a major impact on a child's wellbeing.
- I value at least some choice for our children as individuals
- I can see the strength of this model, in that it gives most certainty to families. I think uncertainty brings stress and unhappiness. However, this model would divide the children in the primary school my children attend between two secondary schools, and would be likely to result in my child being the only one of her friendship group to go to a different secondary school to the others. I think that would make her very unhappy. I also don't understand what would happen if there were not enough places in a particular year group in a particular school to accommodate the children in the catchment. This is not explained.
- Children who've been through primary and junior school are likely to be split up. How. An this lead to good educational outcomes
- By adopting this model you are removing all choice for pupils who share primary schools and may have strong reasons for preferring one school over another. Different schools excel in different areas and as a parent of a neurodiverse child the I recognise the importance of choice in preference for a school that better suits her needs.
- However, I would point out that families choose to live in an area where they feel comfortable with what their surroundings provide and possibly the biggest factor in that choice would be schools. They have to consider stress and safety not only to the child on their daily journey to and from school but their working commitments, whether they own a car or might have to for school transport, out of school activities for their children to enhance their education, city pollution and friendships made from the start of education at playgroups which offer support in times of difficulties, of which life presents many during the school life of a child.
- Balancing catchments on a single metric provides significant risk to schools that are not equipped to meet the needs of the children intake specifically those of SEND
- Environmental impact. Impact on children's wellbeing and community cohesion.

## **7. Implementation and Evidence**

- You really need to provide more details and numbers for all catchment areas. If you do it without providing data to parents you end up with conflict
- Visual not fit for purpose and highly inaccessible for a proposal of this magnitude and importance!
- Don't understand what you are trying to do
- I don't believe there has been enough time to consider and review any of these changes
- Both descrimanatory and devicive
- Impossible to read or to understand your poorly designed model
- Insufficient data to support this proposal so impossible to understand rationale.
- It is very hard to see the exact boundaries for this option based on the map provided.
- Lines are not defined on where our catchment area will be, I have raised this on the video call. How are we meant to make a decision on something that has not been thought out...?
- Can see a lot of middle class getting annoyed at this one!
- Again I need to see evidence to support the arguments put forward. I am also quite confused between the 2 objectives (a) falling pupil numbers and (b) equality of education for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Both are important issues, but it is hard to get my head around these. The options are quite confusing and from a selfish point of view I do want to think about what would be right for our child and family too.
- I can't see how it helps the kids on free school meals though.
- This looks logical
- I think this option provides greatest clarity and makes for a simpler system to administer
- For this much change I would need to see data supporting the proposed motivations for such a change
- Again I have not seen sufficient evidence from the council to necessitate changing catchment areas without other significant negative impacts
- I am visually impaired on this map is an accessible to me
- I need more information, showing how each different option will support children in our city to achieve and thrive. The map suggests this is an unbalanced approach.
- I need to learn more about this model
- It is not possible to critique the options effectively. The information provided is not adequate and there is a lack of equality impact information.
- It is unclear what the benefit over proposal A is.
- It would provide certainty, I like this
- Only viable option is option A
- Although this provides a better spread, I don't think it provides options, so is not as good as B.
- Frankly, given the objectives presented in the phase 1 documentation, I am surprised this is even being considered.
- Reductions in numbers in certain schools not desirable. This is even worse than option 1. Requires further consultation.
- This is clearer for parents, however, what hasn't been explained is what happens in the event that you child doesn't get into this school (assuming that it can't be guaranteed)?
- Another terrible option
- It's hard to get a clear idea from this map but I feel like our choice of school would be very limited.
- Doesn't really solve the issue
- Again, no evidence has been provided to show how this would improve target outcomes

- Again, my problem with is option is how the catchment areas have been designated
- I don't think it's awful, but I don't know what it 'fixes'
- I don't understand how this fixed the problem
- Liaise with Parent Support Group for Option D
- Option C, like option A needs to be more carefully justified with additional information regarding the future decline in pupil numbers across different schools. Because it also delivers no choice for parents, it is worse than Option A.
- This doesn't feel very future proof and I feel you'd be having to merge catchments again in future?
- Again, poor analysis and does not achieve what is stated above.
- Of the suggestions this looks the best in terms of schools being closer to the pupils, so it looks the best although difficult to assess without detail
- Seems a sensible approach. Fits the goals
- This makes the most logical sense to me
- This solution is better when compared with option B but I'm unsure why it would help versus the preferable option A
- This will end in chaos and doesn't take into account the positions of primary schools
- This would be the worst option and would do nothing to change the current situation
- Viability in the short term is shortsighted and damages Brighton as a whole.
- Without seeing the proposed changes, it's hard to comment on this
- Without seeing any data it is impossible to judge this option (and the others). How does it help the disadvantaged? Where is the data related to the impacts of the FSM priority change? It seems obvious to allow that change time to bed in and show measurable results for the disadvantaged before making catchment area changes. Why are distinct catchments a solution here? Where is the data?
- With no information provided on how many children are in each catchment it is impossible to answer this and some catchments appear to still have more than one choice
- This seems the most sensible to me.
- This seems sensible
- This is my second favourite option but prefer option A
- Any sane person would reject this out of hand. In fact it feels like this option is here to make Option A more palatable.
- Overall, these proposals are causing us a great deal of unnecessary anxiety already as it is to so many families.
- Why reduce the number of places in already popular schools? What happens if the only school in the catchment area is oversubscribed? Not enough information to make an informed decision
- We had catchment areas before and that did not work.
- Too disruptive a proposal - Option A is clearly better thought through
- This will impact too many children. Parents chose primary schools based on current freedom over secondary schools; this change would be gravely unfair
- This question is worded badly as the options 1 to 5 don't match the question. how can the answer to how much i support something be 'strongly disagree'. I don't know if 1 means i strongly oppose the model or strongly support it. But I strongly oppose all models. We have not been provided with enough data and evidence to make a proper informed decision about any of the proposed options. They are impossible to assess on a broader city wide scale as I cannot tell what information has been used to draw the boundaries. I can therefore only speak on a personal level or with more general points.
- None of the three options seem rooted in a proper data-driven analysis. i don't know what is driving these changes and what the council are hoping to achieve. Is it to support schools like longhill with dwindling numbers? Or is it a genuine change

based on statistics and science? I wish we had more details on how these options have been reached. We don't know how the boundaries were drawn up, apart from a vague reference to PANs. I feel that we need time to see how the FSM priority scheme works out before changing anything else. We also need to be provided more information for a proper consultation to take place.

