



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

Question 5: How much do you support the model proposed in "option B"?

1. Travel and Transportation

- You are stopping local children from being able to go to a school in walking distance
- You are turning children into commuters, creating more traffic and pollution in the city.
- If children have to use public transport the council have a statutory obligation to provide transport. How much will this cost the council each year?
- You could have someone living in Ioder road commuting 1.5 hours on the bus to longhill or the reverse!
- Significantly impacts access to the secondary schools that are closest and easy to travel to for my child.
- Imagine children five minutes from a local school having to travel to rottingdean. So ridiculous
- It seems like this scheme could mean many pupils having to be driven to their school as the distance is too far to walk: this is insanity given the desire to reduce car use. The road we live on already becomes completely blocked with stationary traffic between 8:15 and 9:00 am during term times, so I am well aware of the impact school traffic can have on the city, and this scheme has the potential to make term time traffic even worse
- In a city where we should be encouraging active travel it seems bizarre to me that the catchment areas should be increased in such a way. It would mean that it would encourage more car driving and traffic throughout the city where parents may need drive there children to schools the other side of the city. For example, Hanover to Patcham every day or central Brighton to Longhill. The traffic and pollution within the city is already worrying, without encouraging more traffic, be that with buses/ coaches/ cars.
- It would create long travel times to schools in many areas other than Hove/Portslade that would be very affected. I have safety concerns for my child travelling these distances alone on the bus at 11, and this would lead to a spike of car driving to and from schools - clogging up roads even more and increasing pollution.
- It seems crazy that a child living near stringer might actually have to travel all the way to Longhill. Is there any evidence on the impact this might have?
- This is radical and I have big concerns around transport. I think if the council can provide sufficient transport options, that keep children's commutes minimal and provided at low or zero cost to families this could work and I welcome the radical thinking here but I do think it would be a disaster if the transport issue is not addressed
- If you know anything about bus connections between Patcham area and BACA, you would see the issue with this arrangement. It doesn't make sense geographically: walking to BACA isn't easy on the existing roads - Coldean Lane isn't a nice road for walking on, traffic is going 40 mph or higher regularly.

- This is by far the worst option. Requiring children to potentially travel from Preston or Port Hall all the way to Longhill is not viable. The same is the case for children at the edges of the proposed Patcham/ Varndean catchment. Any journey that requires multiple buses or a walk of over 1hr each way will have a detrimental impact on the pupils in terms of their ability to undertake before or after school activities and their mental health. It will reduce their ability to walk to school and likely increase traffic as more parents will take their children by car reducing the amount of exercise that their children get. It will cost parents in terms of bus passes. It will negatively affect attendance rates, which are key in terms of encouraging better attainment. This proposal cannot possibly be considered until a wholesale review of the transport policy for the city is undertaken to assess whether this is feasible. DfE guidelines suggest no more than a 75 minute journey to school for secondary school pupils. While I accept that a number of Brighton children already travel long distances to school I do not think this in any way makes a case for saying it is therefore acceptable that many more children should be put in this position.
- This is just random and make children travel enormous distances for no good reason
- This option presents issues for children that may have to travel unnecessarily long distances, and breaking down local communities
- This option seems very unrealistic and unbalanced in terms of the changes made, particularly for the travel distances it sets up for people in the centre and east of the city, while leaving West and Hove untouched? We moved to Brighton to live in a walkable and bikeable city. We would not want to have the travel distance required by this change, to make travel to school by bus or even car (and we dont have a car) along major roads a necessity rather than an occasional journey for 2/3 of the options, to a school completely outside of our local neighbourhood. Has this option been tested for the implications on traffic? It seems it would have a detrimental effect on traffic all around the East and Centre of the city, and be unworkable and unsustainable as a result. Do people in Saltdean want to travel as far as Stringer for school?
- I think the expanse of some of the catchment areas would be a problem for potentially vulnerable children travelling some distance. I am concerned that attendance levels will be reduced the more children have to travel I would like to see the catchment areas to minimise transport times and encouraging walking and cycling.
- If the current lottery system continues for allocating spaces, some children would have to travel a long way to attend their school and could possibly be separated from their friends from primary school. The north/south catchment areas are too big. It will create a two tier system (good and bad school) with parents fighting to get their child into the better school as is the case currently in some parts of the city
- makes it very likely that children here (fiveways/the dip) will have to travel a long way whilst other schools nearby are arbitrarily out of zone
- This option would need to be done in conjunction with a review of current school bus provision and associated fares (ideally no-one having to pay to send their children to school and regular buses for after school activities as well as regular school end time.
- I would not be happy with my child having to get a bus for 45 mins when they could just walk to school in 10 mins. Especially in the evenings when they've attended after-school activities. It takes them away from neighbourhood friends and would likely mean parents would need to drive across the city for collections / drop offs. I know the route into woodingdean from Brighton is already slow at certain times in the day.
- I strongly disagree with this option as it would result in many children potentially having to travel long distances to schools in areas that they are not familiar with

- Kids will end up having to travel across the city where they would currently get a place at a school within walking distance from their homes. This would cause more traffic disruption and issues for working families needing to drive their kids to school when they could have previously walked.
- Making children travel 2 hours a day is bad for communities and their mental health.
- It seems clear that many more children would need to travel by bus to school. Whilst many do, I think wherever possible children should be able to walk to school (no more than 45 mins) where it is safe to do so.
- This option severely disadvantage pupils in the Port Hall/Prestonville area and the area to the east of Dyke Road, including my family on Compton Road.
This option will result in children from our areas being placed in either Dorothy Stringer or Longhill School, which is completely unreasonable as it's over a 2-hour walk away! In fact, Longhill is not truly walkable at all – very few parents would expect their children (as young as 11 years old) to walk for over four hours a day along potentially unsafe and dark routes. This would be a ridiculous situation for any child in a city that has numerous good schools less than half an hour's walk away. Option B would have so many negative repercussions. It would add to pupil absences (proven to be the main indicator of pupil success) due to difficulty in access, put unnecessary pressure on public transport, and increase traffic on the roads. It would force families into huge and unfair financial choices like moving out of the affected areas or considering fee-paying schools.
Even if buses were put on for pupils, this would have many pitfalls both in terms of cost for the local authority and pupil wellbeing. I say this as someone who was bussed to secondary school, and witnessed the many disadvantages of school transport. The negative experience has stuck with me to this day.
For the sake of public health and the environment, children should be able to walk to school wherever possible. For the sake of their safety and wellbeing, they should be given reasonable access to local state schools. This means prioritising access to schools that are geographically closest. In the case of the areas I've mentioned above, access to both Dorothy Stringer and Varndean is vitally important.
- This option is terrible for people in my area (Prestonville). We don't have a school close by (only Cardinal Newman, which we are effectively excluded from on the basis of religion). If you reduce the PAN at Stringer, we will get Longhill, which is a completely unreasonable journey (2 hours walk).
- This option gives the choice element many parents are asking for, will there be busses provided to take children from the stringer area to woodingdean, it is a long commute, it would be an easier "sell" to parents if there was a school bus provided or a new bus route to take them
- This is a ridiculous suggestion resulting in children having to travel significant journeys to go to school in an area completely unfamiliar and away from their homes and communities
- This creates a travel nightmare that Brighton does not have the infrastructure to handle. Who are you kidding? Distance would HAVE to be a priority over FSM or any other factor for this to be viable.
- This is a huge change that needs more time to be debated. It seems to involve a larger number of children potentially travelling across a lot of the city which has environmental considerations too.
- Children and young people should be able to walk to school. It is not safe or fair to expect children to take long bus rides, to walk long distances, or navigate busy main roads. Walking with friends, establishing good habits, the importance of exercise and the impact of this on concentration in school have been totally overlooked.
 - • Transport – Brighton prides itself on being a green city, yet little thought has been given to the implications of this option upon traffic, pollution and congestion, and the

significant financial cost to both individuals and the council in terms of providing transport, for example statutory bus passes.

- This is a terrible idea. Children cannot be expected to travel that distance to school. Completely disregarding vulnerable pupils and younger pupils in year 7/8 travelling across the city on multiple buses etc.
- This is a terrible option where many families would potentially have to travel a long distance to get to school, this would add traffic and pollution to roads.
- This is by far the worst model. The distance from the Preston Park area to Longhill (and vice versa) is vast, and there will be a lot of traffic at the time the children are travelling. The cost and time of travel will be prohibitive for many families. Yet they could be forced into it on this model. Please, please do not do this.
- This option will result in some children travelling extremely long distances to school
- This option will see children having to travel for miles across the city which will lessen attainment. And have an environmental impact.
- This is an utterly ridiculous option. No consideration has been given to the impact of children traipsing through Brighton early in the morning to schools half way across the city, in terms of time an effort resulting is exhausted children at the start of the school day and even more so at the end of the day. No consideration has been given to the costs that will be incurred by the parents in terms of bus pass costs or driving costs for children to attend schools halfway across the city and overall stress of getting children to school in potentially 2 different parts of the city. No consideration has been given to increased traffic and pollution by way of more school buses and cars moving around the city. No consideration to family networks that may be forged during primary school years to enable children to study and play within a familiar community surroundings. No consideration to the benefits of walking to school to forge friendships and improve mental health of children.
- Also cause havoc to traffic and public transport. As a green city we must before children to be able to walk or cycle to school. Option b will make this impossible for the majority.
- Terrible idea, making children travel across the city to a school on the outskirts of Brighton. Especially in the pink area.
- Terrible solution, making more children across the city travel so far for school. If there are already children in certain areas needing to travel to far - fix that problem, don't make it a problem for more children across the city.
- Terrible for the environment, all that extra travel in an already clogged up city
- Terrible option for children living in fiveways area who may have to travel over an hour and half to get to Rottingdean to get to school when they have two schools 5 minutes away. Varndean would no longer be an option despite it being their local school.
- This could lead to children traveling to schools that are huge distances from their homes
- This could lead to some children travelling long distances to schools
- There is no way my son who will have just turned 11 will be allowed to get on a bus in the dark outside of school so why would I allow him to do it to get to and from school. I will have no option than to curtail my working hours and drive him to and from school each day.
- Increased school journey times and pollution.
- This could mean crazy commutes for children from one end of Brighton to another, not even doable on one bus!
- It could possibly make children from central Brighton to travel up to 3 hours a day to a school they don't want to go.
- In this option B Children from the Preston park area will face a 8km long journey through the city to/from Long hill school every day. This journey will add traffic to the city but above all the children from Preston will have to sit in public transport to/from

school instead of joining after school activities (which I believe are important to children's physical and mental health)

- Increase in travel across the city at an already busy time of day.
- This does not give the children living around the schools of Varndean and Dorothy Stringer an opportunity to choose between 2 schools on their doorstep and may have to travel to school when they could walk.
- This involves all children potentially travelling long distances, except kids living in Hove and Portslade
- This creates the possibility of having children travel a long way from home to go to school. That is not a good change to make
- This is a bad option for the environment and for city centre air quality due to increased transport demands.
- This is highly disruptive to many families, creating long travelling distances for many children. This is not in their best interests, and forces many children who have decent schools within walking distances to travel to below standard schools. There is also the financial impact on families, many who already struggle financially but are not eligible for free school meals. We have recently moved into a larger property to support our twins and ensure they have their own space. Renting in Brighton is extremely expensive. Adding the cost of travel for the twins, will put even more financial pressure on us. This is the same for many families.
Studies show the impact of long distance travelling can have on children.
<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/MftpGn8twFUXQXEc/?mibextid=K35XfP>
On this proposal, our twins could end up at Longhill, a school which is a 5 mile journey and more importantly an under performing school. They are also both SEN children. The impact of travelling this far to school will be huge in itself. Let alone it being below standards, when they have 2 good performing schools within walking distance.
- I understand this option provides choice to areas that currently have little choice, but it would mean that hundreds of children will be budding all over the city to go to school. I can't see in any of the council's plans where the impact on travel has been considered here. I get that some children are making long journeys anyway, but to make everyone make long journeys is definitely not a viable solution. There must be a better way.
- This is highly problematic - the distances some children would have to travel for school is unacceptable. And presumably would lead to increases in traffic in what is already a congested city. Have you carried out any analysis or assessment on travel impact for kids and the communities?
- Some of the distances kids would have to travel to school are ridiculous on this proposal.
- My child could end up travelling over an hour by 2 buses to an allocated school away from local area. Travel times impact attendance and therefore progress. Many parents not entitled to FSM or additional funding may struggle with funding transport. Brighton's bus routes are poor with many buses overcrowded to the point of refusing entry at busy times
- Some of the catchments are ridiculous. No kid should have to commute for 3h a day to get to school, and back, which would clearly be the case of some kids in the pink catchment.
- My children may have to commute over an hour each way on public transport under this option which is unacceptable.
- But this particular proposal trivialises the very real problem of getting from e.g. Ovingdean to Stringer and vice versa. Anybody who has lived here for any length of time knows how absurd these school journeys would be.
- I appreciate that there are other children in the city such as the Whitehawk community that already have long journeys - this is unacceptable and the council

should be urgently trying to improve public transport for these children. But this proposal would do nothing to alleviate their situation, only compound the problem for many other people.

- Our house overlooks the playing fields of Dorothy Stringer and Varndean. My children are able to walk to a school at the heart of their local community with their friends - zero carbon due to a recent school streets policy. Proposal B would give them a 50:50 chance of travelling over 2 hours per day with no possibility of walking, leaving the house before 7am in the winter and travelling in the dark and I would feel extremely concerned for their well-being and safety.
- Some children will be required to travel much further distances to get to school, for example children in Rottingdean needing to travel all the way to Dorothy stringer or children of Patcham and Hollingbury needing to travel all the way to BACA.. up to Up to an hour on public transport each way to get to school is unacceptable.
- This is insane! Punishing children who are already struggling with anxiety and bullying by expecting them to travel over an hour on poorly run public transport. This option isn't terrible for my child, but for children living minutes from Dorothy stringer to have to travel to longhill is ridiculous and I believe will backfire. These children are inheriting a climate catastrophe and this will increase pollution so much. Is there an environmental impact study?
- Some of the proposed catchment areas are huge, it's completely unsustainable to bus children across the city when they could be walking to school.
- This is absolutely horrific! 2 local schools in walking distance for my child and high chance he would have to get a bus/ be driven to school daily. Not given opportunity of vardean when so close. This would have a negative Impact on environment with more cars on the road.
- I would be concerned about the distances that children would potentially need to travel.
- Saltdean to stringer? How are poor families going to afford that? That's a lot of travel for a child. Same with Patcham/BACA. Unless you do over subscription by distance again? But then what's the point. This is a terrible idea!!
- Same argument as option A but with added craziness of catchment changes....no thought has been put into how much extra time it will take some children to get to school or extra congestion/pollution caused by more people having to drive their kids to school.
- Terrible plan, some children would have to travel miles every day
- More problems created around school logisitcs such as travel, parking
- The furthest away school in this proposed catchment (PACA) is over 4miles! would take an 1.35mins to walk to from Westdene - it is not a local option - would lead inevitable increase in car journeys - pollution/ arguments about dragging teenagers out of bed. I moved here so he could walk to Patcham high and have local friends. Why do you want kids zig zagging across town in cars and buses?! May as well move to Hassocks!
- The amount of driving, bus and pollution in this proposal is outrageous. The cost for the families, we do not have a car, it's ridiculous, if the school given is the 2 one.
- That is a too large catchment area so the travel to school will be very long for the children
- In this model many families will lose their local school and be forced to travel up to 3hrs across the city every day- i am deeply opposed to this happening to my children but to ANY children in the city.
- Only reason for not giving a 5 is the amount of car travel that would increase
- The areas are much too large and commutes to school will cause congestion issues.
- The catchment areas in this proposal are ridiculously large. Long bus journeys across town should be avoided as they are expensive and tiring for younger pupils

(buses often arrive long before the start of school). There is also a safety issues for pupils walking and travelling long distances in the winter, after-dark –particularly when they have been attending after-school clubs. I imagine many parents would drive to school, adding to city congestion and air pollution

- The grouping of Stringer and Longhill completely ignores the geography of the city. It would take well over an hour on at least 2 buses for a child living near Stringer to get to Longhill or vice versa, or 2 hours to walk there. There are serious disadvantages to children having to travel so far that appear not to have been taken into account. It seems bizarre that there is no data on what the proposed changes would mean for travel times and mode of travel. It would be useful to know how the travel time from Stringer to Longhill compares with the longest distances children have to travel to school under the current arrangements.
- The huge catchment areas that are proposed will likely lead to more pupils needing to travel further (impacting time spent on homework as well as being bad for the environment).
- Ridiculous . Will involve children travelling onerous amounts overcrowding our routes and inconveniencing commuters . Not environmentally friendly
- Ridiculous option giving mega-catchments and creating 2hr commutes for kids living within 5mins of two other schools...
- The idea of children living in fiveways travelling across the city to Longhill seems absurd. I want my children to go to a good local school that they can walk to. And I have chosen to live in an area where they can do that. This was a decision that we made many years ago, so it seems grossly unfair
- The idea of taking lots of children from central Brighton to Rottingdean is patently and objectively absurd. No conversation around anything else needs to happen. Why would children, within walking distance of two schools, be sent on a commute through Brighton each day to a village outside Brighton?
- This seems extremely poorly thought out, would massively increase traffic all over the city and goes against the council's safe routes initiative.
My daughter's route to Dorothy Stringer would be 863m, yet she would not have a chance to attend. Yet my friend's daughter in Saltdean is eligible, but her route to school is 10,745m. (Both calculated using the council's route calculator).
You must consider the travel implications more, especially for children with SEND (without EHCP) who are likely to struggle with such long commutes. (This is regardless of what the SEND provision at the school is like, it is based purely on the upheaval of a massive daily commute)
- The school options are so far away from each other and inaccessible by public transport. If you miss out on your local school you will be stuck
- The size of catchments effectively will mean many children end up 'commuting' to school. Longhill is not a viable option for many families as a commute for their children. Both my children are already in secondary school so this won't effect us personally, imagining them having to commute to Longhill is ridiculous, they would never be able to engage in the wider school community through clubs etc, we as parents would not be able to get to our children if they needed us quickly.
- There is obviously a thinly veiled socialist agenda behind the proposed changes. Why should a child who lives next door to Dorothy Stringer travel miles to Longhill every day? Does this not conflict with the council's eco agenda?
- There is more likelihood of anomalies where children are commuting miles from home. If there is a closer school that children can walk to they should get priority. It is unfair burden on parents when children are ill to travel 3-4 miles to collect them. These do not make sense in terms of travel. A child in Saltdean may have to travel nearly all the way to Preston Park area if placed at Dorothy Stringer, and vice versa. How does this fit with the council's commitment to creating a 'sustainable' and 'fairer' city, when children will inevitably be driven across the city to far away schools as the

public transport is too expensive and unreliable. In the above scenario a child would need to take 2 buses with journey time over an hour each way.

- For this plan to have any chance of success there'd have to be significant improvements to the transport system (e.g. dedicated bus lanes and frequent dedicated buses). Still, I don't think many parents will want their child traveling such distances, in which case they'll probably find other solutions (like moving home), which may then bring on the closure of schools like Longhill.
- This appears the least worst option - it is the most potentially redistributive (and therefore perhaps has the least likely chance of being implemented), but is riven with significant problems in terms of pupil transport.
- This option could result in children having to travel long distances to get to a school completely outside of their community. My son is neurodivergent (autistic) but probably won't need / get an EHCP. It would be incredibly difficult for him to get two buses / travel a long way on his own and cause him a lot of anxiety.
- This option seems completely bonkers. We would have the option of a close-by school with a 25 minute walk or one outside of Brighton. I am concerned that my child may have to attend a school that is very difficult to travel to and would have to walk for 1hr and 52mins (based on Google maps) or 1hr and 7mins on a bus. I don't feel this is a sustainable option and will impact the quality of their education. It would be much easier and quicker for my child to travel to a school in Hassocks than to the other school in the catchment area. We should be encouraging sustainable communities with facilities close-by that encourage walking and cycling. If schools are available close-by it seems unnecessary to have a system that will mean children travelling long distances by bus and car and not being able to walk and cycle.
- Ridiculous, kids in Surrenden Crescent not being able to walk up the road to Dorothy Stringer, their local school. Just to cheat the results.
- Ridiculously long commute for so many children which impacts on their wellbeing, educational attainment (long commutes impact on lack of sleep, attendance and extra curricula activities) and safety as it means they are travelling in the dark and alone at 11 or forces parents to drive around the city which will impact on rush hour which is already challenging and add to pollution in the city and hardly conducive to meeting Net zero.
- For our children to get on buses to leave the centre of Brighton at age 11, and travel during peak commuting hours out of the city is madness. I was a child that did a long bus commute to school and it had a detrimental result on my wellbeing. However, my parents chose that as we lived in a village where there were minimal schools and instead I went to school in a large town. To live in the centre of a city and be forced to travel out of town, when we could walk to one of two local schools, is beyond comprehension
- This doesn't make sense to me, students from elm grove could have to travel to Patcham or Brighton Aldridge rather than the much closer Dorothy Stringer. It is already a 40 minute walk for students in the elm grove/queens park area to get to varndean or stringer but at least they have the option of walking or cycling. Sending eleven year old children to travel long distances across the city seems ludicrous and really not thought out in terms of encouraging engagement with your local area, reducing emissions and encouraging healthy ways to commute to school.
- this is ridiculous , children could possibly have to travel long times to a school far away from them when local is better , just because of catchment area boundaries!!!
- This is ridiculous and seems a total joke. Even to just look at the impact of children travelling across the city and back each day. Bonkers.
- This option reduces the number of children at two schools where there is demand. Children who live nearby should be able to walk to school. Not have to travel across the city.

- The catchment area as it stands now is best no long journeys
- The catchment area Brighton North is vast. It would not be practical for children on the west boundary of this catchment area to travel to BACA unless transport was provided for this purpose.
- The catchment area on the east of the city seems to large, with pupils travelling a long way to school.
- The buses would make this option a nightmare. It's really silly.
- Children will have to get multiple buses at extra cost to parents or be driven vastly increasing traffic and pollution
- the stringer and longhill catchment is a trek for kids travelling either way. a one hour journey on at least two buses is too much.
- The transport implications here are awful.
- The transport links are not available to make this work. It'll be easier for many children in central Brighton to travel out of B&H to Lewes or Burgess hill, rather than travel all the way to Longhill
- It would not make sense to have kids close to a school travel 40 minutes because they ended up in another school
- Socially engineering catchment areas to try to boost attainment is flawed. What matters is distance to school and not busing thousands of children long distances.
- There needs to be more nuance and consideration to this impact- I believe my children would thrive in any area but the travelling/geography create a huge impact.
- This is a logistical nightmare. I can't see how a transport network to deal with the distribution of travel arrangements would be cheap. All bus routes go into the centre, this would need bus routes west to east. Given school finances that money could much better be spent on teaching.
- This is clearly ludicrous and would result in huge numbers of children travelling long distances. It is unlikely to be accepted by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator and the council would be challenged, under the Education and Inspection Act 2006, for failing in its duty to promote sustainable modes of travel
- This option creates more problems than it solves (pollution, congestion, lack of active health behaviours etc)
- Slightly better but if students who lived near Stringer had to bus all the way to Longhill and vice versa this would be less sustainable, potentially costly and difficult for younger students. Would make it more difficult for students to attend afterschool activities.
- Some children may have a very long journey to school even if they have a school close to their house
- these boundaries would force small children to commute unnecessarily long distances for no benefit to them
- This catchment change would see children travelling long distances on buses. The Dorothy Stringer / Longhill catchment would mean children travelling across the city on already congested routes, either through Woodingdean or along the coast road. The travel times are potentially up to an hour during heavy traffic.
It takes over an hour on public transport to get from the western most boundary of this area to Longhill (an 11 year old could be forced to commute over 2 hours a day
- It is counter-intuitive and dangerous to force children on long bus journeys to attend schools several miles from their homes, instead of allowing them to walk to their local schools in a community in which they've been nurtured and feel safe. - The environmental impact would be significant. More cars, more buses, more taxis, more traffic on the roads in an already congested City. With the Council's agenda being so clearly (and rightly) geared towards green ways of travel (walking and cycling) it beggars believe that this option is being proposed. Personally, as a mother of two children currently at a Brighton Primary school, the idea of my girls having to travel for over an hour each way, each day is terrifying.

- This option looks awful - children would potentially have to travel for miles and over an hour to get to school on public transport. there are not good bus routes to longhill and may result in poor attendance and children dropping out of school
- This option means children living close to schools will now have 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.
- This has logistical difficulties and will reduce school absences if pupils cannot afford to pay for bus fares/ or do not want to travel long distances, in many cases unaccompanied.
- This creates serious commuting concerns for children living in the city centre if school placement no longer considers distance from home to school
- This option would have children travelling for miles when they live much closer to different school. For children with SEN, this is likely to result in parents having to give up full time work in order to handle getting their children to school. Unhinged.
- This option will result in huge numbers of additional children having to travel long distances which is unreasonable, impractical and detrimental.
- As a cycling and sustainable travel advocate in Brighton, I am particularly concerned about the lack of safe routes for pupils on these extended commutes. Investment in safe cycling and walking, as well as practical bus routes, would have to come before such impactful boundary changes, and there is no plan for this investment.
- This option would lead to excessive numbers of children needed to attend schools a long way from their homes, impacting their well-being and contributing unjustifiably to increased volumes of traffic across the city where many will choose to drive, adding to the costs of Brighton Council where free transport (bus) options will need to be provided, and reducing the capacity on the bus network at key times of day as pupils will need to use buses to get to and from school
- This option would leave us in the catchment for a school miles from where we live, when we have moved to this area (and both work full time and sacrifice a lot to do so) so that our children can attend a local school and walk safely to school
- This option would mean lots of children travelling to school by bus or car
- This option would mean travelling (commuting) distances for some children of over one hour each way, which is unfair and completely unacceptable
- This option would only give my children (porthall area) 1 school in catchment which they could walk to. If they didn't get into that school, they would face a ridiculously long commute on a bus to a school which isn't performing well. I don't drive and the bus fare for both would be an extra expense. I want my children to be able to walk to a local school with friends
- This gives us 2 local school options but might mean a long distance journey.
- This option would potentially force my 4 year old to travel alone on the bus for 45 minutes to and from school. That's not ok and sits squarely outside of what you're trying to achieve. Look at other options, tell us how you got here.
- This option would result in unacceptable travel distances and time for many more pupils in the 2 larger catchments. I would be concerned for their wellbeing and safety in this scenario.
- This is still the same policy of pushing pupils further and further distances to push up numbers in struggling schools. In fact the boundaries here are incredibly convoluted, with the frankly bizarre case of children having to stand outside their local schools to catch buses significant distances. I'm also disappointed that the council are using diversity and choice as a cover for what is little more than a return to the policy of "bussing", a policy that has a history of failure.
- This is terrible. No possibility of active transport between the ends of the catchment with Dorothy Stringer and Longhill. My child could walk to Stringer, Varndean, patcham, blatchington and Hove Park, but if she didn't get into Stringer she'd have to go to Rottingdean on the bus taking 1-1.5 hours (it's unethical to drive when buses

are available in a climate emergency). People will move out of Brighton and imagine the effect of the well off people leaving and not contributing to the already fragile high street and entertainment scene

- This catchment option is just ridiculous you could have children traveling to the other side of the city each day. It is important that children should be able to attend the local school where they live and not to be sent to a school outside of their community. Displacing children to different areas around the city could be very damaging and causing a lot of children to have lengthy travel each day
- This keeps us in the cusp of one school in our current catchment area. The preferred school will allow a walk of 30 minutes, the second will not be walkable AT ALL our child would need to be driven or would cost a fortune to pay for transport services which are not brilliant from our address to school in the revised catchment area.
- This looks like many many children would have much longer journeys to school, with many children that would have previously been in the Dorothy Stringer / Varndean catchment area potentially having to leave the city centre to go to secondary school. Feasibility of walking or cycling to school would be drastically affected.
- This looks like some children would have to travel a long distance into school when they could be going to a local school. All children whether on Free school meals or not would find this challenging, time consuming and it doesn't feel hugely safe
- This looks ridiculous in terms of travel times for almost everyone involved. Don't we want to reduce car use for the school drop off in Brighton?
- This model involves children from central Brighton travelling to the furthest school which seems to raise further issues for environmental sustainability and traffic issues. Again, it also disrupts social groups.
- This model just proposes to move large amounts of children around bright. It would have implications on travel as not all children and families can afford bus passes or are around to drive, support their children to safely get to school.
- This negatively affects too many children and would mean that my children will have to take two buses to school at the age of 11! They are vulnerable and we live in a city that is not safe
- In a nutshell many families who live in central Brighton like us would find it frustrating for their children to have to travel so far for so long at greater cost. I also believe it would be detrimental to the traffic situation and environment given the extra car journeys this option is likely to create west to east and vice versa.
- This model would, in my opinion, require pupils to travel an unacceptable distance to attend a school. This will have an immediate and obvious environmental and economic impact to our city with more road traffic clogging up large areas caused by parents driving their children to school. To have children travelling for long periods of time over great distances will make them less safe as well as very likely having a negative effect on their mental health. I am aware that there are already children who have to travel a fair way to get to school but it makes little sense adding to this problem by making more have to go through this. I would imagine that kids who attend schools outside their local area are less likely to engage with extra curricular activities at school and are more likely to not attend.
- This one seems crazy to me. We live by Dyke Road but on the side that falls into the Dorothy Stringer catchment. If your children don't get a place at DS (which is quite far away anyway) does that mean that they have to travel all the way to Rottingdean?? They could walk to Cardinal Newman in 10 minutes but might now have to spend well over an hour on public transport to travel to an area of Brighton they have never been to before? I don't understand the meaning of this model AT ALL.
- This option at least provides the potential for our area to be considered for a high school that is within a 5 minute walking distance of our house
- This one I find stressful. If you live in Hove or Portslade you are likely to get into a school fairly close to home and with some of your primary school peers. If you live in

Brighton it's a complete lottery - you could be miles away with no one from your primary school. I do appreciate the need for change, but it would be a total nightmare for my kids to get to school and me to work on time if we were allocated a school far across the catchment area. I'd probably end up needing to drive, which I'm lucky to be able to do but seems bad environmentally. Someone would just be too far towards bike though and buses are unreliable and not great routes.

- This option would see MORE children travel for too long and too far.
- Making children who live near DS and Varndean have to commute over 4 miles to Longhill is a disgrace. It seems to go against every moral and logical reasoning for school placement.
- This proposal is deeply worrying. Such large catchment areas will see many children traveling extremely long distances to attend schools far from home. This concerns me for many reasons. This new need for extensive travel greatly increases the risk posed to our children from traffic and road accidents. Commuting like this will create a horribly stressful start to the day for our children and impact mental health considerably. There is likely to be an increased risk of absenteeism as children are left to travel across the city. The environmental impact should also be considered with traffic.
- Many children would have long commutes to school, involving several buses and car traffic across the city would also increase. This doesn't fit with a green and sustainable transport policy. Children would be separated from their local communities and friends. Children having to catch several buses would be leaving in the dark in winter to get to school on time. This would impact their personal safety.
- Areas are far too spread out, impact of commute for children would be huge if in Preston park travelling to Longhill. Would also hugely increase city traffic and pollution.
- Many kids would end up travelling for large portions of their day. Why send them to school in a completely different area? Tough for parents who work and/or don't drive
- The potential travel time needed with this option is outrageous. This will put pressure on working parents or parents with smaller children to accompany their secondary school child to and from school. Pressure on young people to travel long distances alone, they will be unsafe travelling alone when dark in the winter.
- This is the worst option. No consideration for having to drop off at schools far away. Cost of the bus and the cost lost time hasn't been considered. Pollution where is the data on this?
- This is totally unfeasible for us if we were to get Longhill. This would be a 2 hour trip on public transport which would not be feasible for a 10 year old child, let alone one with SEND.
- This is too far for my child to travel. It would make her vulnerable to being attacked. I feel this not a safe option for her and she suffers with social anxiety.
- This option is an unbelievable recommendation. In this option children that live within a 3 minute walk of Varndene instead having this as an option, could face being forced to travel over two hours a day across six buses to reach their school- when they have two schools within a 3 minute walk to their homes. It will of course cause additional traffic issues across the city, making people that already live within a school zone have to leave that area to drive across the city when there are schools right on their doorstep adding to the issues on the environment. This has been driven by an ex-Longhill governor and attendee, and it is clear that the children are not being considered here at all..
- This option is not a good option, it would mean my two children would have to commute all the way to Longhill when we have two secondary schools up the road, it's insane.

- This means some children would have to travel for a long time to school. Some Children living in Brighton would not even be able to go to school in Brighton if assigned Longhill.
- This model could majorly impact on the commuting time for many. It would require me to potentially walk 90 minutes or commute via two buses for one hour to get to school, when I live ten minutes walk from Dorothy Stringer.
- This option is unacceptable, to travel such distances by car or public transport will impact children significantly. It will increase volume's of traffic and have a detrimental impact on communities.
- This proposal asks hundreds of students in our neighbourhood to spend 10,000 hours of their secondary education on a bus commute. For us, and all those living in the Preston Park area (near Dorothy Stringer and Varndean), this option would require half of our neighbourhood's students to travel to Longhill, based on the lottery system. This requires 2 hours per day on public transport instead of a 10 minute walk from our home to local Dorothy Stringer or Varndean and staying in our community - for 200 days a year. This is asking hundreds of pupils to spend 10,000 hours of their secondary education on transport instead of being in extracurricular clubs or sports or with their families for this completely unfair version of a social mobility agenda.
- This proposal is likely to increase the number of children with 20+min commute times, which has been shown to negatively impact attainment.
- The proposal runs counter to the council's statutory duty to promote sustainable travel to school. Children travelling from one side of the city to the other to go to school is bad policy as well as being harmful to young people and the whole city. Progressive cities are increasingly making changes aimed at a "20-Minute Neighbourhood". The benefits of this approach are multiple: people become more active, improving their mental and physical health; traffic is reduced, and air quality improved; local shops and businesses thrive; and people see more of their neighbours, strengthening community bonds. Instead we are looking to increase traffic, damage air quality, reduce mental and physical health and destroy community bonds. The lack of interest in researching the impact of these proposals is staggering. A Health Impact Assessment would provide essential data for a proposal such as this. Public Health England describes a HIA as a tool for systematically identifying the impacts of plans and development projects, and for informing recommendations to promote and protect health and wellbeing and narrow inequalities. Why is nothing like this being used to assess the impact of these proposals?
- This proposal is pure madness, potentially kids sitting on 2 buses and have to travel for hours each day.
- This proposal is terrible. It would lead to excessive numbers of children needed to attend schools a long way from their homes, impacting their well-being and contributing unjustifiably to increased volumes of traffic across the city where many will choose to drive, adding to the costs of Brighton Council where free transport (bus) options will need to be provided, and reducing the capacity on the bus network at key times of day as pupils will need to use buses to get to and from school.
- This proposal would mean long commutes to school for some pupils.
- This proposal would mean that, despite living within ten minutes walking distance from two secondary schools, my children could have to attend a school that is around a half an hour drive away (not taking into account rush hour traffic). Brighton's transport system just doesn't support this level of extra traffic, it would be completely absurd, not to mention clearly not good for the environment or the health of children
- This proposal would see a significant increase on students having to commute a significant distance to get to school

- This puts my family under huge strain as it may mean our daughter has to get multiple buses across the city, when we have a school that she really wants to go to literally minutes away on foot.
- We have the option of Dorothy Stringer of Longhill. For my child to reach Longhill in time for an 8.15 start, he would have to leave the house before 7 and undertake a 1.5 hour commute that would probably require two buses. That's three hours of commuting a day. A number that I myself wouldn't be prepared to do, so why would I ask my child to do the same? There has been research into the impact of long commutes on children's health and wellbeing, indicating that those with long commutes lose out on sleep, have poor performance. It would also mean that he wasn't able to participate in extra curricular activities outside of school hours and would have to give up learning his brass instrument, which would be too heavy and cumbersome to transport such a distance. 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. As a child, I had to commute 4.5 miles to school on the Underground. Public Transport options were quick and direct, but it still took me over 30 minutes to reach school. I was often late when there were delays to the trains. Also, as a young, lone female child, I experienced predatory behaviour on a frequent basis. No one from my primary school went to the same school as me and I felt lonely and isolated. I chose to live in this area so that my child wouldn't have to experience the same issues. I have wanted to move out of the city for many years, but have stayed so that he could have access to good, local education.
- This seems unviable and creates new issues around children having to travel across the city when there are schools very close and within walking and cycling distance of their home. Public transport isn't set up to support this. Increasing travel to school, which will inevitably increase car rides and emissions, could contribute to a less clean city, poorer environmental standards, diminished safety and increased road traffic around our schools, as well as the mental and physical health issues associated with travelling long distances to and from school in a transport network that isn't set up to support this
- This seems to be the worse proposal as it means lots of children will have to travel by car to alternative schools vs walking to school.
- This seems most sensible to me, as there are no excessive travel times and it feels more evenly distributed.
- This will be a hugely damaging option and I am shocked that the council is considering it. This option means that children who live within minutes of their local school (and are already familiar with it due to family-community links) could instead be potentially made to get 3 buses across the city, taking an hour each way
- This will cause ridiculous travel requirements for children and will have an impact on council funds through funding bus travel as well as increasing environmental impact within the city..
- This will cause many children to have to travel long distances to get to their school which will have serious negative impact on pupils, their families, communities and the city as a whole. I have listed my concerns for option B below. Children need to be in a short walking distance from their school for a variety of reasons. SAFETY: It is not safe for children to be traveling further than needed across a large city with a lots of crime. They are opened up to unnecessary additional risks traveling longer distances to areas they are not familiar with, away from the safety of walking with friends and looked out for by the local community. HEALTH: There are huge physical and mental benefits of walking to school, we are actively encouraged by the council to walk to school. WELLBEING: Long journey times to and from school is detrimental to general health and wellbeing. LOSS OF TIME: Additional travel time will impact on

extra curricular activities and leave less time to spent on homework/clubs/hobbies. Not stuck in a car or bus in traffic as everyone is trying to get their children around the city to and from school. ENVIRONMENTAL / POLLUTION: Many parents will have no option other than to drive their children to school which will increase levels of traffic and pollution at peak times of the day. COST OF TRAVEL: If children have to use public transport the council have a statutory obligation to provide transport. How much will this cost the council each year? JOURNEY TIME: I have calculated for my son to walk to Stringer or Varndean will take 3 hrs and 20 mins a week. To travel to Longhill by public transport (factoring in having to leave enough time for waiting for buses and delays at peak traffic time) it will be 15 hours a week. They would have to leave the house before 7am in the morning to get to school on time. That lost time could be used doing homework, extra curricular clubs, using the local parks for sport and fitness and being involved with the local community. Children should have a right to go to their nearest school.

- This will drastically increase travel times for many children unnecessarily. The use of buses for long journeys is problematic in many ways, and impacts many children significantly.
- This will lead to increased commuting times for children which is evidenced to be bad for them. It will split communities with children from my child's primary going to 5 different secondary schools. The increase in pollution in the city will be totally unjustified. The coast road will become even busier, it will cost a fortune on bus fares for children to travel large distances
- This could cause severe travel problems for some pupils and buses are already overloaded at some times of day, making it impossible for older residents to use the buses.
- This could cause very difficult travel logistics for parents and children.
- 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.
- It will also mean a huge increase in pollution as the length of journeys for some children across the city will be huge and expensive. This will make life for families on boarder line incomes very difficult potentially having to pay for 4 buses or more a day. This is a disaster of a plan and may well lead to more children seeking education outside the city at Lewes Priory or Downlands
- This will rip apart children's communities and friendship groups as the new catchment areas have not considered current residential areas, where children attending primary school and living close to each other will be split up, or considered the travel implications
- This will leave kids living in some parts of the city a long way to travel which isn't feasible for a lot of people.
- This will potentially lead to difficult journeys for children in the "London road valley" who don't get Stringer, as well as difficult journeys from Lewes road
- This will result in children travelling for a significant proportion of the day - evidence shows a strong link between distance to a school and level of absence.
- This would adversely impact pollution levels across the city due to more car journeys and standing traffic, and impact children's mental health due to travelling long distances to school, away from their peers and local communities.
- This would appear to risk resulting in pupils being forced to travel long distances to their schools. I can't see any indication that this was taken into account in the consultation document, which is worrying.

- This would result in more children travelling greater distances
- This would be totally unfair on so many children having to travel miles daily to attend a failing school when there is a thriving school under a mile from their house. This benefits nobody. The only benefit it may have is short term improvement on the school statistics.
- This would completely remove any choice for people living centrally/ may result in the perverse situation of people travelling miles across the city (likely by car increasing traffic) where they're denied being in catchment for a school metres away within walking distance. (We live on Gordon Road minutes' walk away from Varndean but under this crazy scheme would only have the viable choice of Dorothy Stringer or driving halfway across the city to Longhill.)
- This would entail a huge number of children potentially being unable to get into their local secondary school and having to travel great distances to go to a school far away. Would you be comfortable letting your 11 year old daughter get two buses home from school when it's dark in winter? You'd be forcing parents to drive to collect their kids, hugely increasing congestion and traffic in the city (a city that is very climate conscious and just voted in a green MP) and completely at odds with 'school streets' and other costly recent policies implemented by the council. On a practical level how do you accept working parents to drop their primary school child off to their local school and get their secondary school child across the city to a random school far away and then get to work on time? Do we want the city to be one that is attractive for families or one that puts huge barriers up in their lives. I know that currently some children don't have the luxury of a short commute to school but instead of dragging everyone down (so no one now has a short commute to school therefore it's fair) look at enabling those that don't have that luxury to go to their local school because it's an outstanding school through support and investment by the council.
- This would involve many children having to travel long distances to school. The longest distances are much further than any children currently travel to schools within their catchment areas. The Council's argument that some children already have to get the bus to school is an absurd justification for making bus journeys much longer.
- This would mean lots of children having to travel across the city in opposite directions every day, making roads and public transport incredibly busy at these times. It would also mean fewer children are walking/cycling to school impacting an already pretty sedentary day
- This would give our son a 2 hour commute when there are secondary schools nearly in our local community.
- This would mean that children on the doorstep of one school might have a two hour walk to their school if they don't get their first choice..
- This would see a significant increase in students commuting a long distance to school.
- There are concerns around travel and congestion in the city. The distances on this map are unrealistic for many families. The environmental impact as many families drive their children to school would be damaging to an already congested city.
- This would mean children having to get the bus across the city, spending hours on buses, increasing traffic as some parents would give lifts, and would cost the council a fortune in school bus fares
- This would mean significant travel into potentially unfamiliar areas for children
- This would result in some pupils travelling miles to get to school
- Too big of a change too quickly. Catchment areas look enormous and children could be travelling for an hour just to get to school! Part of secondary life is being able to walk with your friends, this plan wouldn't allow that for many children.
- Too far to travel, leading to long commute times, congestion, cost & taking children away from their communities. They should be able to walk to school

- too big commutes for many children
- Too many kids getting buses
- To send children from Saltdean to Dorothy Stringer and children from Hanover to Patcham or BACA is ridiculous it will increase traffic and car journeys across the city and involve 11 year old children taking multiple buses at great expense travelling in the dark in the winter.
- Totally not viable. Pupils attending schools a long way from their homes; where there is an imbalance in perceived school quality and huge geographic distances between schools in the same catchment. Having children travel across the city where walking will not be an option (Longhill School (up to walk of 1 hour and 55 minutes away), therefore local traffic will increase further and reducing the activity of children if they are not walking to school.
- Transports east to west on the north side is seriously lacking for it to be feasible in the poorest parts of the city.
- Travel distance should be a consideration. Travel takes time, money and energy. Pupils should not be traveling more than 30 mins to get to school. This time could be better spent
- Travel across the city for children is disruptive
- Travel across size of south area too lonh
- Travel assessment for east brighton?
- Travel in the north has not been considered.
- Travel times here would be horrendous. This is a bad idea.
- Travel, especially in Stringer / Longhill catchment will be difficult for families and adversely impact upon children
- Travelling far for school is not a positive move to help vulnerable students. They need stability. Support in their community. Easy access to help at a school that is set up for them. They need support of friends and family nearby. Hours not taken up travelling. Non thriving schools need to be fixed, not vulnerable students dispersed.
- Under this model it is clear that Dorothy Stringer would be oversubscribed and children from Prestonville would end up being allocated a school nearly two hours walk away which is ridiculous and not something parents are going to be willing to accept.
- Travelling times matter. A child who lives 1 minute from Varndean or Stringer will be forced to take 3 separate busses to attend Longhill. The school is poorly connected and remote, even for those who live in Woodingdean (who choose to attend school in Lewes. The school needs to be reduced in size significantly, or relocated.
- Un feasible and unsafe distance from lingham school for some areas of that catchment
- Under this proposal it would potentially mean children travelling very long distances across the city from ce art aim areas. It would likely have an effect on attendance of school and under this option would make us as a family consider releasing Brighton if you children were forced to travel a long distance to school!
- Under this proposal my children would have a 50% chance of attending the school whose playground is at the bottom of our garden! They have no access to the school 5 minutes up the hill that I can see through my window, and a 50% chance of a poor performing school an hour away on public transport! Absolutely absurd.
- Unfair for children who live at the top of Fiveways to have to travel to Longhill, too far!
- Utter madness. Children travelling on buses and cars when we are meant to be reducing our carbon footprint. Crazy.
- Very long travel distances to facilitate very little
- Very long commuting time for many pupils. Potentially unsafe journeys involving multiple buses. More traffic on the roads. Not green and doesn't promote sustainable travel. Many more children would be unable to walk to school.

Friendship groups and local communities would be split up. Some children will be left with long, unsafe commutes on their own.

- We live on the same street as Dorothy Stringer, and 2 mins walk from Varndean. To think that our children would face the possibility of attending neither, frankly stinks of at best, incompetence, and at worst gross negligence. Anyone who thinks it is better for a child to be facing a 70 minute journey across the city to school, as opposed to walking 2 mins to their local school, is frankly unfit to be anywhere near public office and should be ashamed.
- We live on the border of two catchment areas and whilst a choice would be offered to our child, he would have to travel considerably further for one school vs the other.
- We might be faced with 3 buses to get to school if our children were placed at Longhill east it's miles away
- what? How is this even an option? If I lived in Roundhill or Woodingdean and didn't get a school close to me the only other option is to travel for an hour?
- Additionally, the Institute for Fiscal Studies (2020) notes that longer travel times and transitions to unfamiliar schools can worsen absenteeism and disengagement, particularly for disadvantaged pupils. As a result, school admissions changes must prioritize keeping these vulnerable children in local, well-supported environments to ensure that they are given the stability they need to succeed. The geography of the Dorothy Stringer - Longhill catchment area proposed in Option B, would mean excessive (over one hour and two buses) travel, and for those living close to Dorothy Stringer and Varndean schools, this would be travel past two schools that are only 10 minutes walk from the children's home
- How is sending a student from the west side of Westdene to BACA solving anything. Likewise, someone living in Reigate Road going to BACA. Why does anyone believe sending all these kids across the city is the right solution? Transport links aren't good enough, not to mention the increased pollution..
- I went to school a 25 min walk plus 3 stops on the train and I do not recommend it. I didn't feel part of the community, no one ever came to my house after school because they couldn't get home easily and I was reluctant to do any after school activities. Winter months were hard with travelling in the dark hours. Kids need to go to a decent school in their local community
- Would mean many children travelling great distances - traffic issues alongside not being able to walk to school or be local with school friends.
- Would be appalling - children scattered across the city
- I think that the plan must relate to the residential area around schools. Catchment needs to be targeted at residential areas around a school and the development of schools needs to follow that plan not lead it. The plan should encourage students to walk to school and discourage the use of cars and BUSES. Greater emphasis should be promoting the safety of students (pedestrians) in areas surrounding schools. To that end traffic management and restrictions should be a prime factor to allow safe pedestrian movement around schools. Making changes to allow access to schools outside the local geographical areas will without any doubt increase road traffic, cars and buses as well as creating hardship for students. Students' friends as they develop relationships will be outside their residential geographical area. This too will increase non school hours traffic. Any proposal to alter the traditional geographical catchment around a school for reasons of disparity is opposed. In areas with an excessive application for placement the proposal will disadvantage local students in favor of students outside the local geographical area
- Also aware that some of the catchments involve current bus journeys of over an hour which seems challenging unless a direct school bus plan was also going to be implemented alongside the changes. Is there a budget for this? There needs to be.
- I strongly disagree with option B for many different parts of the city and not just mine. Commuting children would be travelling across the city, away from their local

schools, which is so detrimental on numerous levels. . In this model, distance would have to be a priority over FSM for it to be viable.

- unrealistic - causing unnecessary long distances to travel to schools which should be local for community, environment and time commuting for working parents etc.
- Using catchment area changes to fix broken schools is ridiculous, it is the easy cheap option, unfair to make local kids travel miles to fix the broken schools
- I strongly oppose this. Just look how far some kids would need to travel! It's outrageous that this is even a consideration. Moreover and with respect, if people can't afford school meals, how are they going to afford the bus fare to get to school? And if trying to redistribute a less engaged demographic, where is their motivation to sit on a bus for 30 minutes going to come from
- I live in the Portslade Border. I want to choose a school for my child which is close to our house (Hove Park) so I don't have to drive. It's better for my child and better for the environment but because of the catchment drawings I only have PACA and that is 45 minute uphill walk. Hove Park is a 10 minute flat walk.
- It creates unsustainable travelling distances to the schools - costs to get to school will be significant and/or it will mean many more children will be driven to school creating more traffic and emissions in Brighton
- It divides primary school communities and proposes unbearably long commutes for kids comprising of 2 bus journeys or over 1 hour walks each way. Will parents be forced to take time from work to take to the road, adding to traffic to transport kids twice a day?
- It would encourage families to drive adding pollution around schools and going against the councils own initiative to create car free zones around schools.
- Surely it's better for all children to be at a school they can walk to within 30 minutes of their home or have access to a direct bus to take them there.
- I live in BN1 5DF, central Brighton. This proposal would leave us with Longhill & Stringer. The idea that my daughter could travel to Longhill each morning is not sensible as (particularly with current transport options) this would take an hour. I like the fact it gives all a choice but I'm concerned about how this would work. Would it be a lottery system within each catchment? Someone living near Stringer but being sent to Longhill if they don't get DS as their first choice seems ludicrous. How will the council provide transport?
Also putting Patcham into a catchment with BACa has the same issue - there is no bus service between Patcham and Moulsecomb. How do you expect children to get to school?
- It is absolutely absurd to send a child living in Fiveways to Longhill School. This is the furthest school away from their homes. It would be so unfair for a child to commute over an hour to get to school, when they can walk 5 mins to Stringer and Varndean.
- I live in the Fiveways area and travel to Longhill would be completely impractical. It is simply not a close enough option were my child not to get a place at Dorothy Stringer. None of the other catchment areas are spread out in this manner.
- 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. There's even more uncertainty as the school could be EVEN FURTHER away. I literally have no idea how they'd get to school every day, the distance is so vast. The commute will change from one they'll be able to walk (in time) to my needing to drive, or a long walk/bus/walk combination. Longer commute, less healthy exercise - unimpressed.
- I have heard this option would be a lottery so I do not support this option. A lot of children would have to travel great distances.
- I have come back to make further comments on this after researching journey times. The journeys that some kids would need to make in this model are insane. I live just off London Road nearish to Preston Park. If my kid got allocated BACA that would be

an absolute mission for our family to get them to school and back. Patcham or Varndean would be OK but there's no guarantee I'd get them. It would be even worse for people up the road whose kids could end up travelling to Longhill. These kids could be travelling for over two hours a day, potentially three. I commute to London only twice a week and I absolutely hate it, it makes me tired, grumpy and affects my attention. I do not want my 11-year old child facing the same predicament just to get to school. I appreciate this is already something facing some communities and that is awful, but of course I'm going to object to a proposal that could negatively affect my kid to such a great extent. I will need them to go to school clubs sometimes so I can work - does this mean they might be getting home at 7pm? I'd need to start driving realistically, I can't let them travel that long every day. Ultimately I think if this is implemented I'll probably leave Brighton. I probably won't be able to afford to move to Hove, where this won't be an issue, and I won't necessarily be able to move closer to the allocated school in time to avoid my kid having to do this because I won't know where they will end up until a few months before. This is an awful proposal and I cannot object more strongly.