- As with A and B, you've given us nowhere enough information to be able to tell whether this model has any merit. We can't even see exactly where the boundaries lie. No information on the number of pupils, places, the demand for places, no evidence behind the assertion that there needs to be a particular minimum number of places to make any particular school viable, no information on transport arrangements, safeguarding, nothing.
- It is quite hard to tell just from a map what difference these proposals will actually make to support those young people. Or what the impact would be on other children in the city. More information would be helpful but also a plan and investment beyond catchment areas is required if we really want to make a difference to this young people.
- Feels like a platitude and not an absolute commitment
- This is significantly better than option b.
- This is astonishingly restrictive
- This is a terrible idea
- I have nowhere near enough information to make an informed decision about this - see concerns raised by Professor Adam Dennett. This seems like the second least worst option for my children but I haven't got enough information to know what the implications are more generally.
- This feels like the most logical and sensible option of the three proposals
- This feels like the fairest option (everyone has one school as option rather than some areas having a choice of two and others only one.) this also seems so sensible travel wise as the catchments are relatively local and the catchment areas look fairly balanced in terms of the size and areas they cover.
- This appears an attempt to blur the two previous options, offering little change for the good and significant change for the worse.
- These questions do not have the information available to those following only this link. The inflation needs to be supplied in visual form, with an accompanying description of the proposal. Complementary inadequate information and is an accessibility issue. This is a very troubling survey.
- The worst option of them all
- The map is unclear. Are you redrawing new catchment areas or are these the existing ones. If you're changing the catchments why break something that works. Fix what isn't working. Don't wreck schools and models that are working.
- The information provided is not enough for parents, pupils, schools and any other interested parties to make an informed decision. However from what we have been told this option is terrible for children living in the Roundhill area
- Simplifies the admissions process.
- Seems a rushed suggestion with little evidential explanation.
- Ridiculous.
- For reasons stated before. This isn't helpful.
- Are council just wanting to make a change to show that they are being proactive?
- Parents need more time, information and understanding as well as the means to suggest amendments and alternatives
- Once again this is fiddling with lines to solve complex issues.
- Nothing would change with this model.
- Not ideal but better than B
- Not enough information

- Not enough evidence to support why this is worth considering.
- Not enough publicly-available clear analysis of the data used to design this proposal be able to make an informed choice.
- Not enough information is provided to make an informed decision and to be able to answer this question.
- Not enough data provided by the council to understand the efficacy of this model, for the reasons set out here:  
[https://adamdennett.github.io/BH\\_Secondary\\_Admissions\\_Analysis/BH\\_Sec\\_Sch\\_Analysis.html](https://adamdennett.github.io/BH_Secondary_Admissions_Analysis/BH_Sec_Sch_Analysis.html)
- None of these three options are good
- Not a good option but much better than option B.
- None of these options are good enough
- Not a chance in hell I would accept this change.
- No noticeable difference
- more children will be coming from private schools thus the projected numbers will be wrong
- Map very difficult to read.
- Map unclear
- It is wrong to expect parents to opt into 3 stubborn choices - that will potentially negatively affect their family's wishes for a school placement, without clear boundary markings
- Mapping too vague
- Looks ok
- Map is awful! Cannot answer this accurately due to poor map.
- Map and information isn't clear enough to make an informed opinion
- Like Option A, there is not enough evidence provided so far to agree with this proposal.
- Just ridiculous
- All three options don't have correct level of analysis of data to inform the boundaries and fundamentally do not address the inequality in the city
- Just leave it as it is
- Its ridiculous option. Its essentially the same, but worse
- I would appreciate insights into the cost implications from the consultants or whomever has been employed to devise these concepts. What are the CBS analysis for these? And I'm not just asking about the schools and children impacts.
- It's ok but doesn't really fix the problem of choice. Personally I would be happy with this but others will think it is unfair.
- It is a good idea
- I want to understand the councils' spatial data, where is has mapped out where children in the city looking for high school places actually live and how they correspond to these plans. None of these options take into account anything but free school meals
- I think this model looks like the most balanced option.
- I think it's not bad, but it's hard to predict when you say the zones are NOT final. It's such a fake proposal. If we say yes, and you change the zone s later, you MUST ask for a revote.
- I feel this process has been rushed and is very unfair
- I don't think amending catchment areas is the answer
- I don't believe there is enough evidence proving this will solve the problems it's meant to and could introduce further issues
- I can't see our road on the map

- Also, all these proposals seem to be working to an arbitrary timeline of 2026. We actually have four years before the real impact of falling birthrate, so please let's make a considered approach and not rush
- I can't say which model I prefer without more info about each model, the proper catchment areas, the impacts, the pros and cons, can you provide this to help people decide?
- feels a bit risky
- I'm still strongly against this option in the absence of data to substantiate that the outcome of the change would achieve the stated aims of this change.
- Definitely not!
- Would people effectively be guaranteed a spot at their catchment area school? Or would there still be 2nd/3rd preferences? If so how would that work?
- Completely unreasonable
- Agree with Option A
- Absurd lack of evidence and supporting data makes this proposal meaningless
- Again maps difficult to read
- All these options have the wrong starting point. I suggest the team works with the UCL expert who has provided some initial spatial analysis on this to the council. Where are the students, where is the demand, let's try to match that.
- Even more ridiculous than plan B
- AGAIN CAN'T MAKE OUT THIS AWGUL MAP
- 2nd best option after A
- A fair option
- Absolute pig of an option. Same as option 1 and not sure why it is included at all
- Again, without seeing more details this question is almost pointless
- Again, there has not been enough evidence presented to provide a rationale for this proposal or what the likely impact will be on pupils and the community.
- Definitely more sensible than Option B but more disruptive than Option A
- How was this map even drafted? Did you consult with parents/primary schools?