- I don't see how it can be beneficial to bus children so far across the city
- I don't understand why the council thinks shifting the problem of travelling to school from one area to another taking a 'city child' approach. Children from Porthall will have to travel further than any child currently is.
- I can't see the sense of this at all. In this option our children would potentially not be able to go to two schools which are a 5 min walk away but would have to travel across the city, catching 2 buses taking an hour.
- I disagree with option B as this could mean children travelling across the city to go to school. In our case my youngest children are going to Patcham nursery, Patcham Infants, then Patcham Junior and should then go to Patcham High which is an easy walk from our home. Under Option B they could potentially be placed at BACA in Falmer and other families across the city placed at schools far from their home. This would mean a long commute by bus, adding extra expense to families and extra traffic congestion. We can't afford the bus fare for 2 children to do this.
- I cannot support any model that will force some children to travel across the city for up to an hour twice a day. It is absolutely absurd, but more importantly, it does not take into account the effect this will have on the mental health and wellbeing of both children and their parents (if having to drive through traffic). It is at odds with the council's own school streets scheme. I used to work towards Roedean school, which isn't as far as Longhill school, and it took me 1 hour 30mins to walk, or an hour on public transport due to having to change buses. The traffic crossing town is dangerous at rush hour as it is. Asking children to make this journey is frankly irresponsible.
- I believe it's ridiculous to send children who are in walking distance to a school a long distance away which would either mean 2 buses or a drive this adding to the already congested and polluted city. We are also always talking about the obesity epidemic so why take away the opportunity to walk. If they wanted to do after school activities they will then be taking a bus in the darker months reasonably late.
- I am very much against a north/south divide. This would leave many children with hour plus bus journeys, involving multiple buses as the direct routes are not available & unable to walk 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 their health and the environment.
- I appreciate the fact this is the most different option which aims to address the inequality however it could mean children having to travel further, use buses which would place strain and not be good for the environment. I want my children to have the opportunity to walk to their local school

- I am very concerned that these changes would mean very long journeys for some children e.g. from central/north Brighton to Longhill would require two buses and a very long journey
- Huge travel distances for children. Whilst some children do have long commutes that doesn't mean we should increase that, if anything we should be striving for decreasing commutes for kids in the city..
- Huge commutes, terrible for children? And terrible for the environment. Not worth considering.
- Hugely problematic in terms of increased pupil commuting times, with knock-on negative effects on child welfare and the environment. This must be a 'straw man' proposal, not seriously considered but instead designed to make the others look less bad.
- Huge amount of travel required. Bad for kids bad for the environment how can it be compatible with striving for net zero?
- How you could expect a child living near Preston park to travel miles out to the east of Brighton to school is simply daft. How much congestion would this create as well as misery for children and parents having to travel miles to school?! The road network is stretched as it is (and don't get me started on potholes and the general state of Brighton roads). You would see more gridlock and it would affect more than just the children you are forcing into schools...
- It means children travelling very large distances across the city out of their communities to fit your agenda. I STRONGLY DISAGREE
- How can anyone think that transporting children all the way from 7 dials to woodingdean be okay?
- NOPE. This is insanity. Please don't ask 11 year old children to undertake a 4 hour round trip walking to school each day. (This is how long it would take mine to walk from Bates Road to Longhill and back.). Both my children get badly travel sick so would refuse to go to school if it involved bus travel.
- How are kids in the pink area to have a decent quality of life with that commute?
- Hove ends up with 5 schools? have transport links to dorothy stringer been considered from east brighton?
- Has potential to be hugely disruptive . Children in the Preston Park area needing to be bussed into Longhill seems unnecessarily disruptive, with 2 schools quite literally on their door step
- Has anyone taken account how long it actually takes to get from fiveways t longhill school? The catchment areas should represent where students live. This should be on the interest of students and parents and not what looks good in ideal world.
- Grossly unfair expecting children to travel miles to a school outside of the city when they are in walking distance of local school.
- Forcing students to travel long distances will create separation and anxiety for students.
- Honestly, this seems wild to me... The best part of Brighton stands to be 2 or 3 busses away from their school and this will be made worse by how over subscribed Dorothy stringer will become
- Forcing kids from Central and West Brighton to travel up to 2 hours each way to Longhill when they have 9 other secondary schools closer to them is completely ridiculous.
- For many children this increases distance between home and school.
- Families risk being given a school miles from their homes. Sustainability and the environmental impact of excessive travel not thought of here.
- excessive numbers of children needed to attend schools a long way from their homes
- Far to many students travelling across the city - have you ever tried to travel at peak time from the far reaches of the city. Perhaps you should and see what time you

need to get up and leave in the morning. Some kids will spend most of their day travelling- hardly sets them up for a good start ready for learning

- This is the most ludicrous of the options! This gives children living closest to Dorothy Stringer and Varndean the options of Dorothy Stringer or Longhill School! This is a a walk of 1 hour and 55 minutes which is ABSOLUTELY absurd. There is no logical reason why children who live a stones throw from 2 of their closest schools should be asked to travel these distances to get to a school. There is no suggestion that additional travel provisions will be provided to support this plan. And the current transport links that are available are not fit for purpose so this option is considerably flawed! This option requires scrapping!
- Transport may be an issue, but MP's need to pressure the govt to roll out free bus travel to under 16's/18's.
- Expecting children to potentially have to travel from Fiveways to Longhill or Saltdean to Stringer to go to school is unacceptable.
- Expecting a child to potentially travel from Preston park are to Longhill is an outrageous proposition. They would be exhausted, miss out on after school clubs due to needing to travel home and in the winter would still be travelling home in the dark
- Differences in the sizes of areas and number of schools seems unfair. Travel distances look likely to increase.
- This option is ridiculous. It will see huge numbers of children having to travel long distances across the city to get to school. It's not practical or fair
- This option is terrible for students in the city centre. It will divide students and force unreasonably long bus journeys for many of them.
- This option is terrible. It means many children being bused across town to a school we do not want to attend. Why don't the council think about the impact on our children? My daughter has already had to cope with Covid, this option means that she will have to travel long distances, away from her friends.
- Distances for children to travel in some of those catchments are too much
- Creates some very adverse situations of children having to travel long distances when there are very local schools which would reduce travel.
- Children may have to travel 3-5miles from their home. That's not practical
- Commute times too long
- The journey times and lack/cost of public transport make this idea ridiculous. Well over an hours walk (past 2 huge schools) to Patcham is just not realistic for us
- Completely impractical; it would mean 13.5 extra hours travelling a week. That's almost two working days. Time which should be spent on enrichment and homework
- Completely ridiculous. How will kids be able to travel these distances?
- Completely wild to suggest that kids at one end of pink zone should travel to the other to get to school, why even suggest this
- Concerns with congestion. I would like my child to be able to walk to school
- Could end up with children travelling large, untenable distances to school, increasing their length of day & making building up a school community impossible.
- Could lead to excessive travel times for pupil and significant disruption in the transition from primary to secondary
- Crazy option that will negatively impact kids travel time and therefore their right to play/socialise as well as negative impact on traffic and air quality. Those on FSM already have a priority in terms of choosing a school outside their catchment area which is a good thing. They may however also not want to spend time/money travelling outside their area.
- Children may have spend inordinate amounts of time travelling to school and back with purple zone (containing Dorothy Stringer and Longhill)

- Children in the Preston Park area might end up in Rottingdean, and vice versa. This can't be a good idea given the distance and time required to travel in already gridlocked rush hour traffic.
- Children living in the current Stringer/Varndean catchment area will have a 6 mile journey to school in Longhill, when they would be walking if attending a school locally. If going by bus, it will require changes and 11 is far too early for a child to make these journeys alone. It would require at least 3 hours of travelling and much of this, in winter, would be in the dark. If working parents take them by car, then the traffic congestion, already bad, would be worse.
- 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
- Children should attend schools local to their homes and not have a long commute which will impact their mental and physical health. This will also negatively impact the environment via increased traffic on the roads.
- Children need to be able to walk to their nearest school, therefore I disagree with both options as kids living in Withdean Crescent won't be able to go to either Dorothy Stringer or Varndean under option A and cannot apply to DS under option B. However of the two option B is preferable
- Can you imagine traveling from Longridge Ave (Saltdean) to Dorothy Stringer every school day as a teenager?
- Children as far as Preston park may end up traveling to Longhill this will have a large impact on their welfare. Sure we can expect parents to drive them or they get up at 6. Very bad idea.
- Brighton is already a congested city. The families of east Brighton have explained how travelling to school is expensive, timing consuming and is a negative and stressful experience for their children. I don't believe Brighton should be creating a system where more children are forced into this situation.
- The travel implication on Fiveways children in this model is immense. I have attended all of the council meetings where the response has been that children are doing similar journeys already.

My questions:

-Why add more children into the same situation, all for the sake of a statistic?

-How are those children who are already travelling long distances performing and how has this affected them?

-Has there been a direct study on the children who are attaining less, and why? -How are those in the Whitehawk area performing, for example? No data has been provided at all to substantiate this model.

-Has the council considered the detrimental effect of additional travel to children forced to do so, with regards attainment?

Again, I urge the council to ensure the 50% achieving 9-5 grades in English and Maths, above South East and National Levels, are not compromised.

With regards a possible journey to Longhill from Fiveways. I personally travelled over an hour one way to/from school as a secondary school child and it was exhausting - this was with a single journey school bus provision.

The journey to Longhill from Fiveways is 2 buses with walks, across the city. Or one bus (no.55) at 1 hour. What if the buses are full, as has been frequently reported by other parents in Brighton? The school day at Longhill starts at 8.15am. I will simply not allow my 12 year old daughter to leave home in the winter months at 6.45am, exposing her to safety risks and long exhausting days. I know for a fact if my kids are exhausted, they won't do as well academically.

- Big travelling distance I would not accept this.
- Better than a. It seems that will be there will be a lot of traffic due to pupils not being able to attend a nearby school (notably Dorothy stringer)
- Better but involves some Children travelling very long distances but improves choice
- As mentioned in my previous commentary, I would be seriously concerned and anxious if my city centre child was sent to longhill. Taking two buses and waiting at bus stops on their own in the dark is a serious concern for me and it's not even to go to a good school! I would move far out of Brighton if this goes ahead. This is not prioritising children's safety.
- Making children travel long distances when they live near schools that might be out of catchment under option B seems like a terrible idea for lots of reasons (extra transport on the roads, cost, breaking up communities) - this would only create new issues
- Making children who live near DS and Varndean have to commute over 4 miles to Longhill is a disgrace. It seems to go against every moral and logical reasoning for school placement.
- At least our child could attend 1 local school with this proposal. With proposal a and c 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)
- Awful suggestion, will lead to extremely long journeys across the city increasing pollution, increasing journey times to schools, will split communities
- At present, Option B is unfeasible for many families that would be affected by it and so far no evidence has been presented that the council and city would find it feasible either. In many cases, it would require pupils to travel to the furthest school in the city from them, upwards of 5 miles (roughly 2 hours walk) using currently inadequate public transport (minimum an hour each way, often with two buses) or a twenty-thirty minute drive (with minimal traffic), which would disadvantage families without a car (often those who are also already economically disadvantaged) and cause increases of already congested traffic across the city. At present, it would be much easier and faster for many families (including ours) to travel to school to Lewes, Haywards Health, Three Bridges or Burgess Hill than to travel to the most distant school in Brighton. Even if a new direct bus route was provided, it would reduce the travel time to the same as these areas that are accessible by train. Long travel times like this would also limit and discourage extracurricular activities for pupils outside of standard school hours, damaging their school experience, ability to participate in healthy activities such as sports and opportunities for broader arts and well-being activities such as drama, music and after-school clubs. This contradicts BHCC's efforts to encourage more pupils to walk to school (<https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/travel-and-road-safety/travel-transport-and-road-safety/walking/walking-school>). It is not unreasonable for pupils to take buses to school but above 30mins, likely above an hour, most often with more than two hours and in a context of BHCC trying to encourage walking to schools, Option B is entirely unreasonable. It would also mean BHCC would be required to provide free transport for affected children as it would far exceed the statutory 3mile distance from their home (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/659d7ebb0dd0a200138b612a/Travel_to_school_for_children_of_compulsory_school_age.pdf)
- Areas too large. Too much travel
- As a parent at the edge of patcham I would not want my child to have to commute so far to BACA, and yet not have the chance to go to DS which is a 15 minute walk away. These catchments aren't practical.
- As a close neighbour of Varndean school, that option at least gives us opportunity to remain in Varndean, however, a larger catchment area means longer distance for students in the other areas to travel to school.

- As long as you don't have to travel ages to get to school this looks like some pupils will have a long bus ride to Longhill!
- Absolute ridiculousness a child in woodingdean would travel to Steiner or a child at fiveways would have to travel to woodingdean. Seriously bonkers
- A huge impact on pollution and travel infrastructure. Change to the catchment areas are to radical. Potential for children living 0.3 miles from a school having to travel over 3 miles.
- Areas too large. Some kids will have horrible travel. Uncertainty for parents.
- Are people in central/east Brighton really going to travel that far to get to school? For example, would a kid in Saltdean get on a bus to travel to and from Stringer daily?!
- All children should be able to walk to school where they live
- Again. So much travel. Local schools for local people.
- As a resident of Reigate Road in the north-west of the proposed south catchment this option cannot be supported and could have a significantly detrimental impact upon my child(ren) and our family life should they end up allocated to a school right across and on the edge of the city at the expense of far closer schools which would be within walking distance.
- Does not seem to be based on logical thinking. I would be extremely disappointed should my child be confronted with a trip to school which made active travel impossible, which appears to be a risk with this (Preston Park to Longhill)
- The catchment areas in this proposal are ridiculously large. Long bus journeys across town should be avoided as they are expensive and tiring for younger pupils (buses often arrive long before the start of school). There is also a safety issues for pupils walking and travelling long distances in the winter, after-dark –particularly when they have been attending after-school clubs. I imagine many parents would drive to school, adding to city congestion and air pollution.
- 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. Health impacts will be suffered where children are required to commute long distances meaning they are stagnant for significant pre/post school hours which could otherwise be utilised for walking / sports / extracurricular commitments. 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. Financial Impact: this change imposes what would otherwise be an avoidable financial burden on families to pay for weekly transport fares. In the event we are located at BACA which is in excess of 3 miles away – the assumption is that free transport will be provided in line with Part 1, point 4 of the Home to School Transport Policy which states The Council has a duty to provide assistance with transport for children of compulsory school age (5 to 16) between home and school if:
 - the child is aged between 8 and 16 years and lives more than three miles (4828 metres) from their nearest suitable school
- This option is dreadful. Longer commutes for children, likely fewer children walking to school due to the distances involved and the health implications that ensue. The person that dreamt up this option should be removed from their role.
- I would be hugely concerned if my child had to travel over an hour to get to school each when there are two schools under 5 mins from our house.

- 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 don't feel I know enough about the evidence of moving children geographically around the city to improve outcomes for all children. This model would mean a 50% chance our child would travel a long way to a school at present needing improvements. Personally that is a lot to ask from a parent to feel OK with that, without being sure it is in the best interests of all children.
- 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.
- I don't think this option gives any consideration to students/parents who have to travel far to a school that is not within reasonable travel distance.
- I don't understand this and why you would ask children to travel miles to school if their 1st choice was within their community.
- Students even 'within catchment' can travel literally miles to school
- I strongly disagree with this proposal as my children may have to attend the 11th furthest school away from our house which at the north end of the stringer catchment. 1 hour by bus each way is unreasonable when there are ten closer schools in Brighton.
- with this option, our children would need to travel (by car? bus?) to a school much further away - ridiculous when there's another school much closer they can walk to. What's the point of living in Brighton and near schools if children need to travel so far to get to school? Can't comprehend how it can even be offered as an option. Shameful.
- With this option, my son could not have gone to our nearest school, and his first choice, which doesn't make sense. He also might have had to go to school an hour's commute away, which doesn't make sense environmentally, socially or financially!
- This will cause carnage and stress for parents and pupils and potentially lead to children having to travel unreasonably long distances with poor public transport provision and cost
- This system will see kids having to travel long distances to school which will make it challenging for the kids and for general traffic - not all areas are well connected by bus to the schools either - such as a kid living in patcham would find it difficult to get to BACA or a kid by preston park would have a super long and difficult way to get to longhill.
- This would involve some children travelling further. Not a huge problem in small city but only if there is safe active travel routes to schools and free and frequent bus services. Without this the proposals will create more traffic and long commutes - school start times should be linked to travel plans
- This option is grotesquely unfair. More attention needs to be made on how far you live from each school. This option would potentially make a child who lives on same road as varndean have to travel an UNWALKABLE distance every school day to academy school in Falmer. This is wholly wrong. Council should be trying to encourage children going to their local school.
- This option is completely ridiculous. Expecting some children to travel hours in a day to get to school. For a 'green city' this doesn't sound very viable.
- This option is an unmitigated disgrace. My child will be ripped from his community, with the possibility of having to travel 2 hours a day to a failing school. This is a crucial time in his development and to be far away from his family and his community is egregious, not to mention the negative impact on the environment and traffic across the city that particularly the Longhill option will result in. If the scheme really wanted to distribute children across the city why aren't the hove schools in play?

- This is an outrageous proposal that creates geographical areas that cannot be easily traveled across on public transport and would create huge bottlenecks of traffic. Meaning a big detriment to children's well being and mental health. To remotely consider saltdean and dyke road in the same area in utter madness.
- This is an awful proposal which will see young children travelling miles across the city every day in order to attend school, whilst they live much closer to alternative schools. This is utterly without merit, badly thought-out, and achieves absolutely nothing.
- This is an awful option that could potentially lead to large numbers of students in central Brighton having to attend a school miles outside of the city. This option, without an accompanying change in the over-subscription criteria to include distance as an important consideration, would in all probability lead to large numbers of students having to travel between Preston Park / Fiveways and Longhill in Ovingdean. This is totally unacceptable - would force huge numbers of students to make long journeys on public transport, would drive many into their cars, increasing levels of traffic, would force children to attend schools a long way from their home communities, affecting out of school activities, would cost the council huge amounts of money in provisioning the free transport it needs to. On top of this, these kinds of unnecessary long journeys would place a huge toll on the well-being of all students and would pay scant attention to those students who have special educational needs. This option appears to be an option to retain pupil levels at Longhill school on the fringes of the city and completely ignores the demographic decline in this area and geographic remoteness. Furthermore, the large catchment to the North of the City with three schools in it, under the random-allocation tie-breaker, would be disastrous for traffic and transport in the north of the city. How can this possibly be coherent in any way with the published local travel plan? <https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/travel-and-road-safety/travel-transport-and-road-safety/local-transport-plan> - I would argue that it would be in direct contravention of it.
- The possibility of children having to travel really long distances is terrible - they are far too large.
- The logistics of pupils going far distances like this is staggering
- The distances needed to travel are unnecessary and don't seem thought out
- The distance travelled and lack buses from the Lewes road/moulsecoomb to patcham high for example makes this the worst option
- The distance to long hill school is absolutely ridiculous for a lot of that catchment area and you cannot expect kids to thrive and be happy whilst they are dragged miles to school every day. It's insane!
- the distance for some children to travel and getting children in by buses would be too much.
- The commute for a lot of children would be ridiculous!
- The commute
- The catchments in this proposal are far too large. Huge numbers of children will be travelling long distances on multiple buses. The fact that some children already have to do this doesn't mean that you should make even more do the same.
- The catchment for my child becomes far too big with much greater distances to travel if second choices are awarded.
- The catchment areas seem too huge so make this viable or appealing for children having to travel miles to school.
- The catchment areas seem much too big and would result in children travelling all over the city - more pollution, more crowded buses and expensive for families who currently have children walking to school. It would also result in more uncertainty for families and children.
- The catchment areas are too big and would result in children potentially having long travel times to get to their allocated school. Portslade becomes the only area with no

choice of school. Patcham is in a catchment area with Varndean and BACA and while this option adds a choice for Patcham parents/children BACA is over an hour walk away (some of it alongside Coldean lane or across Wild Park neither of which would be particularly safe especially in winter) and a similar time by bus as it would involve walking past Patcham High to get a bus to Coldean and then BACA. Patcham High is the nearest school for most children living in Patcham however Varndean and Stringer are both within reasonable walking distance (although Stringer would be in a different catchment in this proposal) and Blatchington Mill is closer than BACA. A parent in Patcham who has expressed a preference for Patcham High is never going to be happy if their child is allocated BACA in the same way that a parent living next door to Stringer or Varndean will never be happy if their child is allocated Longhill if they haven't chosen it

- Putting two schools that are so far away from each other in the same catchment is ridiculous. There are not public transport routes available from either area to the other and the commute would be excessive
- Potential travel distances a large. This seems like the wrong option if we are moving towards sustainability.
- Potentially asking children & families that live north of Brighton train station to travel to Longhill is completely ridiculous when there are 5 other secondary schools closer to their home address! Not a chance that families would accept that.
- Properly planned and integrated public transport options is key, with buses that keep travel times to a minimum by offering direct routes to schools from across the city.
- Pupils attending schools a long way from their homes; where there is an imbalance in perceived school quality and huge geographic distances between schools in the same catchment. Having children travel across the city where walking will not be an option (Longhill School (up to walk of 1 hour and 55 minutes away), therefore local traffic will increase further and reducing the activity of children if they are not walking to school.
- Kids would suddenly be going to schools that were far away from their homes, lots of roads to cross, walk or long bus/car journeys. Meaning no real community and tiring days
- It's a ridiculous suggestion which involves bussing children all over the city (the majority will drive contributing directly to an increase in emissions and going against the city's green policies and meaning that children who live next to their secondary school wouldn't be able to attend it
- Journey times would really affect pupil attainment
- Kids in Patcham and Hollingbury if given Falmer/BACA would have to take 2 bus to get there and then walk through an unsafe subway.
- Of the options provided this is the best but it could put a lot of travel pressure on the city and families.
- Ludicrous- could end up at a school literally on the other side of the city with no bus route to access, despite having multiple schools within walking distance- the south catchment in particular makes absolutely no sense. The carbon footprint potential of this is huge as well as the safety element
- Longhill is a scary distance for a year 7/8/9.. My concerns.. how many buses? Will my daughter be walking in the dark? How will she be able to do after school clubs as she has X 2 younger siblings.
- Larger catchment areas will mean more parents driving kids to school which isn't good for kids, parents, other citizens or the environment.
- Large catchment areas with 2 hours of commuting each weekday puts children at risk of inactivity, not enough sleep, depression and increased anxiety which are primary causes of school absenteeism in the UK. Teenagers with a commute greater than 30 minutes receive 1 hour and 15 minutes less exercise, per day, per teenager. Breaking up their friendship groups that they have developed at Junior school again

is going to cause undue stress and anxiety. The travel costs for children and parents is simply not on. You will make more people needing help financially.

- Long commute
- Also, I think this option would probably make the underlying issue - not enough pupils in Brighton schools - worse. Currently many in catchments like Longhill and BACA send their children to schools in Lewes, or religious schools, or private if they can afford to. If parents who live next to these schools won't send their children to a school on their doorstep, how much less likely is it that parents 5 miles away will? These parents will be very motivated to send their children to another school by whatever means possible. They may well conclude that it is better to send their child on a train to Lewes or Burgess Hill . Or to choose a religious school. Or find the money to go private, or move house. The only children who are likely to end up doing the long journey will be the less privileged children in that area who do not have the means to avoid it. I don't live in this proposed new catchment by the way so I am not speaking from personal interest, just that this is clearly unfair on families in that area. The consultation would need to confirm how transport costs would be met in option b - would more school buses be put on, would there be extra buses to allow children to attend after school clubs, how will the extra transport costs be funded? Would you consider making bus travel free for all children, to mitigate for the extra travel involved?. And would you look at school start and finish times, for example Longhill currently starts at 8.20am which would be a very early start for children with a long journey, potentially travelling in the dark.

2. School Quality, Improvement and Resource Allocation

- Again good in theory but travelling from Woodingdean to stringer is a nightmare. Why not put more money/support into Longhill/baca for their Pop children.
- For example, would it not be an option to combine Portslade (only 220 PAN) with Hove. I am also interested to know if you have considered a different way of drawing the boundary between Hove and North/South Brighton.
- This to me seems as though the perfect answer placing the much lower performing schools alongside a higher performing school and mixing up the catchment areas entirely.
- It also reduces the PAN in large schools that are currently oversubscribed so makes no sense whatsoever.
- Once again, once school is being penalised more than the others - doesn't look fair?
- Quickest way to close Longhill! No one will elect to go there if they can choose that or Stringer. Only families very local to Longhill will attend. Those living near Stringer will not send their kids that far to a not so good (Longhill) school. They will put them on the train to Lewes Priory or Hassocks. It simply will not work and Longhill will not last five years. Also it doesn't work for Hanover children - quite a tricky journey to get to Patcham. Really poorly thought out proposal, just balancing FSM numbers without looking at the realities on the ground.
- Maybe help and improve schools that are failing
- It goes even further in keeping Longhillviable
- It is illogical to make successful schools smaller - and the schools adjudicator would overturn any of these proposals if those schools object.
- Pupil Admission Numbers are being reduced in parts of the city with greatest demand relative to the number of places available. It seems that the council are trying to reduce the numbers in some schools to increase the numbers in other, namely Longhill, meaning children who could walk to a local school now need to travel a long distance. This just doesn't make sense. Councillor Taylor attended Longhill and was up until recently a governor. He has publicly voiced his views which are very bias

towards protecting Longhill. Perhaps a less bias councillor should be leading this
Lack of transparency in the council data and processes

Longhill have a new head who hasn't had time to implement changes. She has a great reputation for turning round schools

Artificially engineering FSM proportions through PAN reductions in more popular schools will not be a solution to the social goals of the council. Schools are an important part of the community and the city as a whole. Moving children around will have city wide social and environmental implications. The repercussions of moving children away from their local communities should not be underestimated

Same as previous comment it would be good to have the option of a local school and make the undersubscribed schools more appealing, maybe 3xtra financial support for these schools. You don't make schools better by shifting children around, you need to support those that are struggling.

- . If this option were to go ahead it would be essential that PANs of larger schools are reduced in order that parents get a fair choice for a local school for their child.
- Instead we should be focussing on funding and supporting schools that require improvement rather than moving pupils around.
- 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.
- more children will be coming from private schools thus the projected numbers will be wrong
- Manipulates catchments to prop up failing schools. Do not think Varndean and Stringer should reduce numbers as many children would like to go here and do not currently get the opportunity
- Not shown is the artificially high PAN for Longhill. This means MOST journeys will be out of the city, not in. You can't sustain Longhill like this, it's insane.
- This option will also probably mean the closure of Longhill, this is because the parents of Rottingdean will need to see dramatic improvement in Longhill's performance to persuade them not to send their children to Cardinal Newman if they don't get into Dorothy Stringer. We shouldn't allow any of Brighton's school's to close. We have seen how difficult the closure of COMART was and the problems it has caused leading to this consultation 22 years later.
- The option that best brings about change and better options for areas of the city with less options. Let this reform come with a revitalised (green) bus initiative to help pupils get to the school they want to go to! Invest in and support all schools, but particularly those that need the most help.
- Not really sure that being able to express a "realistic" preference for more than one school should be the primary motivating factor as parents will always choose for their children to not go to an under-performing school.
- Object due to reduced PAN at Stringer and Varndean.
It seems Fiveways / Preston park area is being very unfairly targeted. Is there a reason? In terms of diversity schools here (stringer and varndean) already have a great mix. Do the council think children here matter less than others in the city?
- This also impacts the idea of "choice" when school quality and distance between schools in same catchment area are so huge.
- This catchment feels contradictory to PAN reductions. On the one hand the council wants to have wide catchments to improve access to a certain set of schools whilst on the other reducing access to those same schools.
- This will mean they will inevitably only be half full (due to city wide surplus PAN) - and almost all of those who do attend will not have chosen to be there - meaning many will not accept their offers resulting in even lower intake and likely a higher skew of FSM% than the current models. Thus it will not achieve the councils

objective in terms of outcomes for disadvantage students and in reality will likely cause the acceleration of the closure of these schools.

- We met a lady at the meeting at Hove Town Hall on Tuesday who was advised by a teacher of Longhill to under not circumstances send her child to that school. She lives 3 minuets from it. The is massively concerning and also tells you the mentality of the teachers there. They clearly do not feel supported. How are we the who community supposed to feel about sending our children there.
The school standards need to be addressed, support the people who live close to the school and give the school more funding to help it work. Her child should not have to travel for a decent school. The one on their door step should be supported and given the funds to improve.
- . It also reduces the PAN in large schools that are currently oversubscribed so makes no sense whatsoever.
- It makes no sense to suggest that the catchment area covering Dorothy Stringer and Longhill would work. If the aim is to reduce the disparity between the schools in relation to the number of FSM pupils this seems like a misguided approach. Asking more children eligible for FSM to travel long distances across the city to attend a school that isn't close to their home or primary schools rather than focus on ensuring everyone has a good local secondary school they can easily get to seems short-sighted at best, and highly suspicious at worst.
- The proposals are utterly ridiculous.
This is an attempt at social engineering: placing better behaved, more academic children into schools where these qualities are less common.
As always, the problem with bad schools is not the children, it's the parents. Until this problem is solved, no amount of Marxist interventionalism is going to work.
Maybe change the way schools get funds, instead of PAN numbers.
- Surely a better option, if the goal is to ensure Lonhgill's survival (which we can only assume is the case given with the presence of the ex-Longhill governer councillor who appears to be running this and with no representatives from Fiveways/Preston Park on the committee), is to raise the level of teaching quality at Longhill. Perhaps seconding teachers from the better-performing schools across the city would be better than subjecting children to this opaque and damaging social experiment with our children.
- If standards in schools aren't great in disadvantaged areas then try and improve the schools not force children who are not entitled to free school meals to go to them
- This option preserves choice while minimizing the reduction of Published Admission Numbers (PAN) at certain schools in 2026. This approach will allow families in the city to transition more smoothly, alleviating concerns that changes in Option A might prevent their children from securing a school placement when it was previously a certainty.
- This option seems to allow students whose local schools are in "need improvements" standing, to apply for a placement within those in better educational standing.
- Surely working to improve Longhill and BACA so that they are good local schools, if they 'require improvement' is a more sustainable option than this bizarre geographical stretch.
- This appears to manipulate the Dorothy stringer intake without addressing the problem of BACA
- Changing the narrative and ensuring that those underperforming schools clearly communicate improvement plans to instill confidence in parents that actually any of the schools they are allocated will be a good choice
- In the west of the city I don't necessarily agree the Blatchington Mills PAN should be reduced as much as proposed. It may make more sense for Hove Park to become a 1 site school possibly with a smaller PAN. Hove Park is a seriously impressive school but the valley site needs nots of investment so being on 1 site as a slightly smaller

school may be better than just reducing the catchment PAN so much.

I'm sure the two schools in question won't like it and I imagine that it won't be popular with people that children are yet to attend secondary school but in my eyes for the purpose of your objective as outlined this is the best option.

- This feels like a quick fix solution for children in deprived areas with under performing schools, there are wider social issues here and just changing the catchment areas will not resolve these. It will upheave many young peoples lives away from their families, friends and communities. Giving them long commute times which will be detrimental to health and wellbeing in many different ways. Pupil Admission Numbers are being reduced in parts of the city with greatest demand relative to the number of places available. It seems that the council are trying to reduce the numbers in some schools to increase the numbers in other, namely Longhill, meaning children who could walk to a local school now need to travel a long distance. This just doesn't make sense.
- How about improve longhill school and allow students who live near it the chance to form communities and pride in where they live!
- 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 doesn't solve the issues as the "popular" schools will still be oversubscribed
- There are other ways to improve school performance that doesn't involve additional bureaucracy to limit the choice of parents.
- This would pit schools perceived as 'successful' against those perceived as 'failing' in the north and south and lead to very little change in the social equity of our city unless there were guarantees that schools in each catchment would receive a diverse mix of students and not split communities based on privilege and ability to navigate the admissions system tactically.
- As per previous responses, I don't think the council should artificially inflate PANS at outlying schools which could operate on a smaller scale.
- 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.
- To provide more choice, equitable across city, of schools that are thriving
- Option B, when you consider the intention to reduce the PAN of Varndean (an already oversubscribed school), whilst significantly broadening the overall catchment alongside FSM prioritisation - this leads us into an acute risk of being placed in BACA which is 3.5 miles away and therefore transport will also be a mandatory requirement.
- Doesn't make sense to send kids from fiveways to longhill at all.... Given there are two schools right next to each other. Perhaps focus on improving the schools.
- 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?
- catchment areas perpetuate poor schools
- Without addressing the fundamental issue of Longhill performance and desirability. It reduces this area to a lottery as to those that get their first preference and DS, and others who will now have a very lengthy commute to a school they didn't want to go to.
- Creates uncertainty for schools budgeting.
- This appears on paper to be an inclusive option but in reality would be divisive and push more families over to Hove where things remain largely unchanged, or out of the city completely which would result in further reduction in PAN and a continuing negative impact on the schools.

- This will just mean a lot of resentment by the random lottery system where most families choose the job failing school and then the unlucky ones get the failing school and if that happens parents who can afford other options use their money to stop their child going to that school.
- Longhill have a new head who hasn't had time to implement changes. She has a great reputation for turning round schools
- There is nothing the council can do to make me put my child in a school that needs improvement and long distance travel. The option should be discounted.
- If there is a school that is failing it is not up to our children to fix the mistakes. Rather than investing in failing schools you would rather let 11 year olds travel out of Brighton? There is no logic or thought behind this. It is just an attack on a small area. A bandaid to fix a much more complex issue.
- Refer to previous answer about improving underperforming schools, embedding new school admissions policies rather than this. This will alienate large portions of the local population and not align with the green values of local MPs.
- They are going to be even less happy if their allocated school is, or is perceived to be a less well performing school that the one they expressed a preference for.
- Please see my previous comments re Longhill, and in this case refer to Brighton Aldridge Community Academy where Ousted rated it as Inadequate. Will changing the catchment area improve the "inadequate" leadership and management? Of course it won't, again that comes from the governance and leadership of the school. Do I want my child to attend a school where "Pupils say that they do not feel safe or respected in school. Many consider bullying, racism, sexism and homophobia to be commonplace and unchallenged by leaders and staff. Derogatory terms are regularly used against pupils with autism spectrum disorder and those attending the school's specialist unit. Homophobia has been normalised by the frequent use of offensive language. A culture of disrespect pervades."? No, I do not. It is the council and the school's duty to better serve these schools, and the idea that enforcing more children from non-free school meals to attend these schools will improve the outcome for free school meal pupils at these schools that is farcical.
- Please see my answer to option A. In addition, this option would see children living close to Dorothy Stringer expected to travel for miles to reach Longhill. More likely, their parents would place them in Hove schools where space was available, which would reduce certainty around numbers for Longhill.

3. Criticism of the Question's Design

- Option B is one of the most polarising options.
- Shockingly poor analysis.
- Again confusing. Which schools would be linked to north and south ?
- I feel I've already made my opinions Blatantly clear in the previous questions (if you could indeed call them that..)
- This suggestion strongly implies the council are trying to use and sacrifice the wellbeing of children to do their job.
- This option is leading and not compliant with the Gunning Principles
- This is a ridiculous suggestion and I cannot see why anyone put it forward, let alone took the time to make part of this survey!!
- I think you have lost the plot and don't have a original idea to solve a problem

4. Community and Social Impact

- I am responding on behalf of The Sutton Trust (Charley O'Regan - Senior Schools Engagement Manager). Whilst we advocate for local communities to implement the admissions models that best ensure fair admissions for all children in their community we wanted to share some guidelines that we would recommend. We strongly advocate for a school system that allows for minimal social segregation and therefore we believe that this model, which its most socially balanced catchment areas could best achieve this.
- I would strongly disagree with this model. As I have said previously firstly I do not agree with reducing PANs in successful schools in order to prop up underperforming schools numbers and budget. This model would also mean communities are actually divided rather than kept together, and there would be a lot of uncertainty in secondary school application particularly in the north Brighton catchment.
- This plan also tears apart communities of children who attended the same primary school and will be going to school in completely different areas (e.g Stringer and Longhill).
- Surely the answer is to invest more in the schools that are struggling to ensure they better serve their communities, rather than any sort of social engineering where we force children into them to try and raise the standards.
- Splits communities of children attending same primary schools and lottery system may result in children travelling long distances across the city
- The catchment areas are too big to encourage a sense of community and lots of different primary schools will be feeding into the secondary schools, creating less of a smooth transition.
- t creates excessive travel time for children living in the Surrenden area who could potentially travel across the city centre and beyond to go to Longhill. This would have a detrimental affect on their wellbeing and that of their community, challenging friendships and removing community connections.
- 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 stringer/longhill catchment area is oversized and will result in long travelling distances and breaking up communities. This has been done purely to balance the free school meal numbers with no consideration for what it will do to communities.
- This option will split and erode communities – it will fracture existing friendships established at primary school and makes a mockery of the importance and fragility of the primary / secondary transition for children and young people. This is a key social and academic turning point and a crucial developmental stage in our children's lives. There is no link whatsoever between our current primary school and a secondary school nearly 5 and a half miles away. Children would also lose their sense of community if they had to travel so far to go to school.
- This is by far the worst option for a plethora of reasons. We live in the centre of Brighton because we choose to be in a city. We want to be part of our community and we want that for our children
- The size of the catchment areas is far too big. It will split communities and siblings.
- This model imposes divisions within current catchments for primary schools so has the potential to split up bonded groups or send children, particularly living around the ditchling road divide a long way from home. It also emphasises the social divide between east and west of ditchling road- already a contentious socially unequal split
- It makes no sense for children living on top of a school to travel across Brighton leaving their communities, safety and friends. This all makes no sense!!
- This also allows for our child to remain with some peers they have spent their primary school years building relationships with.

- This option could force brighton and hove children to travel out of the city to Rottingdean or Falmer and so does not support the concept of the school being part of the community
- Option A makes the most sense if there need to be changes. Making just a few key tweaks whilst keeping the important bonds of the children formed through Infants into Secondary is definitely the route to go. Ripping that up in Options B & C and adding the potential of a child in Fiveways having to travel over an hour in rush hour to Rottingdean is an absolute madness. It's totally impractical, let alone the impact on the environment and roads which is something that really needs to be considered. Going from Infants to Secondary is a huge change, and there need to be constants to help with that. Option A is the only option which continues to keep the catchments aligned between Infants and Secondary.
- Our children's schools are the very fabric of community. The importance and benefit (physical and emotional) of children being able to walk to school.....seeing neighbours and bumping into their friends and peers on the way, saying hello to people who work in the local shops.... cannot be underestimated. It is vital that children, and their parents, can feel part of something on their doorstep and creating physical distance between home and school, would create disconnect and undermine all that is good about community and personal connection.
- This social engineering will destroy attainment across the board as well as destroy communities.
- This is a huge change with limited data to support it & which could have massive implications for families & pupils. With the potential to cause a big disconnect between children and their local communities.
- This potentially gives communities in the east of the city a much fairer chance to get into the more currently 'desirable' schools and creating a better mix..
- This separates Dorothy Stringer and Varndean. Gives children the option for a local school in their community but also provides a choice of school.
- This splits up children and families who would otherwise be together and divides up children together in primary school. It ignored what is in the best interests for the majority of children in order to benefit the minority
- This will divide my community and cause very long commutes to schools outside my community.
- To widen the catchment areas so widely there would be a negative impact on communities that are built around local secondary schools.
- Totally ridiculous. The city will grind to a halt and all sense of community will be lost.
- I don't know why you would send pupils from central brighton out to Rottingdean, that is not keeping communities in the same area
- 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.
- This will not help with creating community which is so important to humans.
- Will completely split communities with some catchments having 3 schools
- You are splitting Stanford school up unfairly
- The main thing to understand is that 'community' around a school matters much less at secondary level
- I don't agree that distinct communities have been kept within the same catchment since the Hanover / Elm Grove area has been cut in two.
- Primary school children make real friendships that are important to them and help reduce the stress involved with moving to secondary school - a huge event in their lives. You'd be randomly slicing up these groups and abstracting children from the communities they've grown up in.

- I feel this option would create huge upheaval within local communities which I believe are an important part of a schools success. I would be concerned about the collateral damage that this would have on more children in the city such as the long commutes for children across an already busy and congested city. Environmental impacts would be huge if this plan went ahead, and the council in the meetings have been unsure whether there is the money for the transport needed for this option. I would hope if the money was available this could go straight into the schools that are struggling to improve them and the the communities that are in deprived areas to support more projects that promote equality.
- This would divide our community and present unfeasible travel times for many of our children when we have multiple schools closer to us.
- This will lead to huge amounts of change for communities, leading to stress and anxiety for children suddenly having to travel so far to school. It will cost so much money to travel on 2/3 buses each way and will therefore hugely increase traffic across the city. The coast road which is already grid locked at certain times of day will become unusable. There will be a huge increase in pollution as well as more families either choosing to leave the city over uncertainty regarding which school their child may be allocated or will choose schools outside the city such as Lewes Priory which with reducing PAN is now an option for families living in Brighton
- I believe it's so important to develop local communities for children to be a part of and keep travel to a minimum and this proposal goes against this
- Young students should essentially remain in their local community
- How is this keeping communities i the same catchment area and ensuring that schools are within their catchment? What total nonsense!
- You say that distinct communities will be kept in the same catchment area, but my children attend Downs on Ditchling Road, and this option will split our community in two. With the schools right on the borderline, you are cutting this community in half.
- Boundaries have been drawn for this option to keep distinct communities in the same catchment area where possible and to ensure that the schools are situated within their own catchment area.. I'm also concerned that these boundary changes will mean that certain roads, such as Albion Hill and Freshfield Road will be split down the middle. Meaning the children from the other side of the street will be going to different schools, completely dividing communities.
- It will divide existing communities and separate children from their friends at a difficult point in their lives. How will it reduce inequalities to turn children from all socio-economic backgrounds into stressed out, vulnerable commuters from the age of 11?
- These areas will break up local communities in a misguided drive for increased choice and closing the attainment gap
- Friends might have to split up between stringer and varndean
- Taking a child away from their own community with its support, familiarity and friendship groups would be extremely detrimental to the child's mental health, safety and well being.
- Having a family living in Saltdean having to send their kids to Stringer makes no sense and is very bad for the local community they live in
- Fails to address the true cause of inequality and will cause additional pain through disruption of communities and friendship groups
- Distance to potentially travel in some catchments very large compared to others. Some communities feel completely divided by certain of these boundaries compared to other catchments.
- Hove seems to be a smaller catchment area vs the east which seems unfair with the socioeconomic status and reputation of each
- Despite the claim about communities this slices Hanover in half, and will result in hundreds if not thousands of children having large distances to travel to school each

day, impacting their wellbeing and social sense of belonging. What will the impact on traffic be?

- 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. 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
- Cuts many schools in half and would destroy communities around Hollingdean and fiveways areas. Feels it would make desirable schools even harder to get into
- Does not enhance community or feeder school links.
- !? Antithesis of building strong community around a school which is what makes them successful.
- Community will be fractured and children will be attending schools outside of familiar localities
- The schools have less connection with a particular community. Effectively forcing social engineering and making more kids suffer.
- Completely splits up students from Balfour and assume Downs too
- Could mean children being allocated a school further away from their home
- Secondly, as a parent, I have invested heavily in creating a strong sense of community identity for my children. I strongly believe that many of the mental health issues for young adults in modern Britain stem from feeling rootless within their community. I have tried to give my children a strong sense of pride and belonging in their community and believe Option B has the potential to erode local communities across our city. I worry about the impact it would have on my own children and on children across Brighton.
- Again, does not achieve what you say and splits many many communities down arbitrary boundaries. Takes no account for primary school locations and the impact dividing year groups when they move to secondary school.
- Arbitrarily divides 5ways community
- Again, it would mean children being separated from primary school friends. To me it appears Friar Road areas are being targeted?
- This school would be far outside the reality of their community, in an area they will likely have barely ever been to and would require likely 2-3 hours of public transport each day, often in darkness. There is no logic that suggests this would represent a good solution.
- Finally, in some respects, it does not achieve its objective in that it would divide up distinct communities rather than keep them in the same catchment.
- Awful. Splits primary school classes up. Long commutes to schools. More traffic. Misery. Illogical social engineering You're just trying to force middle class kids who live near DS/varndean to longhill and that will never work!
- 'Boundaries have been drawn for this option to keep distinct communities in the same catchment area where possible'. The impact of this solution on the Fiveways area, where we live, does not align with this statement.
Cllr Taylor prides himself on an inclusive city driven by community. This option would cut our community in half (Varndean / Stringer) and eliminate this very element for secondary school children due to the lottery system with Longhill. I applaud the council's intentions to improve outcomes for disadvantaged children, but the negative impact on the local children in this community would far outweigh this.
A sense of belonging is critical in a child's life and their outcomes (educational and

psychological). A local school community, a safe commute to school, and relationships with those in the local neighbourhood are direct factors in how a child will feel and therefore perform in school.

- Catchment area is too large and removes the concept of a community
- Catchment areas are too large meaning you could have to travel long distances if you don't get into the one closest to you. 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 and under this scenario, may not end up in the catchment area of their chosen school, which is unfair
- Many parents with younger siblings in Balfour Primary would find the distance between the schools very hard to manage and stressful.
- Completely unacceptable option for those in the South divide which will mean residents of the Preston park area who live a stone's throw from two schools having to drive their children across and out of the city - this is so out of touch with modern flexible working from home pressures and will cause huge additional logistical stress for parents and families when it's already a struggle
- Environmental impact. Impact on children's wellbeing and community cohesion. Exclusion of community representation before creating these models.
- Sibling link must be maintained as it makes life too complicated for parents to have kids in different schools
- Good to have choice in catchments to enable more mixed demographics in school but some pupils will have long travelling distances (safety and wellbeing issue) and may be isolated from friends who may not live nearby.
- As part of the Preston park community I would almost certainly move out of the city if my child was forced to attend longhill school.
- I agree with the important aim of keeping the percentages of free school meals children equitable across the different catchment areas.
- I am favour of the fact that this option gives deprived areas a choice of schools, but I'm finding it difficult to work out how, the new rules giving preference to recipients of FSM will work in real life. Will this simply mean that the "best" schools will have to accept applicants on FSMs over "other" children? Will schools such as Vardean end up with all the FSM students, if they have it as a first choice? If this option basically allows all FSM recipients that would have previously gone to BACA to go to a different school, will BACA end up with 0% FSM students??
- Also their friendship groups will be dispersed.
- It doesn't work to split and divide communities this way and the thought of our children having to commute major distances or leave other peers from their community behind at year 6 /7 is very detrimental .
- This option would simply serve to destroy existing communities, And Will not in actual fact serve the purpose of transporting large numbers of children to the east of Brighton (As the council seems to wish). Those communities were simply splinter, Leave the city, Choose to homeschool, Or send their children to private school - Which from Person experience I can tell you is not something I can afford.
- Furthermore, the new boundaries could lead to situations where siblings attend different schools. This fragmentation is not only confusing for children but also places an additional burden on families who must coordinate multiple school schedules.
- I strongly disagree with Option B. I have attended the Council meetings to discuss these issues and I feel very uncomfortable about the way single academics are being quoted out of context to provide justification for far reaching changes. For example Stephen Gorard talks about measures that work with parental preferences and talks about benefits from natural social mixing as opposed to the engineered social mixing as proposed by Option B. I understand from the Council's slides that Brighton overall performs better for all children than rest of England. We need to be careful not to

make changes that may have unintended consequences of jeopardising what we are already getting right. We also need to be careful when we look more closely at the attainment gap in Brighton compared with the rest of England. When you look at the data more closely you can see - aside from London - Brighton is doing better for our disadvantaged children. This is not to say that we shouldn't always seek to do better. There are some children and some schools in Brighton and Hove that need more support – to this end, we need sustainable school funding and greater cooperation across schools. We also need to wait for the 2025 FSM admission change to bed in and see the results. If Option B were to go ahead, I ultimately feel it would fail to achieve any of the Council's stated objectives. From all the conversations/ whatsapp groups with local parents, many 'advantaged' families would look to opt out of the system rather than send their child to schools who have are performing poorly in terms of attainment and in terms of behaviour, quality of teaching and curriculum. In a similar way that many parents in Rottingdean, Ovingdean and Saltdean are choosing to send their children to schools outside Brighton e.g. Lewes Priory or to private schools. I don't think this happening is advantageous any child in Brighton and Hove and our communities. Any changes need to have all of the Brighton community on board to work – Option B doesn't provide this.

- ? Additionally, and crucially, a big part of any school is the local community it creates and the engagement from that community in events and activities. By expanding catchments you're watering down the sense of community and of ownership. You're creating barriers to engagement. Where is the logic?!
- With this one at least kids in kemptown still have a chance to go to school within the city and nearer to where they live.
- With a lottery system this option will mean that our children could be placed in schools far away from home and friends and not being able to attend the local school which is 10 minutes walk and close to where they grew up
- Will divide communities and increase journey times.
- Fix the "broken" schools by investing some money. Educate the communities where families don't respect education and where attendance is low. Decent schools and their results have a lot to do with the communities they're part of and the value families put on education.
- While potentially good for our family, the idea of a system which creates such extended catchment zones (and therefore travel and community impact) is not one I agree with.
- 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 live in Woodingdean and have done for 11 years. The whole time we have been here we have had concerns around Longhill School as it does not seem to show any meaningful improvement. Woodingdean is a thriving area of the city and there are many children locally that would benefit hugely from a better secondary school experience. Our childrens education opportunity should not be limited due to the fact that we could not afford to live in central Brighton. We fall in the same catchment area as Whitehawk which I genuinely believe is the only reason that there is even any resistance to these changes. To truly reflect a community, you have to accept all areas of it. There will be families with children in Whitehawk that again are restricted to options because of what they can afford. Those people would put the effort into their childrens educations (as we will) and take them further away for a better school. Sadly, priorities for the poorer elements of the community will come down to what is closest.

- We live in Hanover. Some of the schools covered in this catchment area are very far away and are in completely different communities. It also effectively removes the option of going to one of the closer schools for no reason I could see.
- We live in Hanover reasonably close to Varndean and Stringer schools. This proposal would also put us in the catchment area for Longhill. This is not only a long way away for us. We also have no social connections whatsoever to Woodingdean and Saltdean.
- 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.
- Varndean and Stringer are the closest schools to our road (Withdean Cresecnt) but we would not be in the catchment area for one of these schools (Stringer). Also, our eldest daughter is at Stringer and so it would make most sense for our youngest daughter, who is currently at primary school, to also attend the school.
- Utterly ridiculous. As above you are trying to force children to travel away from the area they live in and splitting up areas where there are children going to Balfour school. Families will simply move away from these areas and rent in the catchment areas they want to be in.
- Totally idiotic, it splits communities, the opposite of what is intended
- This would split up communities, add traffic to the roads and children would have over 1.5hr walk to school.
- This will break up communities. Please explain how this option maintains communities
- LOSS OF COMMUNITY: There are huge social and cultural benefits of attending school near where friends, family and local community activities are located. It fact some may say it is essential in the development of our younger generations
FAMILY LIFE: Being near younger siblings schools for ease of drop off/pick ups
- IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES For many children option B will take them away from their local community which as stated in my comments for option B will be detrimental for a multitude of reasons.
- This seems bonkers. How do you have a local community when the kids are being shipped from all around? I've never been to Patcham but my kid could end up there with a bunch of locals - we don't have a car so how will he socialise with his peers outside of school time?
- This proposal will lead to significant travel across the city and break the communities of students attending a local school in their community.
- This option also represents the most catastrophic break up of communities which will have a social impact that extends beyond the school pupils alone.
- There is no community between our Fiveways and the communities of Saltdean, Whitehawk and Rottingdean. and we are too far apart to grow one. It would also greatly damage our family life and our child's life chances. There is already access to our local schools from across the city for those on free school meals. For those that want to come, they can come. This significant step ruins the teenage years of those of so many in the current catchment, making them travel and removing them from their families and communities away from a good school to a school designated as "requiring improvement". It brings life chances down more than bringing life chances up. That is not what social mobility should be about. These proposals are causing us a great deal of unnecessary anxiety already as it is to so many families. The council has not even seen the impact of the change of rules for free school meals before deciding they need to go further. It is baffling why the proposed policies aim to drag succeeding communities down rather than focusing on raising schools within local communities up. Further, our oldest plans to go to Varndean 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 suggestion that it maintains communities is entirely incorrect. This model separates us almost entirely from our community around Balfour. It would mean my daughter at best attends a nearby school NONE of her current primary school class would be eligible to attend (as they all live in the other catchment) and at worst she would be allocated a school that not only NONE of her current primary school class would attend PLUS is over an hour and a half away on the bus. She is on the ASC pathway and would never cope with this commute.
- This option will incur huge increases in car journeys, congestion and a degradation of children's mental health due to school community spanning an entire city. It would split children up from siblings who are already attending their local school. The idea of someone travelling from Saltden to Varndean while another goes the opposite way is ludicrous. The hours of travelling and impact on traffic and therefore the environment would be significant. Children living miles from friends is also cruel.
- This option does not make sense to me. All children should be given the opportunity to attend their local school. This option will have a negative impact on local communities, family lives, and the environment around schools due to increased traffic.
- This model feels arbitrary and reductive.
- This model enables children to have more choice. I think it is a clever move to place Stringer and Varndean in separate catchment areas so they can take children from further afield.
- This looks like a plan for stopping walking or cycling to school, moving children further away from their communities and stupid levels of commuting to and from school.
- Positive engagement with all communities, this is particularly important in those that are seen as making the most sacrifice. This can't be seen as anything other than a failure. The outreach has been very poor, mostly reliant on community groups which greatly favours central Brighton. For example this is only just coming out in school newsletters days before the deadline, This could and should have been pushed out into the community months ago. (A few podcasts and newspaper columns is not sufficient)
- This is completely illogical. I moved around a huge amount in the youth and never had a community to call my own. Going to a local school is the best way to be part of a community. Getting busses 1.5 hours away would destroy this and what about any sort of after school clubs? They would be impossible. Children that live near a school should get priority, not ones bused in from miles away.
- This is a terrible option. It would increase travel for a large number of children, taking them out of their communities. This does not address many of the central issues. This is not a good option. I strongly oppose this choice and the damage it could cause.
- This is a completely unacceptable choice. This would potentially result in children living next door to Dorothy Stringer travelling across the city to Rottingdean. This is neither tenable or green from a transport perspective. We believe it is important for children to be able to walk to school and it is also important to be able to maintain friendships in the local area.
- This could mean my children would once again go to a school outside of the community in which they thrive and involve them getting on public buses to get to school or walking through Wild Park
- This change will cause my children to separate schools due to a breaking of the sibling link, because my eldest will be out of catchment. We love next to varndean and stringer and this would potentially ask my daughter to travel to across the city to longhill, which is in the same catchment as Dorothy Stringer. It breaks up the downs junior and Balfour communities. It breaks up the Fiveways community. It is absurd.