## **8. Geographic Distribution and Choice**

- You haven't made the case for such a dramatic change. It sounds like students around the less popular schools will have to go to them, rather than getting the opportunity to go to a more popular school out of catchment. I think what has to be understood is how geography matters less at secondary level than at primary level. So 'local schools' for secondary level makes less sense as a value to pursue. At the start of this survey, you should have articulated what the key values are. Yes, we want children to achieve and thrive, but there seems to be an agenda here around localisation that hasn't been articulated.
- I can't see how this would help at all, just make things more complicated and competitive and postcode reliant.
- Not sure you're allowed to do this one, takes away all choice from which school a kid goes to
- I do not support this option as it sees the very distinct Fiveways community cut in half. This option also sees families in that community ineligible for the school they live right next to.
- A great way to stop any type of choice.
- As a Fiveways resident this option could mean our new catchment area could be Longhill in Rottingdean which I strongly disagree with.
- Forcing children from the Friars and Surrenden Road to go to Patcham will be very detrimental to the children and families will move or rent elsewhere

- not preferable to not have a choice of school, we would go from having a choice of two good schools to being forced into one.
- Similarly to A, This option only serves to reduce choice for parents and children: Which is not stated aim of this council: Indeed is quite the opposite.
- You are unfairly splitting Porthall and Prestonville out of it's current catchment area. This means children from this area will have to travel longer distances and it also breaks up the well established links to these schools without research and evidence to back up why this is worthwhile
- Where is the choice?
- It gives parents no choice in terms of school. Right now I have two very different children who would both benefit from attending completely different secondary schools in Hove. And neither would fit in to the school that would be our new and very limited catchment . We would have to move and our house value would fall. It's not always about distance to home and in fact I would say this is the least important factor when choosing a the most appropriate school in the area
- Not enough choice for those in Portslade
- This removes choices that we used to have and would force my children to go to different schools.
- As before no change for Portslade
- A single school per catchment area removes any option of choice.
- not allowing any choice is ridiculous and would be terrible for house prices near schools that are considered more desirable
- This is an ok option will lead to certainty as to where pupils are going to school
- Would need to consider it in more depth but second option sounds best
- Would like the option of varndean or stringer
- would be nicer to have the option of Gardena as well
- Worst option, too restrictive and risky for local numbers to dwindle in some years
- With this option Withdean Crescent us in the catchment area for Patcham High, a half hour walk, when there are two schools ten minutes walk away. This will adversely affect the children , the area and house values.
- With the option of only one place, if that place is massively oversubscribed, where will the btjen be sent?
- Why would you reduce the choice for children at a hugely important transition when the birth rates are falling?
- Again like proposal A this does not give parents any choice.
- Perhaps a focus on housing pricing and the impact of second homes and airbnb would be more useful?
- Once again port hall/prestonville is penalised
- Why should porthall area be now claassed as hove??
- Why is the boundary unequal for those living north and south of new church road in Hove- disagree with this as wealthier properties closest to the sea have a catchment extending further west
- Why are the roads that are RIGHT next to Varndene excluded from it's catchment area?
- Whilst much better than option B, there are limitations of choice for many families in the centre/north of town.
- Whilst focusing on a local approach is better in terms of children being more likely to easily get to school this seems to enable many Hove families to maintain choice but those in the Brighton side not to.
- You lose choice
- Why? What possible benefit to parents having less choice?
- Why would you reduce the choice for children at a hugely important transition when the birth rates are falling?

- Why reduce choice - this will have significant impact on house prices in certain catchment areas when rent and house prices are ridiculous anyway! You will have to do this process again when pupil numbers reduce further when no one can afford to live in certain catchment areas - or you will largely increase inequality across the city. Again - repeating my response to option A
- Why can't children just choose the school they prefer, 1st, 2nd, 3rd choice, regardless of distance
- Whilst this is preferable to option B it removes any choice for a parent who may not align with the results, quality of education or values of their local school. Choice is important.
- Why should choice be limited to one only?
- Whilst this model does prioritise children going to their local school, it does take away any choice whatsoever. As far as I'm aware, people having a choice was one of the key drivers of this proposal. The money spent on this should be driven into schools - that might drastically help matters.
- Whilst better than option B, I find this option too prescriptive compared to option A. It will limit opportunities for families within some catchment areas to find the right school for their child's needs.
- while it should work in theory - one choice - one school for some areas - it's disproportionate when comparing east to west
- What options does this have for kids in Woodingdean
- We'd like to continue to have a choice of more than one school
- We'd like to have a choice on the school we could send our children to, and don't want to be restricted to one school.
- We would like greater options to include Dorothy Stringer
- We worked hard to be able to move to our current house, specifically because it is in the Varndean/stringer catchment area. Our son now goes to Varndean and loves it. It is a 5 minute walk from us. We would like our daughter to also go there when she leaves primary school. This proposed area moves us from being in the area to being just outside it. This seems very unfair on us.
- We only have one school in our catchment area- Baca. No choice for our children
- We live in Coldean and part of the reason we chose to live here was to have the choice between two schools, to enable us to decide which would best suit our children. Models A and C remove the choice. Our eldest child goes to Patcham HS and we are very disappointed that you are looking to take that option away. This was already consulted on recently and rejected, I cannot believe our council is putting terrible proposals forward once again so soon
- want to have a choice of which school to send my child to - forcing all students in a particular area to go to a specific school will not encourage those schools to raise standards. Also likely to be knock on impacts to other areas such as housing etc as parents are under more pressure to be in the "right postcode" for the school they want their child to attend
- This gives children in our area the choice of one school!
- Varndean and Stringer are the closest schools to our road (Withdean Crescent) but we would not be in the catchment area for either school.
- Varndean and Stringer are next door to each other so should still share a catchment
- Unfair - children should have two choices - one is limiting and short-sighted - how would you feel only having the one choice of school if it were for your children.
- Under the current model some areas have a 'choice' of secondary school and others don't. In some ways this makes it fairer as everyone is in a single school catchment area however I think that many parents would not want to lose the option of a choice so I think this model would be unpopular unless a percentage of spaces were available for out of catchment children so that a child could express a preference for one out of catchment school in the city (except those with different admission criteria)

like Kings and Newman) and would go into a lottery for the chosen percentage of places. If unsuccessful in the lottery they would get a place at their catchment school.

- uncomfortable notion of no choice
- Travel distance is ok but no parental choice
- Total lack of ability to choose what is best for your school. I had thought that parental choice was an important factor in schools policy
- Too many smaller catchment areas removing choice for people. Where possible, I think choices should be available. I think Varndean and Stringer should be in the same catchment so that you can choose the school that you think your child will thrive in within this catchment area. Many parents may have moved in close proximity to Varndean / Stringer / Hove Park Upper School and under this scenario, may not end up in the catchment area of their chosen school, which is unfair.
- Too limited with choice for BN2 children.
- To not be eligible for Varndean when we live 2 mins away is insanity
- To give families zero choice of schools doesn't feel right. Where only one school exists for a large area, no choice may be possible and that is a reality of school location in Brighton
- Thought the council wanted to offer choice?!? Listening to Jacob Taylor it's clear that's the idea but why? Another rubbish model.
- This would reduce parental choice across the city, though for for nearly all pupils at Coombe Road primary the effect is much the same as Option A
- This would provide more clarity and more certainly for everyone involved. Perhaps there are some catchments that should be joint though... E.g Varndean and Stringer as they are practically next door to one another.
- This would mean more closures and ultimately the LA needs to actually allow building in areas to promote families moving into the areas rather than pushing for apartment and high rise buildings or "co living" which does not promote families as happening in Lewes Rd and Hove areas.
- This would leave me with no choice of school for my son (as we do not wish to attend a religious school - Kings) - only Hove Park. It also means he would not be in the catchment for Blatch which is by far the closest school to us.
- This would cause the same issue as option A for my family meaning Longhill is the only option and for my children's primary school community Option C will give them just one choice of school, Blatchington Mill School.
- This will reduce parental choice. It would be better to expect popular schools and close schools with falling rolls if this is needed.
- This will maintain the status quo where the popular schools are in the more expensive areas
- This will continue to ensure those parents who want 'better' schools will Move to the school catchment areas
- This will create even worse wealth silos
- This will be crazy for house prices in preferred school locations. I can't see this working to anyone's advantage
- This totally removes choice for parents and makes schools dangerously dependent on population levels - and would lead to desirable areas around individual schools rocketing in house prices and effectively segmenting by wealth.
- This takes away the element of any choice for families.
- This takes away parental choice
- This takes choice away from everyone.
- This seems to offer a more local school to each child. But the current system is working fine. PLEASE don't change what isn't broken!!

- This seems like a plausible solution although I would prefer A as it offers more choice. For clarity, I would only fully support a plan which adds a new or relocated school in East Brighton.
- This seems designed to reduce parental choice
- This removes parent and child choice when applying to school. There is then no option if they are struggling in one school, to move to another as this would be out of their catchment area
- This removes choice from parents, and though you say it gives certainty to schools and families, you also acknowledge it will need to be regularly updated and reviewed, removing any opportunity for certainty! Option B offers much more certainty for families.
- This removes choice for children and parents and is unlikely to be accepted by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator.
- This reduces choice significantly. Some catchments only have one school
- This reduces choice and also splits central Brighton so that children at primary school together will not be able to attend with their friends. Why not just get rid of these zones?!
- For our family, this option C is also bad. And I feel like it's the worst for the city as a whole, as it completely removes all parental choice in the decision of which school to attend. We have the option of Dorothy Stringer only. My family live within 400m of both Dorothy Stringer and Varndean. Currently we are in the catchment for both of these schools so have a good degree of parental choice. We moved to this area so that my son could be within walking distance of his schools. Whilst Dorothy Stringer seems like a good school, we have not yet had the option to look at the two schools and compare them and their facilities, so cannot determine which would be better for our child. Option C means we would never have the ability to find out.
- This proposal would mean the pupils from Downs school would be divided between two schools by which side of Ditchling Rise they live on, which would be cruel and arbitrary.
- The split between Stringer and Varndean will probably feel quite arbitrary to some families in Fiveways.
- This proposal is impractical. Families need a choice of 2 schools, at least where one is very popular and the other undersubscribed (Varndean -BACA, Stringer -Longhill).
- While my family lives just north of Port Hall, this access would result in us only having access to Dorothy Stringer – which is already consistently over-subscribed. Even if this catchment change increases the chances of access to Stringer for my children, it would still have significant negative repercussions for them as it would mean they would be unlikely to attend secondary school with the rest of their local primary cohort (mostly based in Port Hall/Prestonville).
- This option would seem to absolutely oppose what the council is apparently trying to achieve, giving parents absolutely no choice, driving up the rental prices in areas closer to the more popular schools, with the lower income areas resigned to the less good schools.
- This option removes all sense of parental or student choice.
- You state there would be a clear transition link between primary and secondary education. This is clearly not the case, as primary school admissions are worked out purely on distance to school. For example, the area most Balfour children live in would be split into three different catchment areas.
- This option provides clarity to parents and children on their likely secondary school. It does however reduce choice.
- This option provides certainty and predictability for families but it also impedes choice
- This option offers less choice in some cases