- This carves up housing and primary school communities, for example Balfour primary.
- The proposed catchment areas here, don't appear to consider communities at all and appear artificial. In particular, the Dorothy Stringer/Longhill catchment area is a very odd shape and barely takes in Dorothy Stringer school itself.
- I disagree with the principle of using my child as an economic unit, making additional children commute 2.5 hours per day, and of blocking children from attending school in their own community.
- The Longhill and Stringer catchment does not make sense in my view, especially without some guarantees on travel- yet even then it does feel as though one school community is getting uprooted to fulfil political means
- The is option would potentially break the connection that pupils have to their own community by expecting long travel times across the city. Very bad idea.
- The families of Patcham would no longer have their community school. This option would remove any parental choice in North Brighton and turn the whole system into a lottery. This is such a big change to accepted national policy for the people of North Brighton that it is grossly unfair. It would also inflict very long travel times on the people of North Brighton.
- Strongly disagree with this option. In this scenario we would move out of the Brighton & Hove area due to this extremely poor option, and likelihood (as we understand it) that our (only) child would likely be required to travel to Longhill on multiple buses with an hour commute, with all the health, safety, wellbeing, environmental and other impacts that would bring with it. Brighton is already an expensive area to live in and a large part of the reason for buying here was due to the excellent schools and the community representing our values.
- Bad for community cohesion too. You could have 3 children living down the same road going to 3 different schools miles away from each other!! Ridiculous
- Time and cost will be additional stresses on the children and families. not going to school with those in local neighbourhood also negative
- Surrenden Road should be in the stringer and varndean catchment area as their community is Surrenden and Fiveways not Patcham
- Stop tinkering with the lives of families and children (and their friendships and bonds) in a way you do not understand. Why ravage East Brighton and leave West Brighton and Hove virtually unchanged. The definition of inequality. Fix the poorly performing schools and don't damage what is working for thousands of families and widespread communities.
- Splitting up established communities
- Sibling link needs to remain
- ridiculous commutes and splitting existing communities
- Removing the ability of children living in. The streets next to and surrounding a secondary school rights to attend there and cforcing travel across the city is unjust and not right
- Need clarity around retaining of sibling link after the proposed changes.
- My son would have to go to a different school to his sister
- My concern is changing catchments basically leaves the schools trying to compensate for social disadvantages rather than improving the schools that serve their particular communities. I undetstand something needs to be done but hope it's not an expectation too far for schools that are barely able to cope as it is.
- My children will be separated. Please guarantee that you will maintain sibling link for an interim period at least so that children can join their siblings already at secondary school
- This option would ruin children's lives as well as the community. This option needs to be removed from the process immediately.

- . What does that do to thriving communities?
- Ludicrous to think about catchment areas over such a wide area - would a child seriously be potentially denied a space at a school that's 500 metres away and sent to a school that's around 4 miles away but can take over an hour to get too during rush hour? And that kids may literally be travelling in the opposite directions from each other. How would this tally with other pledges to reduce traffic on roads and building stronger community links
- There is value in a child going to their local school (primary or secondary) and feeling a sense of belonging in that local community. Where children are not going to their local secondary school (see answers to previous questions) BHCC needs to be understanding why and working within local communities and schools to change this. I go back to my point about an equitable education system and that some schools and local communities need more resources than others.
- Kids who live nextdoor to a school should go to that school eg Varndean. Too much travelling and too many neighbourhoods split up.
- This does not serve to keep distinct communities in the same catchment areas.
- It is a significant change that will impact many people, split up friendships and fragment communities.
- I would like to know that the sibling link will be retained for children who are 'displaced' by the changes.
- I think this is the worst option because the catchments are much too big. I think all children should be able to go to school in their local community and not have to travel halfway across the city. Eg. If you live in the most northern part of the DS/longhill catchment (which is the most problematic catchment in this option) you might have to travel 5 miles to longhill, That doesn't seem sensible, it would remove children's connection to their local community and create a lot more car journeys (even if there is a school bus, these don't usually cover children attending clubs after school so either the kids would miss out or parents would have to drive them). Presumably the council would need to put on school buses and fund travel for a lot of children which would be costly.

5. Broader Educational Equity Issues

- Why not wait to see how the changes to priority status for children on FSM impacts the intakes first?
- It's good that it provides a fairer distribution of good school places across the city. However, I disagree with the increase in travel across the city. The council need to support failing schools so everyone can have access to a good school near them. I also think time needs to be given to see the impact of the policy for FSM children to be given priority.
- Also I noticed this doesn't address the inequality in the west of the city with children only having one catchment school of PACA.
- Its better than option A or C - a bit more pro choice
- It provide choice for parents as each school will have slight differences that may suit a child more.
- It promotes parental choice
- I understand the need to help children on free school meals , but you are penalising children who are not on free meals
- It offers real choice to families
- It makes it a more equal field for families from all backgrounds.
- This allows children across the city to attend the school which best meets their needs.

- Acknowledge through this exercise have found out it's the sad reality for many children in the city already but rather than put more children in this position (levelling down) we should be looking at what we can do for those children. This travel time will be hard on any children but especially for SEN children. The new FSM policy that is about to be rolled out is already fairly radical (first of its type in the country) council's own expert has said should wait to see the impact of this before making any other changes. Children should not be used as pawns to try and address long standing and complicated problems of inequality in this city.
It is the option that gives the greatest equality of opportunity around education and increases options for those facing the greatest disadvantage. So much focus has been on travel which is a valid concern but pales in significance to the systemic inequality in the current system. Transport will need some creative thinking and funding but allowing the existing model to continue so certain privileged children don't have to spend 45 minutes on a bus is nothing more than self preserving snobbery
- Although it appears that families have more than one choice of school, that really isn't the case at all. In our situation there is a choice between a school 15 minutes walk away and another that is almost 5 miles away (2 buses!). There is also a major disparity in the ratings of each schools
- It's an absolutely worst idea proposed! There are way more factors to consider than distribution of free school meals. This proposal will force many children to commute long hours daily to and back from school, children that might not have the option to be driven to school by their parents and it divides existing communities around primary and junior schools.
- It's ludicrous to add to the existing issues of student travel time, city congestion and choice inequality by proposing large groups of children travel across the city to furthest away schools. A very blunt tool to try and solve a complex problem that will just create other significant issues and mean many families move or take their kids out of the system.
- Is a much fairer distribution and gives children a choice
- It appears to be the "fairer" model but still involves a lot of travel and not more than one option for west of the city
- More choice for the majority of children
- This allows my catchment area to have 3 options, which is much fairer.
- This allows parents choice of school where this hasn't been the case before in some of the previous catchment areas.
- Strongly agree on the basis that this option allows some of the more disadvantaged areas to access the more popular schools. For us living in Coldean it creates choice and encourages social mobility.
- This is a much fairer option with regards to the FSM.
- This looks like it could be a fairer option giving more equal choice potentially
- This opens up more and better choices for many children
- This option provides the biggest shift in choice and options for parents and their kids, and has the potential to be truly effective.
- This seems to retain some choice in schools within catchment areas and places in high population areas, balanced with spreading out pupils on fsm across schools better.
- It does not need changing, children with free school meals should not be given priority.
- More choice for more students. Everyone gets the choice of more than one school. Greater social mixing across the city.
- Most fair.
- More choice
- More choice creates a fairer system

- My children have a chance at going to the best schools in the city
 - More school options for areas
 - Most change on distribution of FSM
 - More opportunity to choose between schools
 - much better, gives everybody more choice, travel times and distances should be carefully looked at though
 - Much fairer distribution
 - The balancing exercise here based on free school meal children is what any change should be about. This is also offering pupils options to find the best structure for them.
 - Much fairer in terms of choice for all areas bar Portslade
 - There are fewer FSM in Hove and Portslade in this model compared to the rest of the city so this does not seem very equal.
- Everything should be done to ensure as few children as possible travel long distances to school. How will travel for those who cannot afford it but are not eligible for FSM be funded? Long travel to school is considered a barrier to education particularly for SEND children. How are you going to ensure truancy levels do not increase?
- The issue with this is that a change in the number of eligible children in each area will mean children still miss out
 - There are many reasons why this is not a realistic proposal. Travel times will be huge. With current reputations everyone will likely want Vardean and Stringer and those on FSM will get first choice, potentially pushing the balance too far. Better schools are better (on the basis of this proposal) because kids are from a high socioeconomic group, are better behaved, and want to learn. It will be difficult to keep this ethos if essentially all the kids from Longhill and BACA who are less well behaved go to Stringer and Vardean (I appreciate this might not happen, but it could). Surely improving Longhill and BACA and addressing deprivation locally is a better solution so everyone can go to school locally and attain better. People with money and who are able will also just move to Hove where there is a safer school choice - creating more inequality as house prices are likely to react to this change in catchment areas.
 - This appears to be a hugely risky option. I understand the benefits of mixing pupils from different backgrounds, but there is no guarantee that this plan will work.
 - This appears to be a much fairer system, giving more opportunities to those in less affluent areas. I strongly agree with this option.
 - This looks like a fairer model where every pupil can apply for one of two schools in their catchment area.
 - pupils deserve a choice in where they attend school and currently the catchment boundaries give those in richer parts of the city more choice on where to attend school and their options are schools which perform better and have fewer pupils requiring free school meals. The current system is perpetuating wealth and opportunity disparities in the city and leaving those living in poorer areas with the least choice and a catchment for a school that has been marked for its poor performance.
 - Puts us in overlap between Stringer, Vardean and Longhill. Seems fairest.
 - The thing that works better is obviously that north Whitehawk have the option of other schools than Longhill and that children from other areas have the option of choosing Longhill. Along with that, however, schools like Longhill need to be funded and supported in achieving their ambitions for the education and success of all its pupils. I, by the way, have no attachment to Longhill nor children who attend any secondary school, but I am aware of the need to ensure that all areas of the city deserve access to high quality education. This model seems to have the most potential in delivering that.

- This does not ensure that schools are situated within their catchment area at all. It is a highly discriminative plan which makes absolutely no logical sense
- This model gives more people the opportunity for choice.
- This model shows the best balance of FSM across the city so would be the preference to meet the desired outcomes or ensuring all schools remain open, everyone has choice and the balance of FSM is evened out
- This option comes the closest of the three to tackling the educational inequality in the city, providing all students with choice of secondary school and reducing the imbalance in distribution of students who receive free school meals.
We are a family with primary school aged children, who moved out of the Varndean/Dorothy Stringer catchment as we were unable to afford housing costs. We moved to the Coombe Road area (BACA catchment) and love our new home and the community and would love to stay long term. However, if the options for secondary schools does not improve, we will feel forced to move out of Brighton. Option B offers a chance to tackle the structural inequalities that limit the opportunities of Brighton's young people and also that are forcing families out of the city.
- 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 seems a fairer system for LI. Especially deprived areas of the city. Mix the kids/families/households up a bit, it's probably the only way
- This seems to be fair to most and would achieve the objectives.
More choice for all and DS and V split
- This will provide more choice and more equal opportunities across the city. It will stop the fact that currently people can buy their way in to kids having an excellent state school experience
- This makes sense splitting the city into sensible areas and giving choice to everyone
- This will split communities, the primary my children are at would have children going to 5 different secondaries rather than 2. This will lead to anxiety re places and friendships
- Give the FSMs a chance to work!
- This is a fairer model
- This creates more choice of schools and therefore opportunities for more students across the city, especially helping to balance the current disparity in the east of the city.
- While it's important to ensure that schools have enough pupils to remain viable, this approach should not prioritize balancing numbers at the expense of vulnerable children, particularly those with SEND and those disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the SEND Review (2022), local stability and consistency of support are critical for vulnerable pupils. Moving children to schools that may not yet be ready to provide the specialized support they need can undermine their educational progress. Moreover, balancing socio-economic demographics, such as free school meal eligibility, should be handled with care. For example, sending more disadvantaged pupils to Longhill High School, which is still rated as "Requires Improvement", could overwhelm a school still working through its own issues of behaviour management, inconsistent teaching, and attendance. While aiming for equity is commendable, vulnerable pupils, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds, require schools that are equipped with stable resources and a proven ability to meet their needs. As highlighted in the UCL Institute of Education (2021) research, schools in the process of improvement need time to stabilize before they can take on additional challenges. Ultimately, this approach

may inadvertently disadvantage the most vulnerable children, as the focus seems more on balancing numbers rather than ensuring the quality of provision across all schools.

- Only option B reduces the inequality of secondary school catchments.
- 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.
- Utterly ludicrous. Local people aren't choosing Longhill, Fiveways parents won't either. I believe this option may even lower the amount of kids who choose Longhill as local kids will have access to Stringer and may put that first instead of Longhill now. Fiveways parents I have spoken to have talked about either moving areas or putting down deposits on Lewes Old Grammar school and if they don't get allocated Stringer they will take up a place there. This potentially will actually make closure faster. It is appalling that any child is travelling so far to school and should be changed, but that is not a reason to make kids who currently aren't travelling far to school have the same disadvantage. It says that not all kids matter in actuality. Long travel times have been proven to be detrimental to mental health. Being tired is a barrier to learning, as well as long distances. You want to encourage children to go to school, not make them too tired before they even get there. As for bus journeys, what will it cost you to put on free buses for kids who will be travelling that long distance? Could that money not be spent on improving Longhill so local people want to go there? It will also massively increase traffic and pollution as parents choose to drive each time instead. It feels like a band aid option where you are bolstering results in a really struggling school by filling it with middle class kids under the impression that they'll do well anywhere. This option will not work.
- We need to factor in Kings School and Cardinal Newman Catholic School.
- Yes better as everyone has access to choice and options
- Part of the issue that compounds the problems with this option is that in Brighton and Hove we have random allocation tiebreaks. The Sutton Trust in their paper 'School Places: A Fair Choice?' <https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/School-Places.pdf> the idea of marginal ballots are proposed. This means that a proportion of the places are allocated based on distance to the school, and a proportion are based on random tie break. The paper states that: "it is also desirable to acknowledge that a desire for some sense of community in a school is valid". In essence, this option is about striking the balance between fair access and strong community. If something like option B is taken forward, I would really encourage the council to look at the proposals made by experts such as the Sutton Trust to ensure that it is balanced.
- However I do agree with areas having more choice.
- Children who have FSM already have priority over other criteria including children who live in the catchment area - and that's fine. But to now place FSM issues above ALL OTHER issues, is unforgiveable.
- We live on Redvers Road and this would provide better options for our son when attending secondary school. At present there is a clear lack of balance in the level of children receiving FSMs across several secondary schools in the city and extensive research over decades highlights that segregating or creating environments where there is disparity such as this across a range of factors does not improve pupil outcomes. Option B would greatly benefit families across Brighton, providing the balance required and lead to an environment where more schools, and those attending them can succeed.
- I like the principle of choice and ensuring that all families in each catchment area will have the same opportunity to access a school with better outcomes and inspection

reports, regardless of the family's wealth. This will create a better social mix within each secondary school.

- I believe it is in this option that balances out the portion of students in each school on FSMs the most. However, I strongly feel as though any decided action should be taken with a clause that ensures a review in 3-5 years time that engages with students and staff of local schools more closely in the consultation and decision-making process. This should also be reviewed alongside an essential review of the sort of educational provision that we can define as 'quality'. The question is more that balancing out socioeconomic representation in schools; I hope in the near future we will engage in other pivotal issues such as redistributing funding and redefining what we see as the purpose and practice of schools for the sake of young people and their communities.
- Why hasn't the whole of the city been addressed here to include PACA catchment with Hove schools? Same issue with discrimination with faith schools excluding non-religious students and not following the same rules as the rest of the schools in the city. Why is that legal?
- Also these proposals do not mention how the schools will be better funded to tackle the financial inequalities facing disadvantaged pupils & instead are going to give parents less choice, worse options and our area will mean many of the children will not be able to go to the same primary schools
- I am incensed at the fact that when we live 50 m from a school our kids will have to potentially go on a one hour round trip. Why don't you fix the quality of provision rather than forcing children to travel more. I have children with special educational needs and none of the schools in this option provide nearly as good a provision.
- I am in support of a more equitable spread of school places across areas of different socioeconomic background. However this would appear to give some children very long journeys to school which BHCC would need to support with.
- Fantastic, much fairer and gives more deprived areas a choice in more than 1 school. This is a no brainer if Brighton council are serious about leveling up
- Children in the Port Hall/Prestonville community will be particularly disadvantaged
- Literally I support more choices for the students living in the original BACA and Longhill catchment areas, as they deserve a choice for a better school, however, better road planning is needed before carrying out. What's more, I agree that this plan could effectively spread out the FSM rate across Brighton.
- Again not sure what this means and whether doing this will make a more equitable system or not, think it means children get more options of where they go to school, but that wouldn't help who the schools accept
- The boundaries will completely divide families with children going to St Luke's Primary School. This will be especially traumatic for SEND children who struggle to build bonds with other children. This will also lead to a dramatic increase in requests for EHCPs, as parents worry their children will lack the support needed to thrive.
- Although we lose access to Varndean we at least have a choice of 2 schools, one of which is in Brighton (our town) and also a 'good' school. This also means we have access to a school that was considered prior to purchasing our home.
- All parents should have a range of choices of where they are able to send their child. It shouldn't be a postcode lottery
- Even choice of schools for all
- The new FSM admission policy should be given time to take effect, and investment should be made in BACA and Longhill to bring them up to good and increase appeal if those schools over the next 2 years.
- Creates choice for almost all areas
- Expanding the areas gives a fairer choice of schools my eldest was given a place at an underachieving school due to our location we did not have a choice. We were fortunate and she was accepted into another faith based school and she excelled

getting top grades. Many of her peers she attended primary school with went to the school she was allocated and despite being educated to the same level upon leaving primary school, left the Moulsecoomb school with much lower grades than predicted at the SATs. I think the current system is wildly unfair that if you live in a more impoverished area of Brighton you have such limited choice by extending the catchment areas you at least have a choice.

- All catchment areas zones have more than one choice in secondary school allocation
- All areas would have a choice of school
- Addresses this issue with minimal change in my area and still offers children a reasonable choice of schools.
- AWFUL. The Dorothy Stringer/Longhill catchment is ludicrous, and will involve completely unreasonable travel times. Parents in Prestonville and Fiveways will not send their children to Longhill. This will widen the attainment gap - the wealthier families will move out of Brighton or find alternatives, while those living in poverty will be forced to travel long distances, and therefore experience all of the negative health and educational impacts of that. Please do not do this.
- Choice of schools
- This would appear a fairer system, although without the. Umber I'm not sure
- Fsm 2025 intake data is needed to assess impact before making more changes
- Gerrymandering catchments to move children to schools far away from their local area for pure budget reasons rather than really addressing the problems the city faces. Please engage with professor Adam Dennett. Do not cherry pick the professional advice you listen too.
- Having two school per catchment provides parents with some choice.
- I live on Havelock Road, which has been randomly divided. It is a ludicrous option, which will see my child and others marginalised.
- I strongly support option B, as it would give parents more choice and foster schools with a more varied mix of FSM and non-FSM children.
- We'd like to have options when it's time for our children to go to school, and able to choose preferences between schools.
- Unfair to pupils not on free school meals that they will be placed in a school far from home, needing to travel across the city, be separated from friends and feel vulnerable in unfamiliar surroundings
- Also please explain why no changes are being made in Hove and Portslade as they have at least as big levels of inequity in FSM
- This would ensure our son's can still access the school we can see from our house
- This would create a fair entry system for all children across the city
- The council needs to embed and evaluate the FSM policy change before moving onto more drastic solutions. They should wait for 2 years to see if the higher prioritisation of FSM has any effect on take-up. These children already take higher priority to the catchment area. Wait for the white paper to come out which may give councils power over academies and religious schools before taking drastic action Artificially engineering FSM proportions through PAN reductions in more popular schools will not be a solution to the social goals of the council. Schools are an important part of the community and the city as a whole. Moving children around will have city wide social and environmental implications. The repercussions of moving children away from their local communities should not be underestimated.
- This is the worst option and will not improve educational achievement but be detrimental to a huge number of students who live in Fiveways/hanover areas
- This seems like the most positive option for families to achieve the objectives and also still provide good choice.
- This provides a better balanced choice across the City in my opinion

- This proposal does not adequately address the issue of trying to more evenly spread FSM across the catchments and will exacerbate the existing issue of wealthier families being able to move to their chosen catchment. I do not understand why there is no attempt to address the disparities between the Hove and Portslade catchments. From the figures provided, the FSM spread in Hove will remain the same in this catchment at 20/21% which will be significantly lower than any other catchment. I understand the appeal this with model but think the model as proposed is problematic as it does not adequately address the disparities in FSMs across the city. I think there are some valid concerns around access to Longhill due to its geographical location which are already in existence for those already in catchment. I do not agree with those who think there should no change to the Varndean/DS catchment but this should be a city wide change and the proposals should focus on the whole city, not just the East of the city. Any changes which require longer travel times for significant numbers of children should not happen without a clear plan for funded travel. However, it is also obvious that some of those who are against this proposal in principle are doing so because they do not like the school they would potentially be in catchment for and not actually due to travel issues. Any proposals need to also address other issues of equality of access/outcomes with a particular focus on SEND children - with the following issues in mind

 - Some SEND children will be more disadvantaged if they need to make a long journey to school and some simply will not be able to travel on a busy school bus during rush hour. However, equally due to the inequalities in catchments with only 2 of the 6 catchments having a choice of school - SEND children may benefit from changes to catchments that would allow them to have a choice within catchment. EHCPs are notoriously difficult to obtain and primary schools actively discourage many parents from applying for them - this means many apply to secondary without an EHCP and therefore are not in a higher priority category when applying. this creates inequalities of access for children in single catchment areas.
- This option would mean our younger son would go to a different school to his brother. Dorothy Stringer is woefully below what's required for SEND students, in fact they penalise and discriminate against neurodivergent children by punishing dysregulation and attention challenges
- This option provides more equality than others. At the moment houses in the catchment area for higher achieving schools are ludicrously expensive and unaffordable for many. The relationship between catchment area and housing costs is problematic and option B can potentially address this.
- THIS OPTION ONLY SERVES TO ACTUALLY DISADVANTAGE MORE CHILDREN ACROSS THE CITY.** Including a significant impact on

 - mental health of children (huge increases in SEND provision)
 - long commutes to school for a huge proportion of the city (unless places are decided on those living closest to the schools of choice)
 - breaking down of communities
 - breaking down of current school communities
 - Huge congestion across the city
 - huge pollution across the city (in which we already face huge problems)
 - Those families with the means will leave the city or send their children to private schools which will impact on the falling numbers of school places.
- This option offers the best outcome for balancing out the FSM number evenly. It provides options to all communities. This proposal along with a rebalancing of financial support to ensure that those schools that need more money are quickly given more money in this period of change to enable them to flourish and grow at speed and catch up with those schools that are already outstanding or good in their provision.
- This option makes sense if the main aim is to enhance proximity to school.

- This option improves the disparities between FSM in schools best and gives parents an actual choice.
- This option helps to maintain equality for free school meals but maintains a level of choice for parents in all zones, with no one school, catchment areas
- This option has impact in terms of choice and equity for families across the city.
- This option has a disproportionate impact on the children in the Preston Park who would need to travel by vehicle instead of walking to school. This would reduce their time for extra curricular activities and result in less exercise, damaging well being
- This option gives those who currently have limited or in some cases no choice more options
- This model provides us with more choice of school for our children in our catchment area
- This model promotes choice
- This looks even fairer and I'm in the catchment area for a good school that is closer to us than would currently be the case
- This leaves no parent choice as the other school is literally miles away
- Prestonville is a community area with families living here and moving here for the community, this would push families away and possibly out of the city.
- This is the only option which would set about bringing meaningful change for all areas. There will be many unhappy parents but change and growth is difficult and it REALLY needs to happen. We as a community in the city have a duty to look out for all and realistically this is the only true option that would do this! Yes yes yes.
- This is the only option that will truly address inequalities and give parents and students real choice.
- This is the only option that reduces educational inequalities (as measured by your FSM in catchment metric) in a meaningful way. And it is the only option that offers those living in poorer communities to the East of Brighton a choice of school within catchment. It is objectively superior to the other two options if increased access to education and reduction of educational inequalities are key objectives.
- This is the only model suggested which gives most pupils a choice between more than one school in their catchment. Currently, if you don't have a sibling at a school, SEND requirements or qualify for free school meals, you are left at the bottom of the priority list, which in some areas means you can only realistically be admitted to one school. In the case of BACA in the current catchments for example, this is not even a school the council has any control over. That's a big area where there is essentially no council comprehensive provision at all for the population. This proposal wouldn't rectify that for PACA, so perhaps a tweak might be possible with that catchment to allow pupils to at least be in the catchment pool with another school/other schools.
- This is the most equitable model presented as it affords people choice, so that parents and guardians can make the right choice for their child and their needs. However, if this model is proposed according to a lottery system then I couldn't disagree more as it has massive implications on travel times, splitting up social groups for young people, negative climate effects as well as impacting on the stress that young people experience through long commute times.
- This is the least worst of the three proposals but the lack of certainty and the wide disparity between schools again is unacceptable when we moved to Coldean specifically for the school catchment.
- This is the fairest options for disadvantaged pupils to give them better school choices
- This is the fairest option as it provides greater choice, but it still means that students could potentially have great distances to travel but having said this there are plenty of children already travelling in from Kemptown to the five-ways schools (though not the other way) If you decide on this option the wealthier parents in fiveways will make your lives a misery. Just consider the few children who ended up at Longhill from

that area this year. Whatever you decide will annoy people but if you are going to make decisions, make them where they benefit those of lower socioeconomic status and SED areas of the city, they won't shout the loudest so their voices so often get ignored as it is easier to listen to those who have power, influence and financial means to buy property in an affluent area with the best schools. I don't know why I am bothering writing this as like I said nobody listens to people who live in less wealthy areas anyway.