- This option is ok, again travel times is ok, but a bit limiting if someone has a strong opposition to the one school in their catchment, illuminating any choice which seems unfair
- This option excludes the Porthall area, which is currently in the existing catchment area for schools with good standards and commutable i.e. Varndean and Stringer. Expand the catchment area, don't exclude areas in the existing catchment area.
- This option eliminates the choice of schools, which is important for the individual child
- This option effectively gives parents across the whole City no choice of school.
- This option does not allow for any choice for the child or parents in which school they attend.
- This option as with option A keeps families in the east with no choices for secondary and no option for access to a higher performing school except for either travelling out of area or trying for a place at religious school.
- This option appears to have potential negative impacts such as limiting choice further and therefore limiting opportunities.
- This offers no choice for anyone and will really ghettoise the school system
- This model will increase the pressure on 'living in the right area' and push up house prices.
- This model reduces choice for pupils and and parents, which feels reductive in terms of making things fairer for everybody. Pupils living in Whitehawk would remain restricted to Longhill.
- This model provides certainty to families about which catchment area they are in. Families can still express a preference for a school outside their catchment area, but would have more certainty about which school they are 'guaranteed' to get into (if they make that school one of their preferences). This is the best model and makes more sense than the current one.
- This model entirely removes parental choice
- This model doesn't promote choice
- This might ghetto-ise certain areas
- This model appears to allow for children to attend geographically local schools.
- this massively reduces the element of choice and will make people move to specific areas for specific schools which may not be feasible - not all schools work for all kids and parents should be given an element of choice when deciding on the best school for their kids
- This makes more sense in terms of children being at schools in their geographic area but removes any choice they may have in the school they go to. Some schools may have a different emphasis (e.g. music or sport) that a student may want to choose to align with.
- This model nearly eliminates any possibility of independent choice and means the council will dictate where your child will go to school based on very narrow boundaries. It will also have the adverse effect of those economically better off, and able to, will purchase/rent property in the desired catchment area, leaving a middle band of neither FSM nor well-off families without the means to change their circumstances or practise free will to choose from a wider selection of schools.
- This looks like it makes the most sense in terms of locality.
- This just means that huge residential areas are provided only one school
- This isn't single options for all. Hove still get multiple options. Why? I think this option will lead to crazy property sales to ensure children get into the school their parents want them to go to.
- This limits children to having realistically only one secondary school to go to and will only serve to maintain the increase in house prices in the locality of certain schools.
- This is the worst option ever. That results in only 1 choice of school for students in each catchment area in Brighton. The less favourable catchments - BACA and

Longhill - are slightly enlarged but I doubt whether FSM rate would improve as Kempton and Coldean are not 'expensive' areas.

- This is the worst idea. It will definitely lead to people moving to get the better school
- This is similar to option A but removes any choice for parents / pupils. Does it and suggested PAN changes actually reflect potential relative increases and decreases in demand based on where children actually live?
- This is ridiculous = zero choice as far as I'm concerned.
- This is possibly slightly less bad than Option B, but it still suffers from gerrymandered borders, and it removes parental choice altogether so it's still a bad option.
- This is effectively choosing your child's secondary school at 4 years old. Again, having no choice is a bad thing and is negative to all children.
- This is de facto what we currently have in Patcham. So I am quite indifferent.
- This is crazy to make such a big change. Just offer school places by distance from school. The changes are far too drastic and there would be zero choice of school available for anyone.
- This is an extreme cut to the hove areas. You have quite blatantly tried to group up less affluent areas for a two-tier system that you are supposedly trying to avoid.
- This is acceptable in that it puts a school option close to us. But it still only gives us one option.
- This is a much more intelligent and fair system and also creates choice and for us particularly stops us being stuck with no choice at all which both A and B impose on our family.
- This idea seems to limit the choice of parents. What if one school was better suited to a child because it was creative/sporty/had excellent pastoral care etc?
- This gives parents and children no choice. It is based on the pretense that each school is an equally good choice when that is simply not true.
- this gives no consideration to locality
- This gives my child only option of Dorothy. We moved to this area to have options and choice. This takes this away from us.
- This feels to be the worst of all options, denying choice and autonomy to parents in every catchment.
- This doesn't work in the context of Hove
- This excludes us from DS/V and doesn't seem fair on Whitehawk
- This doesn't seem to give enough choice, given that some schools may suit some children better than others, and friendship groups would be split according to where they live.
- This does help to establish a better distribution of access to postcodes but still leaves Saltdean with 1 choice.
- This creates a very small city based catchment for Dorothy Stringer, I'm not sure how you can imagine that children who are currently living in this area will still be living in this area in the future. Our city - especially in the centre is very dynamic and changing.
- This could drive up house prices and further disadvantage our poorer families
- This could affect rents and house prices in the area closest to more popular schools, pricing lower income families out of the area. It keeps some schools high in fsm children. It might reduce choice.
- This completely limits choice and creates segregation by post code.
- This completely illuminates any form of choice from families.
- This approach will further amplify property prices in catchment areas for the schools considered "better" and will likely push more families to Worthing that don't want to send their children to BACA or Longhill (we are one of those families).
- This approach might simplify place numbers for a given school in a given catchment, however it all but removes any kind of notion of choice (or meaningful expressing of

preference at least). It would also encourage the already ridiculous battle for people to move houses into specific catchment areas for a particular school - with all the knock on effects that has on housing prices and problems.

- This approach does little to address the current disparity between the East of the city by delivering less choice and therefore equity for children in the city.
- This allows no choice and barely changes disparities between schools.
- This again solely relies on where you can afford to live in the city and takes away any choice for families to give their children better opportunities.
- This could lead to people renting to get in and will unbalance
- This does not provide choice for parents.
- These catchment areas look too small
- These catchment areas have not been drawn fairly. Why have pre drawn catchment areas at all - why not purely distance from school if the local school is to serve the local population or provide a complete open entry for anyone to apply to any of the schools as in other parts of the UK.
- There should be a choice, this will only increase some areas desirability / undesirability.
- Hard to read this map
- there should be a choice
- There is no choice here. This is a bad idea.
- There is no one size fits all school. All families deserve a choice.
- There is no choice here, you get the school you're given
- There is no choice - more families will choose schools outside of B&H
- There is no choice
- There is no real choice of school in Portslade, pupils there are in the catchment for a single school (PACA) while half a mile down the road pupils have a choice of 4, Hove Park, Blatch, Kings and Newman. You're presenting the pupils of Portslade with the illusion of choice.
- The wealthiest areas of the city still have access to the top performing schools - Varndean and Stringer. Parents have no choice. High income families will move into Varndean/Stringer catchment, causing even greater social disparity within the school system.
- The same disparity will happen with this model. Push up house prices around the 'desirable' schools.
- You are going to find issues of creating 'catchment area' pockets in the city that will increase house prices.
- The brown area only has one school in catchment area and provides no choice
- The most affluent areas still get precedence for the more 'desirable' schools
- The major problem is that secondary schools are concentrated in the western part of town which leaves very little choice for the people living in the eastern part.
- The fact you have 2 secondaries effectively on the same site makes these catchment areas fundamentally flawed for the local residents
- The inevitable of this will be to drive up house prices ever further in the areas of the most 'desirable' schools which will exist in the (currently) most expensive areas, allowing people to 'buy in' to their school of choice.
- It is hard to see how the change creates significantly greater balance, while reducing potential pupil choice in central Brighton by splitting Varndean and Stringer catchments.
- The catchment areas feel somewhat arbitrary. Many parents would prefer some choice.
- Terrible. This again doesn't give equitable choice - well it gives no choice to anyone and leaves many people facing longer commutes, or moving children out of area, or moving house.

- Takes away choice
- takes away any choice
- Takes away all choice, or at least a sense of choice.
- Still splits Preston park community in half
- Still limiting options
- Still better than some areas having a choice and others not
- Still a good change for me but only one school to choose is not particularly democratic
- Splitting the stringer and varndean catchment will mean that stringer covers the wealthier 5ways houses and varndean less wealthy Hollingdean. It would also be very difficult for children from Downs who's catchment covers both sides of ditchling road.
- Splits Whitehawk down the middle. No parental choice.
- Some choice is important
- So no choice of school for the majority unless you live in hove - how is this an improvement?
- Smaller catchments in Hove and Portslade just limit the council and mean more families don't qualify for their closest school geographically.
- Smaller catchment areas seem sensible
- Single school catchment area reduce parental/pupil choice
- Single catchment is a terrible idea. All areas should have the choice of at least two schools (that's why I was previously mentioning Portslade on the 2nd model). One of our children was severely bullied and if there is one choice there is no where to shift a child to for a fresh start. Parents also deserve to have a choice because all schools function slightly differently and provide different services based on their specialisms. So for example Patcham has a non exclusion policy which is great for kids in the area who are more challenging but not so great for a child left dealing with those children. So there must be choice.
- Single catchment areas do not give any choice at all
- Similar comments to before. This time you're eliminating choice.
- Significant changes to the boundary in Hove means less choice. For example, children living in very close proximity to Blatchington Mill will not be able to attend that school
- Should stop children from Saltdean and Rottingdean and Woodingdean from avoiding Longhill
- Selfishly, this option would suit us best but the slightest adjustment to those outlines puts us in a school we would absolutely NOT send our child to.
- Segregating schools and limiting access for children across the city ensures those in deprived areas are not given the option to a better secondary school place due to where they live. Only having one school per catchment also reduces the choice for parents.
- Seems like the worst option. Siloing students and drawing arbitrary boundaries. No parent or child choice. This seems so short sighted. What is being done to tackle the ridiculously high rents and housing costs?
- Restricts choice for multiple areas
- Ridiculous - again, poor kids in Surrenden Crescent not being able to attend their local school just to cheat the results.
- removes choice entirely
- Removes choice
- Removes the option of Dorothy Stringer for my child. Better than option B which seems ludicrous.

- Removes any possibility of choice, and with reduced places in stringer / varndean, the presence of only one school per catchment means that there is total uncertainty about where my child might end up.
- Removal of parental choice which is not in line with best practice.
- Reducing choice is not viable
- Reduced parent choices
- Reduced options for my children
- Reduces student/parental choice
- Reduces choice, reduces healthy competition between schools.
- Reduces choice currently available.
- Problem with this is people buying their way into the best schools via house purchases.
- Potential problems with reduced pupil places within certain catchment areas. No clear plans for what happens when the school within a catchment is oversubscribed
- Postcode lottery again. Choice is everything
- Portslade only has one school option which seems unfair, we live closer to hove park than paca but can't have that as an option.
- Portslade is in the same position again
- Portslade needs more than 1 option, as do other areas
- People want choice. Kids want to go to school with their friends even if they live a few roads apart.
- Parents should have at least one choice in their area.
- Parents need choice.
- Great idea if you live in the catchment area of a BHCC or faith school. Not so great for those in the East and West of the city.
- Parents find it hard when they are not given a choice of school
- Parents choice of schools significantly reduced to one single school, which may not be best for child. All parents/children deserve to be able to choose a school based on a range of factors that would suit their child, not just be limited to one
- Parents and pupils should have some choice about where they go to school and I completely disagree with any system that removes all choice
- Parents and children should be given a right to chose between more than one school
- Parents and children should be given a right to chose between more than one school
- Our children can attend a school that is suitable for where they live
- Overlap surely must happen for patcham, stringer and varndean at least. With no catchment overlap there will be massive disruption
- One school per catchment is no choice at all
- Only one school choice for large parts of West Hove (the orange catchment area).
- Only one choice again
- One of the suggested positives for this scheme is that there would be a clear line between primary and secondary education but that isn't the case within the 'Ditchling Road' area of the city. This splits the downs and Balfour school catchment areas largely along economic lines - this would split up cohorts from those schools along economic lines and could fuel rather than address local inequalities. It also removes any choice for children who may be having a tough time in their current schooling.
- Offers no choice
- No parental choice
- No one has a choice
- No choice, limits options
- No choice with some catchments only having one school. I disagree with this entirely.
- No choice- where we live the schools closet to us at out of catchment! That doesn't make sense