- This is the fairest option as it allows choice for all catchment areas. It enables access to the best schools for each area.
- This is the better option for Kemp Town residents as at least we get the option of more than one school unlike the other 2 options. My daughter would still be separated from her friends who have been put in the Varndean catchment. Unfortunately, this seems to be the worst option for everyone else. There are huge numbers of people complaining about this option so it feels like we are outnumbered and our voice won't be heard as there are not so many residents in Kemp Town with kids.
- This is the best of the three options and far better than the status quo.
- This option is particularly disappointing as I broadly support increased diversity in schooling and have followed this for sometime. It is also one of the key reasons for my children attending state school posed to the private systems (other than money). However it appears the council are interested in the goal but have put very little thought in how to get there. In particular an apparent unwillingness to listen to the council's own experts who all agree that there is no quick fix to diversity, solutions takes time, hard work and can't be achieved purely by redrawing boundaries. Where those schemes have been successful they have all followed the same pattern.
- This is disruptive to status quo, maintains parental choice but very limited. Similar to other options in terms of shift in FSM mix. Varndean and Stringer currently are only 0-4.9% below current FSM mix for area, which is very "close" to FSM population, according to Sutton Trust, so not clear why change is needed based on the rationale. High performing schools and other methods to expand access for disadvantaged pupils could be used other than moving catchment areas. Experiment in Bristol in 2016 did not show a good impact on social equality, it increased wealth ghettos, as parents moved closer, and the schools involved are currently on a 5-15% reduction on FSM pupils compared to local area. It didn't work to enforce new catchment areas, it just stymied parental choice. I'd also like to say, option B does not benefit me at all personally, unfortunately (!) - none of the options benefit me as they ALL reduce my choice - I just can't see the evidence base for huge upheaval of current catchment areas. It is not clear that moving catchment areas when the schools involved are so far away will work, and it is likely to impact on many many pupils travelling long distances, when they live close to a suitable and good school. The family impact and SEN impact is huge. Again, this is actually not affecting me but I don't think it is a balanced choice.
- This is clearly not a North-South divide!! 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.

- This is bonkers! You say it's about allowing disadvantaged students the same opportunities but straight away placing a major barrier to them.
- This WONT achieve what your hoping as families will move or send their children to private schools which completely goes against what you are trying to achieve of mixing up children from diverse backgrounds.
- This is a far more equitable option. The East catchment areas would allow for students to travel together to a school with peers and offer real choice for families in the most disadvantaged areas of the city.
- This is a far better model but it would be better to see the West of the city have access to Hove Park school rather than have them forced into PACA which is another Aldridge Academy Trust school, divorced from the community.
- This is a fairer option for children in the east of Brighton, particularly those in the current Longhill and BACA catchment areas. It extends the catchments in the east of the city into more affluent areas, allowing for a greater mix of students in all schools.
- This gives parents and children a better choice to aim for a school more suited to their child's needs. If that were academic or sporting, as a parent this would be my preferred option.
- This gives me more choice of schools, closer to town rather than further
- This gives families choice and doesn't force people to move house or use the private sector or other local authority's , it gives school a chance at being more mixed
- This gives everyone area a choice of at least 2 schools, making things fairer for everyone
- This gives children more options but I still think making kids travel is stupid
- This eliminates some of the "postcode lottery" for parents who are not in the catchment for high achieving schools.
- These options would cause huge disruption to family life and travel. People will move out of areas and more people will send their children to private schools which will cause further disparity in the education system.
- The only option that makes any meaningful change to the current structure - the other options will do nothing to deal with the social segregation that currently exists and is the only one that would potentially start to even things out and redress the imbalance that currently sees 2 schools having a disproportionate number of disadvantaged children.
- The impact of the commute and the disparity of quality of education is too vast. More students will access schools outside of B&H further reducing income
- Seems the fairest option providing better access across the board.
- Significant increase in travel distance and travel time. This will have a negative impact on all children, however is especially punitive for children on EHCPs.
- So much disparity here, why do some areas get a choice of one and others 4? Some have choices that are all quite close, others rediculously apart (stringer and longhill)
- The council needs to embed and evaluate the FSM policy change before moving onto more drastic solutions. They should wait for 2 years to see if the higher prioritisation of FSM has any effect on take-up. These children already take higher priority to the catchment area.
Wait for the white paper to come out which may give councils power over academies and religious schools before taking drastic action.
- Rather than setting strict boundaries, in order to even out socioeconomic status in schools, and special needs, those on lower incomes, and with special needs would be given priority in admissions in the schools of their choice, as they are going to be most impacted by long/difficult journeys which more affluent families can do by car....and more impacted by going to a school which is too large/unable to adequately cater for their special needs.
- Provides choice within a catchment area but still divides children from primary schools

- Provide attainment that is equal across the city. Break generational educational poverty by mixing the areas for Brighton catchments. Over time attainment for all students will become equal. Every child deserves the chance to achieve Maths and English and thrive, not just the families who buy their way into catchments of certain schools. Proud of our Council for being bold and brave.
- Probably slightly better giving the students more idea of two school options if they don't get their first place, however priority of places should be based on distance from home to school of each student.
- Portslade kids have no choice. Feels a bit unfair.
- Portslade children are disproportionately disadvantaged by this proposal
- Portslade families are limited to choice but with higher FSM children surely some of these may be eligible or even required to take up places in areas with less deprived pupils at Dorothy Stringer or Varndean. Also no choice of LA school, only PAA Portslade Aldrich Academy no longer considered part of supporting the community since library closed breaking promises.
- Poses many serious problems, including potentially long commutes and the disadvantage this would be for the child; parents whose children are at risk of being allocated a distant, less rated school may move to an alternative catchment area or choose to use private schools instead, thereby meaning the problem of an imbalance of numbers will return.
- Option B seems to give the most opportunity for kids to be placed in a school that better suits them academically, rather than just the one closest.
- Option B looks like the best option to me. With this option we can get a good mix of children from poorer and richer areas into the same classes which research has shown, raises the attainment of ALL pupils. Yes it means more travel but this is not unusual throughout the country. Parents need to stop thinking that travelling more than a short walk to secondary school is not normal. I feel the parents and children of the Five Ways area have been indulged for too long at the expense of the poorer families in the city and are now entirely out of touch with what the rest of the city is experiencing. Comments on the Facebook Page 'Brighton & Hove School Catchments' clearly demonstrate this, with posts that children from Five Ways are going to be split 'Five Ways' and comments replying stating this already happens and sometimes primaries in Brighton & Hove have actually been split 6 ways. Again this has happened with travelling to school with parents in the centre, where the choice is between Varndean & Dorothy Stringer, believing that children across the city are all just walking to their local school within 15 minutes, which is not happening. Option B seeks to make things more fair. I hope Brighton and Hove City Council is brave and puts something like this forward for a formal consultation. I am concerned though, that once again the loud voices of the Golden Triangle will drown out the voices of those in poorer areas, most of whom are battling poverty daily and don't have time to respond to this engagement exercise, let alone write several biased analyses such as Professor Dennett of Five Ways, to get people on their side.
- Offers fairer access to better schools for children in less well off parts of the city
- Offering pupils a choice of schools is best, as it allows them to find a school that meets their needs. Also, if pupils can choose from a range of schools, it encourages those schools to be better.
- It also doesn't provide choice for all
- Of the options presented, this provides the most equitable offer for children across the city
- Of the options presented, this is least bad. It smooths the FSM allocation the most across the city, gives choice to some catchments that previously had none.
- My previous answers hold in many cases. I accept it offers more choice.
- More choice for people in the majority of areas in Brighton and Hove. This would enable a mixture of children attending each school.

- makes sense to have more choice. thought it's quite ridiculous that people living in Hanover area were in the catchment for schools like Dorothy Stringer and Vardean when where we are in Moulescoomb we are technically closer/same journey time and not in the catchment area at all at the moment.
- It seems the fairest distribution of FSM students
- It seems this option gives families a choice in theory. People know what to expect, but Brighton & Hove City Council previously changed their system because people could move to their preferred area. I may be wrong but I suspect the FSM in some areas might increase this highlighting the issue more. I also think there is little point in doing this when other schools remain boundary free. Those who are determined to get their child into a school that achieves and can afford to utilise the system and know how to, may be better educated themselves. You can try and eliminate some of the difficulty but I think you are just moving it and not dealing with the underlying issue.
- It seems fair
- FSMs are not the only measure of disadvantage - see comments from previous answers. An Equality and Impact Assessment on pupils with SEND (with and without an ECHP), PP, BAME, EAL, LAC needs to take place. Likelihood of pupils of starting their journey to school before 07:45am. Likelihood of pupils not being able to access after-school clubs due to travel. Each assessment will give the public more information on the losses and benefits to our children.
- Likely to upset many and cause some real issues in home to school travel. However does allow a better FSM distribution for some areas currently heavily disadvantaged.
- I think this option would promote the best students being focused on 1 or 2 schools. This won't help the other schools and students to thrive, on the contrary, it will promote more inequality and disadvantage to students with less abilities (and my children are actually quite clever, so I'm not even advocating for them here)
- I think this model levels the playing field and provides better equality of opportunity, and choice for parents.
- I think this is a better way and means that not one school has move free school meals then another which will help the school to hopefully help out more with these family's

6. Child Wellbeing and Development

- I have seen no evidence that this will improve the target outcomes. It just seems likely to create significantly longer travel times for pupils, which will affect wellbeing of students and parents.
- Pupils will have to travel far on transport to school instead of walking. Walking to school has physical benefits. There will be increased traffic. This model does not take into account pupil well being and the many benefits of going to a school near your home.
- Option B catchment area is ridiculously large and could entail our children commuting for excessive periods to lower performing schools. This could have a detrimental affect on their wellbeing and education and it concerns me why this is even a proposal.
- Terrible option with potentially dreadful consequences for the environment, friendship groups, community cohesion and children's welfare.
- The idea that a child with a local school on their doorstep would have to travel 2-3hrs to get to school is abhorrent, goes against any wellbeing principles, any sense of building a community of trust, nor a sense of belonging
- The impact on child mental health and environment of thousands of children commuting out of their communities when they have perfectly good schools in their

neighborhood has not been considered. 2000 hours of commuting per student. It's a terrible idea. Anxiety and absenteeism will skyrocket for those communities affected. The environmental impact is also terrible.

- Maintains some element of choice so parents can select the right school for their child's needs.
- I cannot support this option, which would require pupils (my daughter included) to travel miles across the city in rush hour. My daughter has had a difficult start to her life and I do not believe she possesses the resilience required for this journey on top of a long day in a pressured school environment. I am also concerned that Longhill, school in our proposed catchment area, as it stands would not be able to meet her needs. I am aware that some vulnerable children already have to travel long distances to school. I am appalled that this is the case, and particularly that these children are not all given help with bus fares. However, I do not think the problem will be solved by requiring more children to travel long distances and breaking up community catchment areas further. In this option, my daughter would also be separated from almost all of her friends at primary school. For her, this would be very difficult and traumatic because of her early disruption in life.
- However, if this is the option chosen, the possibility of going to Longhill would be so catastrophic for our son, that we would leave Brighton and move to a neighbouring town. he has SEN needs not being met; is over a year behind at school partly due to lockdown, is very sensitive (and slightly odd) and has been a target for bullies in every year so far. I won't send him on a 2.5 hour commute to a school that is not performing, to be picked on on the buses, leave home before 7am etc.
- The potential journeys which this would create for children are too long. Saltdean to North Brighton and back every day, or from next to Dyke Road to Rottingdean. Or the top of Westdene to Falmer. I think this would be awful. I have a child with autism and I would have grave concerns about his safety making these journeys. His lack of understanding of social cues often leads him in to conflict with others. He would be very vulnerable making these long journeys alone as his social skills are under developed. He has a formal diagnosis but does not qualify for an EHCP.
- The catchment areas are far too wide which risks children having to travel potentially an hour across the city which is not good for them, local communities or the environment
- 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.
- Parents want their children to go to the school that is close and a natural progression from feeder primaries, where their friends go and with a short commute. The idea that any child can live in central Brighton and potentially be placed in Longhill in Saltdean, which is an hour commute each way (on two buses), is totally unacceptable. It would impact their quality of life, the time spent with their family, and their education via their time to do homework. The idea that this is even a possibility is unacceptable.
- The increased burden on transport infrastructure in the city will create dramatically negative effects on the environment, childrens' safety, quality family time, childrens' tiredness & ability to perform in studies & other areas of their lives. There are no scenarios where this catchment area makes sense.
- The most detrimental to health and wellbeing of a large number of children. This will disrupt strong family communities in central North (as people will leave catchment to be closer to a school). It will try to force many children in the Fiveways, Porthall area to travel to the furthest away school from them rather than one a short walk away. Doesn't fit with zero carbon ambition in the city or school streets in this area. Would

mean girls as young as 11 travelling an unreasonable distance in the the dark in winter across a city.

- The most ridiculous idea I have ever seen. Children are not commuters. You will damage their wellbeing and academic achievement
- The possible distances are too vast, meaning young children having to navigate tricky journeys that make no sense to their well-being.
- The primary motive for suggesting this proposal appears to be to balance the number of pupils have received school meals within schools. However, you have only provided data on your assumptions for the proportion with in the catchment areas. These are of course different. Therefore the premise of the proposal is weak. There may be many negative consequences to this proposal. Some pupils will be forced to take very long journeys to get to school. This will impact on their ability to achieve. Some students will be forced to go to a school where they have no peers from their primary school to support them. They will not be able to join in social activities with their classmates because They live so far away. It will increase traffic And pollution. Some children will be at greater risk of bullying.
- The impact on children's' wellbeing would be huge. With limited opportunity to take part in extra curricular activities and being unable to walk to school would impact on their physical and emotional wellbeing.
- This isn't a reasonable level of travel for 11 year olds. Mental health impact on kids, especially neurodiverse kids who also lose time for homework when they need more. Splitting of community and friends groups. Increased congestion and environmental impact.
- Option B is completely unfeasible for my family and many other families in my area (Prestonville). There has been no evidence presented as to how this could be made feasible. It would mean for many, many families a 2 hour walk or unpredictable journey of 2 buses across an already heavily-congested city.
I appreciate it is not possible for all children to be able to walk to school, but public transport is inadequate and the council would be legally required to provide free transport for hundreds of children in this areas as Longhill is over 3 miles away from Prestonville. With the council's finances in dire straits, I do not know how this would be achieved without defunding other vital local services which are already struggling under the current budget. With the early start time of the school and a long commute I believe this would have a severe negative health impact both mental and physical on the children local to my area, as well as potentially impact attendance from our community which I believe is directly correlated to attainment. Longhill is the furthest school from us geographically from any other in the B&H area and it would actually be easier/quicker for us to send our children to school in Lewes/Burgess Hill by train than current options. This seems completely unreasonable to anyone living in this part of the city. As well as the impact of a long commute on physical and mental wellbeing I am concerned this would have a detrimental impact on children being able to participate in extra-curricular activities such as sports and the arts which are vital to a well-rounded education.
- This horrible option will introduce an unnecessary commute for children, likely impacting their well-being and educational performance. It is also not very environmentally friendly.
- This forced time commuting is bad for mental health It puts pressure on family time, on public transport or leads to more taxis - all of this is bad for the environment and wellbeing of all people in the city.
- This option would have a huge impact upon the quality of life and mental health of children and families. It will lead to increased rates of depression and anxiety; it is essential that young people have a sense of belonging, including an established network of friends and families from within their community to support and nurture them. Children feel safe and nurtured in the communities they have grown up in, and

their schools are the very the fabric of their communities. It is fundamentally and morally wrong to propose a physical distance between home and school. This would undermine everything that is important about community and personal connection, and will have a significant detrimental impact on mental health and social isolation.

- This option will undeniably result in plummeting attendance figures and issues with punctuality, particularly for those with existing attendance challenges who would have even further barriers to overcome.
- This option would have a significant impact upon parental engagement, whereby parents will be less able or inclined to engage with their children's schools. Families and communities significantly contribute to the success of local schools – the proposals will divide communities, destroy local bonds and negatively affect the success of all schools.
- There is clear evidence that attendance at after school clubs and extra curricula activities leads to better outcomes and achievements for all children. Yet the proposals minimise the opportunity to participate or engage in these due to logistical issues.
- This creates situations where children living close to one school - eg Stringer or Vanrdean - 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.
- This makes no sense - my child has 2 schools currently within walking distance. This option would mean now only access to 1 school and another school Long Hill that would be a few buses and 1.5hr commute. It's not about the quality of the school but the fact that I don't want my child or any child having to commute for this long to school for the following reasons: Not getting enough sleep, being tired and unable to concentrate in class. Not being able to take part in extracurricular activities Not being set up to be good learners for the day
Many of these issues are highlighted in episode 4 of the Class Divide podcast where students, a parent and a teacher all talk about the ongoing impact still being felt since the closure of COMART and the travel that children have needed to do since. I am aware that there is a view that because some children are already required to make longer journeys to school that it is ok to make more children do this. I completely disagree with this view, and do not see how making more children make even longer journeys will improve things.
Many parents and myself included are looking at other options such as moving or faith schools as we do not want children having to walk to school. This is also breaking up local communities, meaning my child would not have a supportive community around her. We need to remember about COVID and that these children who it would impact have already been impacted by COVID, academically and socially and this is not spoken about at all.
- This model is ridiculous. You're proposing having hundreds children (some as young as 11) commute hours at a time across the city. The impact on the environment, mental health of kids not being able to participate in any after school activities nor camaraderie with peers living near each other seems irresponsible and unfair.
- This option goes against good sense. Schools should be local to where people live. To have children travelling across town to cover a two hour walk from their home is impractical and will not benefit mental, physical, emotional well-being, the climate or the building of communities. I strongly disagree with this option
- This option is a non starter. Not only would it disrupt communities and children's pre existing relationships held from primary school (enabling them to feel safe and assured).It would also lead to expensive, drawn out/stressful and tiring commuting time for the children. Which will likely impact their ability to learn and grow within the education system.

- this is the worst option meaning a dislocation of local bonds and existing friendships and make children travel which is not good for them or their families. the vulnerable children I work with need to be placed with their current primary group
- This is the worst option. It does not in any way reflect travel patterns in the city. It will result in children travelling long distances which will impact on their health and well being, access the opportunities like sports. It will also increase car use and air pollution - which is proven to impact on educational attainment and runs counter to the LAs statutory air quality plan.
- This is the most ridiculous plan I have seen. You can't have children who live close to once school tracking across the city another very far away. Ludicrous . This will affect children's mental health, take them away from their local communities and mean they are unable to participate in after school activities due to the increased travel
- This option appears to be sending kids who are not FSM to poorer performing schools to help boost their performance with little regard for the impact on the children. It does not take into account the impact on children of earlier starts, longer journeys, being separated from friends, impact on parents, attending school outside of their local community etc.
- This is the least sensible model with children being moved round the whole city just to even up numbers. Children in Patcham may have to get to BACA which is not a walkable distance. Currently that would require 2 buses or a parent to drive them. In a city which is desperately trying to improve its environmental impact this is ridiculous. Furthermore children should be encouraged to walk to school in order to maintain their health. It is highly likely that children will be separated from their friends as feeder primary schools could be across the city from the secondary school.
- This option increases travel time and disconnects communities across the City especially from the Stringer catchment - Longhill and vice versa. It hugely impacts journeys across an already congested city and in turn will have a negative impact on children's mental health and well being. It also gives a very unequal balance of options for the hove / portslade area
- This is the worst of the three options. It also unfairly targets Fiveways area and I think it's shocking that the council are even proposing this as an option. I do not agree with either the catchment area or the planned PAN reduction at Stringer or Varndean. Trying to force families to send their children further, rather than to their local school is wrong for so many reasons - i) unnecessary added travel time for more children, ii) added congestion and pollution (many parents would not feel happy with their kid going on a school bus and would drive, adding more traffic) - in a time of a climate emergency and having a green Mp - hugely disturbing the council would even suggest this - it seems labour no longer think we have a climate emergency, iii) carving up communities. This proposal will not work - certainly for those in Fiveways / Preston park area, if their kids were given Longhill, purely for the extremely long distance to travel, majority would not accept the place. You would just create more issues as people would leave the area - even less children going to primary schools and subsequently secondary schools across the city.
- This option allows parents and more importantly pupils, to have a choice, to choose a school that fits their individual child, has better transport options for them etc.
- This option means large numbers of young people will have to travel quite far across the city to school depending on where they are placed, it doesn't seem equitable compared to the other options. In my view this will have a massive negative impact on families who have to juggle work commitments, after school clubs and picking up younger children in different parts of the city.
- This option results in long commutes for a lot of children, and divides communities. My child has severe dyslexia and she needs a lot of time for her homework. Adding in 2 hours of commuting time everyday would be horrible for her. There would need to be extra busses - and what about kids who stay on for after school clubs? What

about visiting friends after school and then having to travel far when it is late? What are the safety concerns of moving a lot of children around the city on busses? I have witnessed first hand the bullying that goes on on the city's busses after school - it is horrific. I would not want to subject my child to that, which would result in many parents choosing to drive and clogging up the cities roads. I want there to be a good offer for all children but forcing long commutes on more children seems really unfair on them. I know many children already have long commutes, but why make this problem worse?

- To enable our city's children to thrive, we need to ensure that each school is adequate to allow every child that attends every school to do so. Not shift the problem of a failing school across the city and cause more issues in doing so- not to mention increased traffic, negative impact on the environment and most importantly, the mental well being of our cities children
- The transition from Primary to Secondary school is a social and academic turning point for adolescents the council's proposals lead to greater uncertainty in the process at what is a crucial developmental stage in children's lives. I have a close friend who is a teacher at a B&H secondary who is concerned about absence levels and the mental health of her students as it is currently, let alone if we introduce long, gruelling commutes in rush hour traffic into the mix.
- I have a child with severe anxiety and school refusal. We currently have a 5 minute walk to school, if she is forced to travel to a school so far away she will no longer attend. If she can walk, even if this is a 45 minute walk, the chance of her attending school will greatly increase. There are many other children in this situation, rates of anxiety and school refusal are particularly high in this cohort of children due to the disruption to their first year of school thanks for covid. If you impose this option we will have to move out of Brighton to an area where she can walk to school. The economically disadvantaged children in our area will be less likely to be able to move, and will be disproportionately affected by these ludicrous journey times.
- This option would mean students currently close to Downs and Balfour may end up having to travel to Longhill. This is too far. Children should be able to make friends with other children who live close to them, within walking distance, to facilitate social interaction outside of school, which in turn would support their mental health at a time of increased isolation and mental health issues amongst teenagers.
- This option would mean that children could be travelling across the city to attend a school far away from their home and community. This would increase traffic, pollution and costs. It would also be a ridiculous offer when there are suitable schools in their local area. This option has not taken into account the children this would be affecting and their wellbeing
- This option seems to be the fairest with regards to the whole city.
- This proposal is perverse. Absence is key to tackling disadvantage - this proposal will increase absence rates. Government research states that 'a school's absence rate is the strongest predictive factor in of the progress made by its pupil premium students' ('Against the Odds', Social Mobility Commission, 2021). Yet this proposal would worsen absence rates by forcing hundreds of children to make longer journeys to school, a known causative factor in absence rates.
- Friendship likely disrupted which is one of the most important constants for happiness
- This proposal would be disastrous for the many hundreds of pupils who live in central Brighton but forced to travel 2-3hrs per day to Longhill, at vast expense to family budgets, to the NHS, to their studies and wellbeing, to their mental health, to their social and extra curricular activities, to city traffic and transport routes, to the environment, and to parents jobs', etc. levelling out FSM ratios is a totally inadequate reason for the enormous impacts on pupils' and parents' lives.

- This will have a detrimental effect on i) children's mental & physical health and wellbeing, ii) traffic congestion, iii) council funding (presumably the council will cover the additional costs?).
- MENTAL HEALTH: The effects of long school commutes on sleep, anxiety, depression are well documented. Mental health is the main cause of rising school absences in the UK.
- This will create too much uncertainty for families and students. It could also result in long and unsustainable travel times to school making school attendance an even larger issue.
- This will harm students forced to commute for 2 hours per day, 2000 hours over their secondary schooling, which is evidenced to lead to higher anxiety, depression, lower activity levels and less sleep. It will do harm to children affected by this policy. It will remove them from their communities.
- Forcing children to travel to schools far from their homes could have unnecessary negative impacts on their wellbeing; it also seems likely to further congest Brighton's streets with traffic, worsening an already serious air quality problem. I would assume that for lower-income people, or other groups without access to private transport, this could be hard as well.
- This would be terrible and detrimental to the well-being of students in option B who will have potentially longer commutes to and from school reducing their ability to engage in extra curricular activities and be part of their school community.
- Utterly ridiculous. Eldest daughter autistic and would struggle to get multiple buses across city to one of the options and I have a younger daughter who would need me to walk her to school still. Not sure what you would propose?? Send eldest off on her own getting lost through the city? Or will you send her a taxi every day?
- We live within 10 minutes of both Varndean and Dorothy Stringer, but a series of long bus journeys from Longhill. I believe it would be very detrimental to the mental health of my daughter if her school were so far from her home, making socialising with school friends outside of school hours extremely difficult.
- 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
- 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.
- Whilst I understand the incentive to balance the number of children with FSM across the schools, I think that making children travel large distances to school has more negative consequences than positive in terms of their safety, mental health, the impact on parents, pollution and the loss of local friendships. I feel that this model is trying to achieve an idealistic numbers game, claiming that more children would

'thrive' in an educational sense, but that it totally neglects the impact that this would have on children's day to day experience, therefore undermining any positive educational benefits and leading them to fail to thrive in other ways. The additional stress on families having to get their children across the city twice a day during rush hour traffic must be taken into account, as does the increase in traffic that would occur due to this initiative. As I mentioned previously, I would not expect an 11 year old to cross the city alone on public transport so I'm curious to know the safeguarding measures that would be put in place. Would the council provide school buses? What about buses for after school activities/ breakfast club? How do you propose to counteract the rise in city traffic when the parents decide to drive the children rather than subject them to a long commute? In terms of a greener future, I can't see the justification in forcing families into a position where they will drive their children to school when the current alternative is that they walk to their local school.