- No choice is not favourable. I cannot see how this will achieve overall objectives - fair access to quality education for all being the least likely. Those with means will simply move or cheat the system. Great for estate agents and cashing in on stamp duty, but not for pupils!
- No choice for parents
- No choice for parents and we just make families move to areas with better school
- no choice for Coombe road parents.
- No choice
- I think the council have put this option in a ringer, to make option B look less bad.
- No choice for children. Doesn't solve existing problems.
- No change to my catchment area, which is ridiculous!
- No change for Saltdean
- No change
- Might create a postcode price war as happens with Primary schools. People will move to the catchment area of the school they want
- Many people will ignore the catchment areas when applying if their preferred school is not close by or move!
- Makes sense geographically for kids travelling and for evening up the demographics. I think it's a good option. There's too much snobbery around Varndean and Stringer places.
- Makes sense from a travel point of view but I would prefer to see overlapping catchments to allow some parent choice.
- Makes complete sense, provides certainty for parents, pupils and schools and makes it easier for all of the above to plan. There needs to however be some provision that every child is guaranteed a place (within reasonable variance) of the school in their catchment area to prevent the risk of 5-10 pupils having to move to a different catchment.
- Makes all schools equal. This is how it already is for the east and west sides of the city where there is no school choice
- Makes a lot of sense to have one school per catchment - increases clarity for parents about where their child is likely to attend secondary school.
- Love this option. Growing up we only had one secondary school option and you went to the nearest one. This option out of all 3 is the one that works the best. It helps parents know which area to live to get into the school of choice, less of a lottery system causing stress with friendship groups when you get split between 2 schools.
- Limits parental choice with only one option available
- Limits options too restrictive
- Limits choice. Children need different things and different schools may something different
- Limits choice, several of the schools are barely in their own catchment area
- Limiting the choice for more children within the city does not lead to a positive outlook. where possible children should have choice, but the most important thing is that they have security that if they are within walking distance to a school, that they get a place at that school. If at the very least a set number of places should be reserved for children that live locally to these schools
- Limited choice
- It still leaves west Hove with only one option. And reduces choice for the rest of the city
- It takes all the choices away. This whole project needs more work.
- less disruptive than B but still unclear how second/third choices would work outside of the 'parish'

- Kemptown suffers the most dramatic change in every scenario including this one. This is risking the amount families moving here and potentially risking existing families moving away.
- I would not support this option, as it would restrict the choices available to parents and children
- At the same time this is the only option in this engagement exercise that seems fair to Portslade! but I don't think that's a good enough reason to support it.
- Also, there is no choice
- It's consistent but significantly removes parental choice
- It's interesting dividing up the schools that have always been paired together. I think this undermines parental choice which is unlikely to be popular.
- It's important to have choice to reflect personal preferences and to optimise travel times.
- I think this does nothing for the families in east Brighton and I'm not sure what separating varndean and stringer catchment areas really achieves
- I'd like to have the choice of more than one school with different characteristics
- It's a good compromise and again is better than the status quo but I'm slightly uneasy about the lack of choice this offers
- It only gives me the option to send my 4 children to a school I don't want them to go to.
- It is naive to think people won't either move house to be nearer the better schools or take them out to attend private schools
- It is so important to have choice
- I would be concerned that this reduces the options for parents and children within the city
- I can't see how this helps anything apart from removing choice.
- I think this may increase the postcode lottery effect but preferable to carving up by north and south with no account to distance the schools are from children's homes.
- if going to have one catchment, send the village kids in the Deans to BACA (one direct road) and incorporate Whitehawk into the city
- This option does provide access to a closer school, but appears to remove any element of choice/ option of going to a different school as in the other options?
- It now cuts out 3 streets that were already on the cusp of their current catchment area. It will take the walking route from 30 mins to 50 mins and there are poor transport services from our address to schools in the revised catchment area.
- It reduces choice too much and boundaries being right next to schools is ridiculous
- It reduces choice for (some) families, but might be a reasonable compromise
- I understand the pros of having continuity during transition, but I believe that when it comes to secondary education parents deserve to have a choice of more than one school wherever possible and this does not achieve that.
- I think this option is the only option that takes into account and makes amendments to the Hove area of the city. Why do none of the others? I'm not sure how this would work if each catchment just had one choice, would that be a guaranteed place?
- I totally disagree with option C, as Kemptown area has only a single school option. This lack of choice is unfair and limits opportunities for families in our area
- I think this would create a massive shift in the housing market, which in time would create a tiered school systems with the most affluent in the city having access to the best schools.
- I like this one. The catchment areas are a sensible size, which means no one has to travel too far to get to school. Splitting the Varndean and Dorothy Stringer catchments is probably a good idea, to release pressure on applications for both. The Hove boundaries also look good

- I live in BN1 5DF this option would leave us in the catchment for Blatchington (where as we are currently Varndean & Stringer). That would mean having to travel really far distances which goes against the cities plans to be carbon neutral & also I'd damaging to our area as we will no longer be in a catchment for a good local, central school
- For much of the same reasons as previous answers. Areas with high numbers of children will only have one choice of school
- I think it's unfair that children in the Dorethy Stringer/Vardean catchment wouldn't get a choice of schools
- I have no issue with having one catchment schools, but I disagree with the way the boundaries have been drawn and want the schools local communities to be considered. Drawing a boundary line along the edge of a school makes no sense as it creates nonsensical situations as illustrated in some of the recent Argus coverage where people can see schools from their houses but are forced to then travel across the city to attend a different one
- I see no difference between option 1 & 3 for Saltdean
- I think I prefer option B now, because this one means we will only be in the catchment for Cardinal Newman, and I don't want Catholic school
- I think allowing families some choice where possible is important
- I prefer the boundaries as they were
- I hate that I don't have a choice of schools (I live in Patcham catchment) so wouldn't want everyone else to be in the same situation. Parents should be able to choose the school they feel suits their child best and that may not be the one school they have in their catchment.
- Giving people one choice of school will only increase divide in my opinion with people who can choosing to move near preferred shcool and people moving away from unfavoured schools
- Have one school service one catchment area makes logical sense, otherwise there will constantly be a battle for the best perceived school in the catchment area
- I cant see the benefit of this... it just seems to limit choice
- I disagree as this would put Coldean into the BACA catchment instead of Patcham. BACA has had very bad reports, including of racism and bullying, and I would strongly object to my children going there.
- I don't believe this resolves the key issues for children in the Longhill catchment area
- I don't agree with this model too much as there is a lack of choice in this model.
- I dont think this is the worst option but would have been nice to have more choice.
- I do not agree with this change as it is not enabling parent choice and preference for their children and will change the nature of the larger really good schools scu as Varndean and Dorothy Stringer which are excellent now and are popular locally to where the families live
- I bought our house so my children could attend the schools in the CURRENT catchment area. This is very stressful to suddenly NOT have this option when we have planned for this. This needs to be something implemented and thoroughly researched with impact over travel etc. this needs to be planned for at least three years in advance so parents can prepare for this, to avoid this current stress and disruption.
- I also do not agree with this proposal as it gives away the element of choice of secondary school. This proposal will have a huge impact on housing areas as you would only have 1 option available. As we have seen with the current system, people are willing to MOVE IN to the area of their desired primary and secondary school choices as we want to give our children the best step in live. This might not be applicable to everyone but a lot of parents are trying and have tried and this would mean you would have no choices of secondary schools (apart from church schools)