- I strongly support this model as it offers parental choice within broader catchment areas. However, if you are proposing that schools within catchment will be allocated via a lottery then I strongly disagree, as you could then have children travelling a long way across the city - detrimental to their health and wellbeing and with enormous environmental/traffic implications
- Pupil welfare and safety isn't being considered in option B, nor is the infrastructure and pollution of the city. Option B is incredibly short-sighted
- I reject the proposed boundary change for schools in our area, specifically regarding the shift to Longhill. As a parent of a child with autism, I am particularly concerned about the implications this change would have on my child's ability to travel to school. Public transport is not a viable option for my child due to their specific needs, and the proposed change would create significant barriers to their access to education. Additionally, this decision disrupts the important bonds that children have formed within our local neighborhoods. Moving schools would limit opportunities for kids to spend time together outside of school, which is vital for their social development.
- For our family, this would mean that our children would be largely split up from their peer groups, and would be highly likely to need to travel long distances by bus. I would be enormously concerned about the detrimental impact in terms of social anxiety, starting secondary school in an area less familiar to them, and the environmental concerns associated with massively increased travel. I strongly disagree with this option b.
- As someone that has worked with primary and secondaries on year 6 transition across sussex for 10 years commissioned by every local authority . I know the impacts of these sort of enforced lotteries are detrimental to the wellbeing of children and their families and thier communities. It simply doesn't work .
- I feel pupils should have the opportunity to go to a nearby school and would worry about the affects on families, children's mental health and enjoyment and willingness to attend school.
- I dislike this model most because it is designed to support PANs at schools that I don't agree should be supported. I would not like my children to go to BACA because I fear that they would not get a good education there and I fear for their psychological wellbeing as we are a family with same-sex parents and there are strong fears among pupils there of homophobia. The whole Ofsted report fills me with dread for any children that go there. I would also never want my child to go to an academy, as I don't support that system of education. I also think it is harmful for the council to compel any child to travel far from home to go to school, when there is a preferred option near their home. This is for social, health and environmental reasons. I don't feel the council has taken the concerns I have listed here into account in this process.
- I have serious concerns about this option for much of the city. Episode 4 of the Class Divide podcast lays bare the impact that closing Comart had, and continues to have,

including:

- Children getting on the bus and being away from their community for the day
- The cost of the increased travel
- Not feeling safe because you are not in the community you know
- Having to get up early to be able to make the bus, and risking a detention if you are late
- Not getting enough sleep, being tired and falling asleep in class
- Whether asking children to do these types of journeys sets them up to be good learners for the day

I don't think it is fair or right that the children living in Whitehawk have to face these issues. But I don't see that these proposals are fixing this (only moving a school would do that). This option simply means that the numbers of children who are facing these same problems is rapidly increased. Simply saying that 'other children are already doing this' is not true - I don't believe that the current catchments would have any children being asked to travel the distances this would require, or in the numbers that this would lead to.

- My middle son has just started Patcham Infant school. He spent most of the first 2 years of his life in lockdown, which as a result means he is very shy and takes a long time to adjust to new environments. It is going to take more time than normal for him to settle and make friends. So I really hope that he will be able to go to the local secondary school which is part of Patcham community and with children who he will know after years of Primary. This will ease the transition and hopefully make Secondary school a positive experience for him. It will cause a lot of anxiety, stress and upset if he has to travel across the city to a school outside of his community where he knows nobody. The extra commute will also increase the temptation not to attend school, and after school clubs/ weekend activities, play dates, etc will be less appealing if it involves a long solo bus journey. I agree that we need a fairer system for all the children in Brighton, but I strongly disagree with Option B for the reasons I've stated.
- I believe that this option will put too much strain on the schools in question, will detrimentally impact the education and wellbeing of many children, and further divide local community
- I believe none of the proposals offer value or tackle disadvantage but this one is completely impracticable requiring journey times which would be harmful to children, they also risk dividing communities.
- I am severely impacted by this proposal as it would mean my children could potentially be travelling for more than an hour to get to their secondary school. There are currently no bus lines nor train services supporting this initiative meaning they will have to take 2 or 3 buses potentially to get to their location nor do I think it's good for the mental health of my children to having to travel this far out of their home area for education at the age of 11. Their friends circle will also be far away which means their support network will be further spread out than currently our school options.
- I am not sure how this option will meet young people's education and emotional wellbeing needs as the catchment size in east Brighton is enormous. Has the council sought expert opinion on this? This is important as these are children lives potentially being meddled with. I am not convinced this is workable option for best outcomes for children and also if the council is to meet its environmental targets
- Grouping the schools in this way means that a significant portion of children will not get a local school. Time/distance/effort of travel to school is a major barrier to school avoidant children
- These children shouldn't be used as pawns in your social levelling-down scheme.
- For my family this is the better option - although I still don't think it is that good over all, especially for the kids in the 'longhill' area.

- As a parent, this proposal would potentially see my children who live in Fiveways being sent to school in Rottingdean. They would have a commute of: 1 hour 56 minute walk, a 40 minute cycle and at present there is no direct public transport link. This is against a 12 minute walk to Stringer or Varndean schools. I cannot even fathom how, as a parent, I could justify an option with such a lengthy commute. The detrimental impact it would have on their education is irrefutable: the additional travel time would impact time being spent on homework; time spent on extra-curricular activities (not to mention safety concerns regarding travel later after participating in extra-curricular clubs); the exhaustion factor for young adults having an hour commute to school.
- From the little I can see here, this looks like the worst of the three options. Why would you make children travel so far across the city? How on earth will they get there safely and on time? What about the impact on rush hour traffic and pollution? When will they have time for homework or rest - or sleep - if they're commuting that far?
- Due to reduced PAN and wider catchment area, my children would go from having a 12-15 min walk to either Stringer or Varndean to long commute by car or PT. This is wholly counter productive to their physical wellbeing, the environment and emotional wellbeing if they are more likely to be separated from their network of friends across 5 schools. (Longill, BACA, Patcham, Varndean and Stringer). I am concerned for the safety of large numbers of young girls travelling by PT, across the city in excess of an hour, with transfers, in the dark if they stay behind for clubs or sports in the winter. This is unnecessarily increasing risk for vulnerable young girls at a time when nationally we are committed to the reduction in Violence Against Women and Girls in a decade. A key arena for public sexual harassment towards girls occurs on the journeys to and from schools. Our girls are safer having short walks to schools than spending in excess of an hour on public transport at risk of harassment from fellow male students and older men. I have personally witnessed cruel and sustained bullying of students on buses by other children. And yes, for some children travel on PT is unavoidable, but when you live in an area where you have schools within walking distance, why would you risk the physical and emotional wellbeing of a child with long commutes which increases likelihood of incidences occurring and gives the affected child no opportunity to escape the situation. My child has been affected by long term bullying in his primary school setting for the last two years and i am fearful for him moving onto secondary school. I would likely choose to drive him, than expose him to increased opportunities of harassment.
- Children shouldn't be sent across town to a worse school. It isn't safe or good for the environment or for working families. It also won't improve the school.
- Catchment are too long with children not able to build a support network with friends outside of school. They will have to travel further in the dark, alone when friends live other side of the city. 50% of teenagers experience mental health, this will increase if they feel more isolated
- Dividing central/east Brighton into 2 huge catchment areas would be very stressful for families for the following reasons: increased uncertainty about which school your child will attend, stressful and upsetting when your child does not get into the school they have chosen; lack of continuity between primary and secondary causing unfair divisions between primary school friendship groups; long, unsafe journeys to school on an inadequate public transport system - children cannot walk these huge distances in poor weather conditions. It simply does not make sense to expect a child who lives next door to one secondary school, travel an hour across the city to attend another one - especially if it is not a school they have chosen. This system risks leaving a significant proportion of students and families unhappy and anxious about the school they are 'forced' to attend, due to an arbitrary decision made by the council. It potentially creates discontent and lack of trust in the education system. In

a school environment when the stress on pupils, and the consequent crisis in young people mental health is already an issue, why exacerbate this? The impact of this on attendance / long term absence / school refusal should also be considered. These catchment areas are too big and will not work.

- Catchment areas too large. Children travelling too far to go to school each day. Impact on their wellbeing, environment
- It feels like the council is overlooking the fact these are small children facing huge life transitions. They are children, not economic units to be shipped across the city to correct a -1.4% statistic - which is still above South East and National average.
- Awful outcomes for the safety, health and wellbeing of children who will have to travel longer hours, when currently walk to school. Stop propping up a failing village school.
- As a parent I don't want my children traveling across Brighton to attend school or maintain friendships.
- Very difficult for children in areas that will change who have had a lot of upheaval in their lives and now facing not going to secondary with their friends
- Children from Porthall/Prestonville would need to take 2-3 buses to get to Longhill and it would be over an hour commute each way. There is evidence of the health impact long commutes have on children and these plans also undermine any plans the council has to reduce air pollution or traffic in the city. It is not fair that children in the East of the city have a commute but 'solving' this problem by making more children have to commute is not the answer. The council is also not presenting a safe or affordable model for transport for children in the city. We know that buses are often where bullying occurs, the buses are also often overly full and expensive - putting more children on buses, for longer journeys is not a solution. 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. 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. 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. 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.
- An insane concept to think that our child would benefit from potentially going to a school so far away (Longhill from Preston Park avenue). This would make our whole family unit suffer
- Absolutelu crazy option to have children travel so far- huge psychological, social and environmental costs that have not been considered. The UK is faring way worse than its peers on sense of belonging in secondary schools- a key metric for educational attainment. This option will undoubtedly be exacerbate this issue and contribute to mental health crisis among our young
- Absolutely bonkers. Risk of affecting children's mental health with longer journey, Traffic and air pollution
- Absolutely ridiculous. Not sustainable for infrastructure or health reasons.
- A large proportion of children with the two large catchments will have a much longer/more expensive commute to school. It will also affect attendance/participation in school clubs, and friendships where people that live close by might be sent to a different school across the city.
- As a secondary school teacher (in one of our city schools), Option B raises many grave professional concerns. As you will know, we have significant issues with the following: attendance figures, lateness and punctuality and teenage mental health. In my professional opinion, Option B would exacerbate every one of these areas that education professionals striving to improve. Lengthy commutes into different

communities from primary schools/family homes will mean that non-attenders and those with poor attendance will have a further barrier to getting into school. Likewise, in recent years we have seen a sharp rise in the number of young people suffering from anxiety and poor mental health. As a teacher, I know we are not currently able to provide the support so many of these children need. I can only predict the dire consequences Option B would have on the mental health young people: on a daily basis I see teenagers suffering from anxiety and this is with a current model whereby they attend local schools with a support network of friends from primary school and the local community. I can only imagine how difficult it will be for teenagers with existing poor mental health to be sent to a school out of their local area and I believe moving children away from local schools will contribute to a rise in numbers of teenagers suffering from anxiety and poor mental health. As I understand it, we do not currently have the funding and resources to support the mental health provision required by teenagers in Brighton and Hove. Any option that may increase demand in this underfunded area is inconceivable to me as a professional working with teenagers.

- A very extreme proposed amendment.. way more social/economical/environmental analysis is needed on how this will impact not only the children but also on the councils resources regarding traffic controls, bus links etc. how will this emotionally effect children being sent to schools so far from their homes and local communities. Will this result in losing families from the area altogether and all the income they bring to the wider community?!
- Also, the north/south divide risks displacing children from their local area with potential negative impact to their mental health caused by travelling across town, early starts and late finishes resulting in less sleep, losing a sense of community and belonging and reducing their ability to take part in pre and post school activities. These factors will impact all, the disadvantaged included.
- From where we live the only option would be Varndean. Both Patcham and BACA would be difficult to get to, and unwalkable, which is not really acceptable. My older son is currently at Stringer, and will have left by the time my younger one goes to secondary, so there will be no sibling link. Varndean is not a school that we as a family like, so this would put us in a very difficult situation. It also looks like it is splitting the catchment of our primary school, St Lukes, so a lot of the friendship groups will be split. It seems so ridiculous that a child in Saltdean would be in the catchment area for Stringer, and kids who live a mile away would not.
- Where to start? This would be a terrible idea and would be incredibly disruptive and stressful for children transitioning to secondary school, given the lack of certainty they would have and the breaking of link between primary school and secondary. The journey times involved especially for the blue zone could also be very damaging to educational focus and ability to participate in before and after-school activities.
- Travelling pointless causing stress, traffic, pollution, time, making it v v difficult for children with various autism, anxiety conditions. Being split from peers..
- Total lack of options to accommodate what is best for different children!
- This would stop my children being able to put the same first choice as most of their friends. Option B for the Prestonville/port hall community will result in either Dorothy Stringer or Longhill School (a walk of 1 hour and 55 minutes).
- This will cause much greater travel for many children. Negative impact on mental health, travel distances, environment. Also this will break down communities as children will likely no longer attend school in their local community with their friends. This option, regardless of how it's dressed up, is purely to ensure Longhill does not close. Simply forcing children to attend this school from other areas is not morally the right thing to do.

- This seems awful as many children will likely end up travelling considerable distances to school. There are so many health and environmental negatives associated with this.
- This option would cause hundreds of students to have to travel 5+ miles across the city twice a day at peak times. You have already heard about the various impacts that this would have: poor attendance, poor mental health, loss of ability to engage with after-school activities, decreased neighbourhood cohesion. All of those disproportionately impact pupils with SEND.
- This option will tear local connections apart. Children will end up in a lottery, in a catchment that could see them attending a school very far from where they live, in an area where they have no social support or connections. Away from Friends, this will hugely impact their mental Health with the big transition from Primary to secondary school. A child living in the city centre may have to travel to Rottingdean, with their nearby friends attending varndean, or even falling into hive catchment areas so travelling there. A child in north kemptown and south hanover may end up having to travel to patcham. Which is not well connected with the area, and their friends on neighbouring regions may end up travelling out to Rottingdean. Friends and connections will be severely impacted and I worry on the impact for our children's mental Health. A child may end up going to a very large secondary school away from where they live with none of their friends nearby.
- This option makes no sense to me. It would mean more children would have to travel long distances to school. I am aware that some children in the city already do, but why would we make this issue worse? Children deserve to go to a local school where they are, and feel, part of their community. I believe it would be HIGHLY damaging to children's mental health and wellbeing to travel to a school that's far away, when they have a local one. This option would undoubtedly increase absence, lateness and tiredness. Also, many children would be unable to participate in after-school clubs which would mean they don't feel part of the school. In addition to all of these issues, the council should be committed to eco issues and this is SUCH a negative - parents would drive their children to school which would cause congestion, fumes etc. I am strongly against this option.
- They are both extremely sociable, active children who adore school, and I cannot see how they (and we as a family) could sustain a rich schooling experience (for example, attending sports and drama clubs, playdates with friends and teammates etc) if those clubs took place at a school 5/6 miles away from our home. It's utterly impractical. As a working parent - who owns a small local business which contributes to the local economy - attending a school so far from where we live would have a very real, negative impact on our work and home lives.
- This option is the least desirable because of the impact on community, specifically in terms of long commutes across the city and the impact on children's safety, mental health and wellbeing. I also have real concerns about the impact of these long journeys will have on academic outcomes, attendance and punctuality.
- This option is ridiculous as many young people could get a school miles from their homes and there would be a lot of uncertainty as to whether they would get into the same school as their friends which could cause a lot of unnecessary stress.
- this option is horrifying for my and my 2 SEND Autistic daughters who are already completely unsupported within a broken system. You now want to add trying to get them 1 hour each way across a city to our hell, ensure further depleting mental health because they will no longer be able to walk to school, suffer more pollution and accident potential and any friends they do make will probably be miles away. This is not a solution. How about you fix the schools that are failing and invest in them instead of this lazy, sticking plaster pretend "solution".

- This is the only option that gives everyone a choice of schools, including those in the less affluent east of the city. I have seen on social media that there are already campaign groups organising to fight against this option to protect their vested interests, so perhaps it is doomed to fail. God forbid their little ones should have to go to school with kids from poorer parts of town. This is the only option that success in delivering to the objectives set out in the consultation.
- This is not favourable to my family situation. My eldest daughter is in Y7 at Varndean, but under this model my youngest daughter in Y5 would either go to Dorothy Stringer or Longhill. Given the amount of extra communications and potentially different inset days, I would prefer my Y5 goes to the same school as my Y7. The significant extra travel time and cost for my Y5 to go to Longhill would be detrimental to our already time poor family. We encourage our children to walk and my Y7 walks to Varndean, around a 25 minutes journey time. It would be a comfort for my Y5 to be able to walk to the same school with her oldest sister. Longhill would take 1 hour 45 minutes to walk for us. The bus would take approx one hour. That is unreasonable.
- This is distasteful from a both a sustainability and a children's health perspective. This idea should clearly be immediately struck out.
- This is a totally unviable option. Children would need to travel up 2 hours plus a day to schools. Children are already under much pressure without adding a tiring pre/post journey to their day. Children should be able to attend schools within their local community. Do not make the children suffer or be responsible for solving the councils school underfunding/ budget problems.
- This is a terrible plan for the majority of children's day to day welfare - this includes travel times and their mental health, and also negatively impacts the wider community with an increase in people travelling long distances across the city.
- These catchment areas are much too big and seem completely illogical. Children who live less than a ten minute walk from a local school won't be able to get a place, while children who live 3 miles away will. This has huge impacts for parents, the environment and the children's mental and physical health. Walking distances up to 25-30mins must be prioritised. It is utter madness.
All the roadworks that've been done to improve air quality around our local schools, with the aim to prevent unnecessary driving, reduce pulmonary lung disease and promote healthier life styles and now a suggestion to force everyone to drive their kids across town or send them on a lengthy commute via two or three busses!
- In addition, it would materially impact the outcome for children mentally, physically and emotionally
- The pink catchment area is absolutely ridiculous. If this is put into place it will leave some children in Fiveways and Rottingdean potential commutes to school of well over an hour each way and in excess of 12 hours per week. This will have a huge impact on the physical and mental health of the children and no doubt have a negative environmental impact.
- This model still splits majority of children in the catchment for Stanford Junior school who largely live in Port Hall and Seven Dials area. Starting secondary school is daunting, but facing being split from your friends and having to walk 40-45 minutes on your own to Blatchington Mill or 50-55 minutes to Hove Park lower school is extremely daunting. And possibly unsafe. Surely with lower birth rates, there should be an expansion of catchments for all?
- The DS/Longhill catchment area is too big and will result in some children having to travel for vast distances across the city (very early in the morning because of the early 8.15 start at Longhill). Research says that long travel to school has a detrimental affect on the well being of children with a city of our size we should not inflict this onto our children.

- The catchments areas here are large and this is likely to result in many children having increased journey times to schools which could have a negative impact on the children.
- Strongly disagree. This could result in children having to do long commutes to school of several hours, splitting up friendship groups and communities, impacts on mental health, tiredness and physical health, increased traffic on already congested roads, financial implications for travel, and pollution impact from extra transport required.
- Too much disruption for children in terms of friendship groups.
- Safety. It is not safe for children to be traveling further than needed across a large city with a lots of crime. They are opened up to unnecessary additional risks traveling longer distances to areas they are not familiar with, away from the safety of walking with friends and looked out for by the local community. I would absolutely not want to put my 11 year old in this position

There are huge physical and mental benefits of walking to school, we are actively encouraged by the council to walk to school! Long journey times to and from school is detrimental to general health and wellbeing. Additional travel time will impact on extra curricular activities and leave less time to spent on homework/clubs/hobbies. Not stuck in a car or bus in traffic as everyone is trying to get their children around the city to and from school. Many parents will have no option other than to drive their children to school which will increase levels of traffic and pollution at peak times of the day. There are huge social and cultural benefits of attending school near where friends, family and local community activities are located. In fact some may say it is essential in the development of our younger generations. Being near younger siblings schools for ease of drop off/pick ups. I have calculated for my son to walk to Stringer or Varndean will take 3 hrs and 20 mins a week. To travel to Longhill by public transport (factoring in having to leave enough time for waiting for buses and delays at peak traffic time) it will be 15 hours a week. They would have to leave the house before 7am in the morning to get to school on time. That lost time could be used doing homework, extra curricular clubs, using the local parks for sport and fitness and being involved with the local community. Children should have a right to go to their nearest school. The effects of long school commutes on sleep, anxiety, depression are well documented. Mental health is the main cause of rising school absences in the UK.

- This feels like a quick fix solution for children in deprived areas with under performing schools, there are wider social issues here and just changing the catchment areas will not resolve these. It will upheave many young peoples lives away from their families, friends and communities. Giving them long commute times which will be detrimental to health and wellbeing in many different ways.
- In the case of children living in the Fiveways, Prestonville, Surrenden area of Brighton children would need to catch a bus at 7am (potentially leaving home at 06:45am) in order to arrive at Longhill High School for an 08:15 start. There would be no option of school cubs, less opportunity to attend clubs locally and 3 hours of a day travelling. I can only see this option negatively affecting wellbeing and education outcomes. I am particularly concerned for children with SEND who do not have an EHCP. Many of these children are just about coping in school. A long and unpredictable bus journey would be too dysregulating for many pupils and impact their wellbeing. If they did make it to school they would simply not be ready to learn. Schools would need more resource to support these pupils. Whilst many children with SEND may already travel to school by bus and struggle to do this it does not make it right. What would be perceived as 'bad behaviour' is dysregulation. Ultimately, attendance rates would drop - we know these have not recovered since the Pandemic and education outcomes for this disadvantaged group of pupils will fall. Not the goal of these proposals. As part of this engagement exercise I have learnt that children do travel for 45 mins or more on buses across the city. I wasn't aware of

this. I don't consider this a good use of their time, good for their health or wellbeing or good for education outcomes.

- As mentioned previously it would be also be difficult for vulnerable children without EHCP to transition if having to travel long distances to schools (possibly without their community) that might not be suitable for them. This includes SEND children, those with mental health or medical difficulties, and young carers. Further families will move out of Brighton unfortunately or end up choosing secondary schools out of Brighton/private options further reducing budget. The likelihood of my son in year 5 currently getting into his preferred and most suitable secondary school (although we remain within catchment) is low due to priority changes, sibling promises, and PAN reduction. Having looked at schools this year I am aware one school has very good pastoral support so its been distressing to think his mental health/medical condition would not be taken into account. He has a continence problem and I am already concerned about the transition to secondary let alone the transition to a secondary that has mentioned by Ofsted to have behavioural problems, albeit improving, I would worry about bullying. He is also a young carer too. Once again he would not be prioritised on the basis of any of these reasons however.
- You're suggesting that some children would need to take 2 buses to and from school. And all children, but this will adversely affect year 7, 11 and 12 year olds, who are so young and the transition from primary to secondary is huge. I'm wondering if you've forgotten this. Either this or you're suggesting that parents and carers drive them to school, which would mean more traffic on the road, more congestion, and during a time of climate emergency AND we have a Green MP in one of our wards, this is huge hypocrisy and an embarrassment. That's over 2 hours commuting a day on a bus, potentially longer. Seriously? Not only this, you would be pulling them out of a social and emotional support network that for 7 years, has helped them build resilience and confidence. The negative psychological and emotional impact this option would have will be huge.

7. Implementation and Evidence

- Absurd lack of evidence and supporting data makes this proposal meaningless
- absolutely way too much chaos which likely to do more harm than good
- Again I do not have enough information. How does this compare to the current system?
- It is just not viable. And especially as you don't have the data to suggest why it would be.
- Why have hove and portslade stayed the same? There doesn't seem to be any evidence on why these 3 options have been chosen?
- Where is the data behind this? The impact assessments? How is this going to impact the mental and physical health of children that will be forced to travel to long periods of time each day? How will travel be impacted? How will the environment, especially air quality be impacted. Where is the data?????? This whole engagement exercise is lacking data and impact assessments.
- The council have not done any impact assessments - financial, transport, environmental, public health, traffic etc - that would give me any confidence in option B and it doesn't sound like there would be sufficient time if this proposal was taken forward following the engagement exercise.
- I would really like to know where this option has come from. The blue and pink boundaries especially would do so much damage.
- Please, please don't pursue this awful option. I have emailed separately on this point. I have always voted Labour, have worked hard for my whole career in education with

a focus on those from disadvantaged backgrounds, and I would feel hugely let down and disappointed if such a flawed proposal was taken any further.

- Having been in the meeting on Tuesday 8th October in Hove Town Hall, it was clear that none of these impacts had been properly assessed ahead of putting this option together. It seems there has been zero consideration for these knock on impacts on children and families which seems ridiculously flawed given the aim of this entire exercise is to improve outcomes for children.
- The maps provided are of such poor quality and the word 'Dorothy Stringer' appears over my road, so I can't actually tell which catchment we would fall into. There is no evidence behind your analysis, it is not fully costed nor does it comply with wider policy across the city..
- It's the only option I can support. If the idea is to balance out numbers and also give parents a choice then this is the only option on the table that actually meets that criteria.
- I also wondered if you had considered the suggestion of 'inner' and 'outer' catchments, giving priority to children who live very close to the school, followed by an outer catchment decided by lottery?
- Insufficient data to support this proposal so impossible to understand rationale. Go for it. Nothing changes if nothing changes!
- Just nonsense. Seems utterly arbitrary. Increased travel, lack of choice for families
- As mentioned in the previous question, in order for meaningful engagement I would like to know the evidence base and rationale for each proposal. How were they reached? What was the evidence and link to sources, and what proposals were excluded from this engagement exercise. It is a concern that this information is not provided, and from what I gauged from the online meeting, it has still not been provided.

It also appears from the presentation that the evidence for this option improving outcomes for Free School Meals/disadvantaged children is vague

- The option maps are not clearly legible. Is this deliberate?
- There isn't enough information on how this would work in principal it seems fairer but will it actually offer a choice of schools or is it still down to proximity of the school such as for the Longhill/ Dorothy Stringer catchment - it would need to be a ballot process for it to be fair in offering an actual choice of two options.
- 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
- This is a ludicrous, stressful option that is already causing significant unrest and anxiety.
- The mapping is too vague. The assumption that parents are to not consider the impact to their individual child, but guess work is ridiculous. Parents will do what is best for their child first.
- Struggling to see any logic in this proposal
- The maps are not clear enough to judge, but it looks like you there is no increase in options for pupils in the Seven Dials in an area where a faith school unfairly dominates (and only takes a tiny percentage of children from an atheist background).
- The worst possible solution
- If council genuinely believed in making this a success then this would have give chance to tease out policies that work for all regions while addressing concerns. This engagement and consultation does not in any way give time for that to happen. Putting forward a survey with inherent biases seemingly not taking the criticism on board, this has broken trust that the council truly listening.

A paucity of ideas, if this was truly just an engagement, then where are the truly imaginative solutions. Where the council have thought along these lines for example the FSM program there has been wide support, although we are still waiting for the

results. Here we have been given 3 solutions on the same theme, that artificial forcing children around the city is the solution. Examples, where diversity has successfully improved, (I am not pretending these are remotely viable in Brighton, but surely the point is to bring things to the discussion) have been.