- I am less familiar with how this affects Hove. But it solves nothing for Brighton side and from my PoV has the same affect as A.
- Giving children and parents absolutely no choice about which school to attend is again not likely to be at all acceptable.
- giving children and parents absolutely no choice
- Gives no choice. This is a huge transition and and parents have a right to a choice. This still means that a huge number of children in fiveways area won't have access to their local school Varndean.
- Gives no choice
- Again, we would lose the ability to go a school that is 2 mins away due to boundary changes.
- Better than option B but still providing less choice for all
- Currently have a choice of two schools in our catchment, do not want that reduced to 1 school
- Currently Hanover kids get to choose Stringer or Varndean, apparently there are real differences of which kids fit best in either, so dictating it based on area will result in worse fit.
- By creating single catchments areas you are removing choice from parents. In the Poet's Corner area the catchment cuts it in half meaning lots of my son's friends would have 1 option and my son would have a different option.
- Creates more issues across catchment lines as more different groupings.
- Choice is a fundamental driver of improvement. Why take choice away?
- Complete removal of choice
- Fundamentally frustrating parental preference by allowing no choice will not only be unacceptable to parents but the Office of the Schools' Adjudicator will be unlikely to find this proposal code compliant.
- This model reduces choice for pupils and and parents, which feels reductive in terms of making things fairer for everybody. Pupils living in Whitehawk would remain restricted to Longhill. Existing primary school pupils in the current catchment for Varndean/Stringer would be arbitrarily separated from classmates and friends at secondary school, depending where they live on this newly proposed map.
- Geographically better for most children
- don't agree because some people are more able to 'buy into' their preferred postcodes
- Again, it doesn't make sense that you can't choose from the schools nearest to you, but they have arbitrarily been divided along the main streets. My son would not have been able to go to his first choice and nearest school in this scenario. It would cause odd results in property prices too.
- Although in theory, I would be happy with the school catchment that we fall into here, I recognise that these are restrictive & for some parents a massive change to the current areas. catchments this narrow don't maximise the breadth of pupil intake that option A or the current catchment areas offer.
- Although it would effectively remove parental choice, except for the option of moving house, there are some positives to this option..
- Almost no choice for some catchment areas compared to others. Some catchments seem to cover very small areas of population that would struggle to maintain 1 large school resulting in full closures.
- Again, this would cause significant disruption to children in the Pitrt Hall/& fiveways areas.
- Again why change the northern boundary of Varndean and Stinger catchments. I understand splitting these into separate catchment but why exclude people that are currently in catchment for both from being able to go to either, particularly when they go to a local primary school

- Again why split stringer and varndean when they are next door to each other
- Again, only one choice of school for those in Coldean and Moulsecoomb
- Again, strange placement of the boundaries. Kids in kemptown would have to travel a long way out of the city to get to school. Doesn't make sense
- Although I see many advantages to single school catchments (string links with feeder primaries, commutable distances in most cases to school, removal of anxiety over where children will be going) unfortunately, due to the marketisation of the education system, we now have many different schools with so much variety in what they offer that a child may be matched up geographically with a school that may not suit their needs as another of our schools. This unfortunate situation leads me to believe that in a system built upon choice- we must retain some choice.
- As per previous answers, this is not giving anyone a choice
- As we live in kemptown, this change would result in us a)only having access to a single school b)having our kids at a school outside of Brighton c)we previously had access to 2 good schools, now only one (requires improvement) school d)we chose to buy our property based on this factor e)this change will bring down the value of our home.
- This option would remove parental choice but at least would be much more reasonable for my community geographically, and I'm sure there are benefits to parents having a higher degree of certainty where their children might attend school.
- Again, geography should not be the only determining factor in best fit. No choice for anyone?
- Again, this doesn't make sense for us living in the port hall area who are in Brighton but are being asked to send our children to a school in Hove. Again travel distances are an issue
- Kids in Hove are the only ones with any actually choice so very unfair Brighton who are left with no choice at all.
- does not allow choice
- Again reduces choice
- Again forcing families to go to one school will just create pockets of Brighton that become more deprived and others that are more appealing. House prices will be affected by this system and those that can't afford it will have to stay living in a less desirable area. House prices are bad enough as it is in Brighton. People who have bought in less desirable areas may well lose money as people refuse to buy in an area without with a failing school.
- Again Kemptown residents just get one option and the only option is a failing school. I feel that Kemptown have definitely got one of the worst deals with your proposed changes.
- Again the east seems the largest when why should it be
- Children in the east of the city will only have access to a failing school
- Doesn't give any choice at all
- Diminished parental choice
- Again the boundaries look like gerrymandering. This gives us no choice in secondary school, feels like we don't live in a city, when we do.
- better but east brighton stull has long distances - but enevitable considering the closure of the east brighton school
- Better for our children to have a choice otherwise parents will consider moving house to facilitate their preferences.
- As long as there is not areas where children can't get into any schools as on borders
- Children in the Port Hall/Prestonville community will be particularly disadvantaged
- Doesnt this kind of thing engender ghettoisation and house price inequality
- Geographically this makes sense to me.However, the problem is that it would potentially split Downs in half, which is potentially not a very diverse way of doing

things either. And I suppose that represents the challenge here. Any positive changes will likely create new problems - both from a geographic and inclusivity point of view

- Would there even be enough children in the Dorothy Stringer catchment. Once again this splits Whitehawk and contradicts the free school meals aim?
- I am not in favour of the significant reduction in choice with the proposal.