Placing schools on economical boundaries. Creating centres of excellence in areas of deprivation that pupils can get to and want to get to. Federating high and low performing schools. These have all come from your same experts.

Unfortunately "bussing", ie the allocation of children into social groups and bussing them into different areas to enact social change has largely failed in past as they are massively unpopular and those that can, usually with the most to give into the scheme, disengage and either take their children elsewhere or push back until the schemes are closed down. At the moment it is hard to see this as anything other than a political box ticking exercise driven more to pull apart the communities in Central Brighton, then truly elevate those in the East and is a massive wasted opportunity.

- This is crazy!
- Option B is a ridiculously unsustainable option which will encourage many more journeys across the city, and meant that students furthest from their schools will have to miss out on after school activities or travel long distances on dark evenings. The public transport links from Longhill to Dorothy Stringer are poor. This option will increase traffic for those in Loder Road, which is already subject to botched 'school streets' plan
- This is ludicrous
- This is meaningless - insufficient information. Give Patcham its own catchment, then say Varndean with BACA in another, and Stringer+ Longhill in a third.
- This is the most ridiculous plan I have ever seen
- This option is completely insane. I know that the council have already read and appreciate Professor Adam Dennett's analysis of the proposals, and therefore I will not labour this further. I honestly believe it would be in the council interests to employ professor Dennett and seek his advice on how best to manage the challenges the council faces in dealing with improving the City's access to education, instead of wasting everyone's time with the 'option' proposed here.
- Any sane person would reject this out of hand. In fact it feels like this option is here to make Option A more palatable.
- There's also known conflicts of interest here! After speaking with friends with legal backgrounds, the council need to be very careful going down this sort of route. I 100% reject and furthermore even if this proposal went ahead, chatting to friends in the Fiveways / Preston park area, none of them would agree to sending their children on a long journey, out of their community, to a school far away. It just wouldn't work and you'd be creating even more issues. Going to the engagement meetings this week it's clear that there is no data to back these proposals up - a big problem!! Please can the council ensure they do a full impact assessment on all proposals.
- Too disruptive a proposal - Option A is clearly better though through
- Utter madness
- This is wrong on so many levels and the idea that 'other kids do it so why shouldn't yours?' That has been shown by the council makes me feel physically sick
- This option is, at best, poorly thought out in terms of impact. At worst, it's utterly impractical and would have a devastating impact in many ways.
- 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. 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.

- here is no information in the consultation about how many more children would have to travel, or the impact on their wellbeing.
- Councillor Taylor attended Longhill and was up until recently a governor. He has publicly voiced his views which are very bias towards protecting Longhill. Perhaps a less bias councillor should be leading this Lack of transparency in the council data and processes
- This would mean limited choice and bigger schools imo
- Too much change in my view
- Very difficult to assess without more data but looks unfair that in Hove (bigger houses, more money) you have more schools and less travel than in the East. In this model the East area is massive! Also don't know what the catchment is for primary schools; how are these borders affecting kids who've gone to primary together?
- Why is Hove not changed. Better to just abolish catchments entirely.
- Why not have no catchment area except being in B&H
- 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.
- To what unnecessary cumulative expense this is for the Council?
- Furthermore, this model is not providing us with any data that a forced social engineering solution will actually work. So why is it being pushed by Councillor Jacob Taylor? We have concerns that he is looking at speed pushing this through whilst pretending to have a public consultation. Apparently he did the same thing when he was a gov of a local primary school - pushed the competing school to reduce their numbers and keep his failing school at their normal numbers and then didn't recuse himself from the proceedings and debates as a councillor. The adjudicator said it was poor practice. Are you seriously going to let this happen on this scale?
- I can't see the model! I live on Shaftesbury road Bn1 4nf.
- have yet to see the evidence of this type of plan working and feel this is all being rushed through with not enough research
- I am not sure what is meant by distinct communities but this comes across as classist at best.
- Very similar to Option 1 so my opinion is the same
- I don't understand this plan. This survey is poorly done because we need to see all the options, with good explanation, before providing feedback... I also can't give feedback on this without understanding these 'boundaries' north and south that you mention here.
- Current catchments not perfect but 2 wrongs don't make a right. Dont think there is consensus for this option. Why yo parents think they must have multiple choice of schools? Many of catchments are single and work well. More certainty of getting in.
- Hideous option that will bring misery to so many families. If you go with this I truly believe it's political suicide for the policy makers on this. It will result in many horror stories
- Gives some options
- Generally agree, but think move to these boundaries should be gradual not instant to minimise aggravation to admissions officers and stress to parents
- As with A, 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.

- Fail to see how this achieves the outcomes previously described
- Don't have enough information to make an informed decision
- As earlier - can't make an informed decision here
- Again, I offer the same comments as option A, not distinct enough map, much too much travelling in distance and time, even more than option A, a definite 'NO'
- Agree with Option A
- Another terrible option
- If going for this model why not just place the purple and blue catchments into one larger combined area.
- Again, I don't have enough information. But I can see that this option is the most radical in redistributing FSM. I would like more information about your rationale for these specific catchment areas, and alternatives.
- Again, I don't feel I've been given enough information to make an informed decision - see concerns raised by Professor Adam Dennett. But this feels like ideological social engineering with disregard for: the mental health implications of separating children from their friends and subjecting them to long daily journeys, the social cohesion implications of splitting communities, the opportunity cost of spending time on transport rather than relaxing/creating/exercising etc and the climate implications of increased vehicular travel.
- But again where is the transparency and publicly available data to inform this proposal?
- firstly, this visual is not fit for purpose. It's highly inaccessible and in no way of a high enough standard to support a proposal of this magnitude Your graphics team should be ashamed of themselves for submitting such poor visual aids.
- As before - I cannot give an informed answer because there is no info about the options anywhere obvious that can be accessed.
- A map to see the actual proposal would be helpful?!
- So far, BHCC has conducted no financial, environmental, public health or traffic impact assessment for any of the proposals. Still, as Option B would have impacts on all of these areas, it is surprising that it has been put forward as an option at all without any supporting evidence.
- Boundaries should be closer to the actual schools. it is not clear how the submission process would prevent having to potentially travel long distances within two of these catchments. Although better than the previous option.
- Once again this map splits Whitehawk so distinct communities are not kept together. .What a ridiculous thought about map - some rationale would help?
- 'ensure that the schools are situated within their own catchment area.' I don't understand this - how can a school not be in its own catchment area?
- Feels like the best option for achieving the goals and also still providing choice
- Feels fairer in terms of population spread
- I cannot see the map.... where is it?
- I am visually impaired in this map is an accessible to me
- I can't see the boundary's and the supporting information is. It available on mobile.
- I do not support any catchment proposal that does not incorporate distance to school into its allocation priority.
- I don't feel like I've seen evidence to the proposed models. This particular suggestion seems ludicrous.
- I don't agree with this, but it's the best of the worst options. At least we will have w choice of secondary school with this option.
- I don't think amending catchment areas is the answer

- I prefer the boundaries as they were
- I need to learn more about this model
- Would rather boundaries were left alone but this is the best option in my opinion
- 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 the proposed north/south divide to the catchment boundaries 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
- We'd like to continue to have a choice of more than one school
- There is no information in the consultation about how many more children would have to travel, how this would be supported, impact on their wellbeing etc.
- The Council has provided no evidence that forcing children far away from their local schools can help address the attainment gap, and the experts cited by the Council do not support such measures.
- This option doesn't benefit any students or families. The only beneficiary is Longhill High School. This is a clear indication that the entire exercise is flawed and strongly supports the conflict of interest resulting from putting a Longhill governor in charge of this review.
- This model makes absolutely no sense
- This is the option I think will have the most serious knock on effects, many of them unintended, due to the significant changes. And just practically speaking having Longhill and Stringer in the same catchment area, for example, will be very hard to engineer in reality. I strongly oppose this option.
- This is an arbitrary approach which is not data-lead and penalises those in the current catchment areas.
- This is an absolutely awful option which should never have progressed beyond a thought experiment.
- This is an absolute nonsense with completely unbalanced offering
- Please can you explain how these shapes were drawn?
- This is a genuine change that would have an actual impact
- 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.
- These changes wouldn't impact me so it's difficult to comment.
- Seems ok
- Ridiculous plan
- Ridiculous
- Please release the data and thought process behind how this will benefit the majority of school children here. There will be great travelling, communities lost all to the detriment of children, families, communities, the environment, the traffic. Why would this be implemented?
- Parents need more time, information and understanding as well as the means to suggest amendments and alternatives
- Not enough information is provided to make an informed choice but this seems a terrible idea due to increased commuting time for a large number of children with negative impact on mental health, climate change and air quality.
- Not enough information
- 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_A_analysis.html

- None of the three options are good
- No change
- Map very hard to read.
- Map and evidence base isn't clear enough to reach an informed conclusion
- Need to see a map to understand proposal
- Liaise with Parent Support Group for Option D
- It would be helpful to see what this plan actually looks like
- It is very difficult to work out the exact catchment boundaries based on the map provided.
- It looks a ridiculous and unworkable option
- It is very difficult to work out the exact catchment boundaries based on the map provided
- It is not possible to critique the options effectively. The information provided is not adequate and there is a lack of equality impact information.
- Impossible to read or understand your image
- It is much better than the other options
- It is not ideal, but this model is the only one that allows for choice.
- Impossible to comment without seeing boundaries

8. Geographic Distribution

- You are taking away the preferred option from most parents in the area. Longhill is not a viable option for children in the city and you are also dividing unfairly the neighbourhood of Porthall/Prestonville. I also am not confident in the councils projections in PAN numbers nor that they have data on when the numbers of children applying will live
- Also, the ridiculous catchment areas!! It makes no sense, to have Fiveways and in the catchment area it is in on this proposal!
- Really unfair on Portslade, cutting off children geographically closer to Hove schools
- The main issue is with the Dorothy Stringer/Longhill area. It throws up the absurd potential situation of a family residing on Loder Road, Brighton having to travel by public transport to Longhill Academy, when there are 2 schools within 5 minutes walk, and a further 2 schools within 25 minutes walk. Their journey by public transport to Longhill would be over an hour each way. The journey for a family living in Coombe Vale, Saltdean going to Dorothy Stringer would be even longer
- The North/South divide idea is extremely problematic.
- This option does not seem to make much sense, from a geographic or from a practical perspective. The option appears to have been generated by ChatGPT to meet the single objective of spreading the mix of children with free school meals across the schools in the city.
- Not enough choice for those in Portslade
- This is a terrible suggestion and I believe will end up worsening what the changes are striving to deliver. The schools are so far apart that there would still only be one realistic choice for pupils and the if they dont get in they will have to travel long distances and live far from the majority of their peers. This also splits the Downs and Balfour school catchment areas largely along economic lines within the 'ditching Road' area- this could fuel rather than address local inequalities and split diverse friendships at a formative age.
- This is absolutely diabolical and will create an even worse lottery system than the current one

- It keeps one of the more popular middle class school in each section - splitting Stringer and Varndean into 2 sections makes more sense
- It's still unfair that only one school is in the catchment in the west of the city
- Kemptown dramatically changes again putting new families off moving here whilst Hove remains unchanged.
- This is a very flawed option - positioned as providing choice, given their location and Ofsted ratings this will inevitably lead to BACA and Longhill receiving third preference or lower for almost everyone in their catchment.
- This is a wonderful option that balances the need to serve all demographics with the vital importance of offering CHOICE within nearly all the catchments
- Gives each catchment a choice of at least 2 schools
- Ending the east/west divide will enable much more fairness
- Better than first option
- It looks like children living in Preston Park area wouldn't be in catchment for Varndean or Dorothy Stringer, which are very nearby.
- These catchments create massive disruption for families due to a number of reasons: 1) significant travel given size of catchments like the Dorothy Stringer / Longhill area, 2) for people living near Varndean but find themselves outside of the new catchment area, this seems like madness and will disrupt communities, friendship groups, 3) there seems to be an unfair / uneven allocation of schools, with one area having only 2 schools, another 3 schools and another 5 schools.
- This is absurd. You'd be forcing children (as young as 11!) to make their way across the city for hours at a time to/from Longhill to Fiveways. IMPROVE LONGHILL and students will actually WANT to go there!
- Very large blue catchment area which would be difficult to get to school if you were based in Westdene and placed at BACA.
- Again no change to Portslade. This option would be a disaster for those who want to send their children to Stringer. It is unreasonable to ask children to travel for seven miles to a school they don't want to attend to help prop up the numbers. Parents from this catchment are unlikely to do this anyway and will go private, move or send their children to other schools. This will create different problems and will still not improve Longhill. Also those who can see Varndean from their windows will now no longer be able to attend.
- Why not look at an inner and outer model where all schools have a close catchment inner area who are offered places and then an outer area that get offered places after like a lottery
- Appears to give more options to families in East
- Again, this option offers no other choice for those in portslade than a poorly performing school while the other areas have options. Now Portslade is the only catchment with no other option at all, I do not want my child to have to attend a school that requires improvement.
- As long as wherever you live you have more than one option.
- Best of the three options for children in Moulsecoomb and Bevendean, though we also recognise it's limitations
- Because in Saltdean, it's an awful situation. I want to send my child to Longhill. I can't.
- Would like the option of varnean and stringer
- Better but as I live with either patcham or Baca the choice is still limited, both terrible schools and would personally rather move out of Brighton and Hove
- Brings more children into Long hill catchment
- Catchment area too wide
- Children in the east of the city will have access to an acceptable school

- Children in areas such as bevendean are at a real disadvantage with only 1 school option
- City is too big to limit to 2x large North and south catchment areas
- Placing Longhill and DS in the same catchment area seems mad, geographically speaking
- Finally gives more 'deprived' areas like Moulescombe & Whitehawk a choice of schools. No choice for Portslade though
- I can see the map clearly and I can see that Varndean is one of our options - this is the school XXX wants to attend so this is the best option for us but I still think this needs to be planned into the future more so people buy there houses knowing in advance the catchment areas.
- I can understand the logic of trying to add another school to the Longhill catchment area, but this is likely to result in some very long travel times to school for some pupils. There will also be a frustration of parental choice around Stringer and Varndean. It is also likely to have a negative impact on Longhill and the children attending it, which may be perhaps unfairly viewed as the less popular choice of the two schools in this catchment area.
- I don't see how this system being a lottery across the three school settings could possibly work . geographically across these areas and schools it will cause major issues.
- I do not understand the rationale for this proposal given that it departs from any kind of neighbourhood logic and would generate fierce opposition from families unwilling to send their kids to Rottingdean from Fiveways. These families will not play ball and will obstruct any merit in the proposal, alas. I do not believe that Longhill will gain from this proposal. It will not be successful and the school will not improve in the way it deserves to. For clarity, I would only fully support a plan which adds a new or relocated school in East Brighton.
- You are not addressing the problem you are just shifting it. A school needs to be opened in the Elm grove area
- Whilst it doesn't affect the part of the city where we live, I am also baffled as to why Portslade seem to have been excluded from this option. If you believe that choice is a key desire for parents, then it is not clear why this doesn't apply for Portslade.
- I still don't believe this is a helpful option for people living in Saltdean. I feel the council needs to work with the neighbouring council in Lewes and provide more options that way towards peacehaven and newhaven.
- I support some of the intentions of this model but I don't understand why Portslade doesn't get increased choice of schools when this seems to be the goal for everyone else. Why can't Portslade and Hove areas be combined as other areas have been? PACA is part of the same academy as BACA and those boundaries are different in each model. It feels like the proposals are only trying to make things fairer and offer more choices for certain areas. The larger sizes of these catchments make me wonder about an option with one big catchment, or possibly split into 2 areas: Portslade/Hove and Brighton. Within those wider areas use the usual admission priorities, but possibly add in certain postcodes that would get next priority of choice after FSM (not the nearest postcodes but areas that currently don't have an equitable choice) and then after all of those criteria, places could be allocated based on walking distance to school as with the primary school allocations. This is just an thought as I write. Maybe the postcode idea is flawed, but what other factors apart from FSM could be considered to make things more equitable?
- I think choice is important and there should not be any areas with only one school to choose from.
- Wouldn't want to go to Longhill

- Would hugely over subscribe Varndean as everyone scrambles to avoid the inadequate BACA and for a child from south of Elm Grove to have to travel to Patcham seems ridiculous
- Why has Portslade not been included?
- Whilst I do like the idea of each catchment area having more than one option, it would likely be geographically impractical for children in the blue/pink catchments to genuinely consider both options as viable choices.
- While this might work for the reasons described, it doesn't seem to be a sensible way to carve up the city to keep travel times down for all. Hove and portslade get short travel times; hove and the north get plenty of choice; the rest of the city gets neither.
- While there is more choice for us (we are in Patcham) - from an academic perspective I worry that splitting up Vardean/DS will reduce competition between them. I also would think that almost everyone in the South will want to go to DS and everyone in the North to Vardean. And why is Hove doing so much better ? They have lots of great schools - and all have a lot of real choices? What about improving school quality first - or simply doing away with catchments altogether, and gradually increase the size of the more popular schools to meet demand?
- What sense does it make to ship children from Saltdean to Stringer and not allow local children access. Surely this goes against trying to reduce reliance on vehicles? There are local children from poorer socio economic families that will be excluded.
- Unfair Varndean catchment excluding houses within 0.3 miles of the school. Only 2 schools available to pink zone yet a huge choice of schools for all other zones. Within the pink zone Dorothy stringer will be inundated based on the performance of Longhill and due to difficult bus route from areas around Fiveways huge increase in need for car transport if Longhill is the only school available. Cardinal Newman should be included in pink zone as 5 schools available for green zone.
- This would still prove to be a massive issue for people in the north area. Everyone will want one of two schools and be forced to go to BACA and again, they won't take the space. They'd rather go to different Local Authorities or go private or move house, or give their kids a longer commute. The bottom line is, a lot of people will not want to send their children to BACA or Longhill because they have terrible reputations.
- This would offer saltdean children Dorothy Stringer alongside Longhill in our current catchment. Currently you are rolling the dice for schools outside of catchment if you don't opt for Longhill.
- This seems likely to cause significant problems. We would be in the area that the options are Varndean, BACA and Patcham. How would this work? Would you be able to give your top 3 choices in order? Would it then be decided with a combination of the priority list and with distance from school, or would it be a lottery. If it's a lottery then that causes problems as some children will be travelling long distances to school and not able to access their closest school.
- This seems entirely unworkable. Some kids in Fiveways might have to go to Woodingdean for school if they don't get into their local schools. Just keep it local so kids can go to schools near where they live and be close to friends
- For our family, this option B is the WORST option as it removes parental choice. With this discussion about changing the catchment areas, and the potential upheaval that may result. I am questioning our desire to stay in the city. If option B were implemented, I would likely look at moving out of the city as the risk of not getting a place in a local school and the impact of that would be too high. I don't know what the solution is to solve the city's school issues. I don't know how to make things fair for everyone. I don't know how to ensure that all schools get enough pupils and that local communities aren't broken apart. But this option is definitely not the solution. This option has the potential to deeply negatively affect our family and I cannot support it.

- This provides choice of a second school in catchment for Saltdean families
- I feel that the risks to those already in the catchments are being completely overlooked by biased proposals. The survey also demonstrates bias in the decision-makers. With organised campaigns and the large populations of White Hawk, Saltdean and Rottingdean it is also likely that they will see this as an added option for them and they will out number those of us that are severely disadvantaged by this proposal in the Preston Park Area, a community far away from theirs. They don't care about the damage they are causing us. We are not as organised because this has taken us by surprise. But we have far more to lose than they have to gain.
- This option seems to provide a bigger range of options for Brighton and Hove families. The catching areas are well connected by bus routes too.
- This option seems particularly difficult for pupils living in the Preston Park area. Varndean and Stringer are schools close enough for children to walk to school with friends where as having to travel to Longhill is not easy and will involve the need for buses.
- This option seems completely ridiculous for both people living in central Brighton and for people living in East Brighton, the long travel distances either way to either Dorothy stringer from the East or Longhill from the centre goes against the council's own policy of keep travel distances to school below 3 miles and who is going to pay for the expense of buses or car journeys?
- This option seems fairer, except for the students of PACA, but has it considered the logistics of children commuting further??
- This option provides the ability for Moulsecoomb and Bevendean families to send their children to higher performing schools in higher socioeconomic neighbourhoods, thus breaking the cycle of underperformance and deprivation. This option also still provides the option of BACA for families who prefer a closer school.
- This option provides choice in all catchments
- This option removes the area of port hall/prestonville from the catchment of varndean leaving only stringer or a school in rottingdean which is completely crazy from a practicality, affordability, or environmental point of view
- This option removes all choice from Stanford children, leaving only Stringer. Geography should not be the only factor determining best school fit for a pupil.
- This option makes no sense for the south Brighton catchment area. Only 2 school options at opposite ends of the catchment and of very different standards
- This option is very artificial and creates peninsulas where children either side of certain roads will go to different schools. There's an illusion of choice. No one who lives near Dorothy Stringer will choose to send their kids to Longhill for example as it's very far away
- This option is purely here for the council to perform a social engineering experiment. It is designed to bring Stringer and Varndean down and force the children in those areas to travel miles away to Longhill or BACA.
- This option gives two very large catchment areas in Brighton whereby children might have to travel large distances if they don't attend their local school. The Hove catchment area remains untouched with a large number of schools in it thereby ignoring the fact that Labour are looking at introducing academies and faith schools into the council remit.
- This option gives Patcham coldean and other areas an opportunity to get into good schools and not just the well off areas
- This option gives multiple choices of schools to the areas in the east of the city, potentially helping to redress some inequality
- This option excludes the Porthall area, which is currently in the existing catchment area for a school with good standards i.e. Varndean, leaving just Stringer as the option for a 'good' reasonably commutable education option. Expand the catchment area, don't exclude areas in the existing catchment area.

- This option best meets the goals to improve school catchment areas. It gives catchment areas more choice and brings different demographics together in each school.
- This option allows more than 1 school for a catchment area
- This option allows each catchment area a choice of schools
- This one doesn't look good, particularly the pink zone linking Longhill and Dorothy Stringer. That's not a sensible catchment, with people having to travel far to get to school. Presumably everyone would apply to DS and Longhill would get the people who didn't get in - that seems quite divisive and unhelpful. Especially if there is also a long distance to travel eg if you lived in 5 ways and had to go to school in Longhill. The catchment areas seem too big.
- This model seems to provide a greater spread of children across the schools in the city.
- This model divides the children at Downs Junior School, which would be very upsetting for all the children. The boundary down Ditchling road also divides children along economic lines with the wealthy kids living on the West side all going to Varndean.
- This makes a mockery of the word 'catchment area'. It's ridiculous.
- I don't necessarily understand how the boundaries were drawn; e.g. an odd-looking corridor connection East Brighton areas with the central area around DS. But the principle of having DS and Varndean in different catchments seems to be the right one. If centrally-located families in the DS/Longhill catchment fear a long journey for their kids out to Rottingdean, maybe more work needs to be done to explain that these families could still apply to other out-of-catchment schools that may remain undersubscribed and could be closer (e.g. Hove Park/BACA).
- This is the only option that gives the pink area a choice of 2 schools. Ideally there would be more choice, but A choice, is better than NONE
- This is terrible. All these children having to travel to places like Rottingdean- ages away from where people live! Worst idea of all.
- This is ok, except for boundaries being very close to some of the schools, which seems unfair
- This is insanity - it would leave my child a 50/50 chance of being at school outside of the city she lives in the centre of.
- This is by far the best of the three proposals. However, I think it is very unfair on children living in Portslade who would then be the only children in the city to have no option to choose which school they attend. I would argue for combining the Hove and Portslade catchment areas so there are just three catchment areas in total.
- This is better than the current option. Its still too Hove based, but at least the rest of the city gets more than one choice.
- Ultimately we won't send him to long hill. We would send him to another school or move.
- This is a terrible idea which will invoked tax paying middle class children to school from Fiveways to Ovingdean
- This is a terrible idea - the pink zone is absolutely enormous and would mean children leaving the city entirely.
- This is a non-starter. The huge catchment areas will lead to inevitable excess car journeys and pollution or long >1 hour walks for children with all the associated risks when walking re pollution, traffic accidents, lost family time/time for extracurricular activities. It will also break up the fabric of communities with children attending from such wide geographies.
- This is a more realistic and fair catchment model for families in Patcham, Westdene and town centre
- I can't see why the argument being applied to the east of the city doesn't apply to the west.

- This is a huge change and incredibly disruptive to people's lives and children's expectations. Children from Brighton could be forced to travel miles out to Woodingdean and Patcham. It is not fair on them. Why do none of these proposals affect Hove? Brighton residents are being punished.
- This gives families in the east of the city a chance at a higher performing school. For families who cannot afford the rent of the central area of Brighton or do not have buying power in that area this opens up a real opportunity. This is a game changer for families living in less affluent areas who want their children to have more opportunities, particularly areas of woodingdean, Whitehawk and parts of Saltdean.
- this gives families in Coombe road area a choice of schools.
- This does seem to be fairer way of doing things meaning that those in certain catchment areas would have more chance of accessing a good school under the proposed arrangements.
- This does not offer 'choice' for children around fiveways and preston park as no one is going to want to travel to a struggling school a long way away- this will inevitably create problems with gridlock across the city
- This creates a fair system that gives students choice and prevents the "postcode lottery". Prevents those who live in the town centre having all the advantages of choice
- This is much the same. Hove the 2nd smallest area have the most choice of schools. Woodingdean area only has 2 schools. Again very unfair system
- 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 Sutton Trust report is being widely used to support this option, however the critical information being left out is that they recommend using a 80/20 rule of geographical proximity and ballot to avoid children at the extremities of the catchment having to travel huge distances and avoid breaking up communities. This current plan could have two children who live 5mins walk from long hill and Dorothy stringer respectively, crossing each others path on a 90min commute to school in the dark.
- The Stringer/Longhill catchment area seems particularly impractical and rather perverse. It looks like a corridor rather than a catchment and excludes a lot of children who live locally to Stringer.
- The size of the Brighton catchment areas vs number of schools seems disproportionate
- The shape of the catchment makes no sense for Longhill, why does it go into the catchments of the other schools so much?
- The schools are not geographically placed for any catchment area to work. Give choice give opportunity not boundaries. Parents and children will sort it out and include a trade system.
- The Longhill catchment makes so little sense for the furthest groups it negates all the other catchment gains.
- The geographical change makes no sense. With Varndean and Longhill in the same catchment some children would be forced to walk for hours or there would be an increase in cross-town car traffic. A child could be sent to a school where there are 5 or 6 schools closer to their residence.
- The choice of Dorothy stringer or Longhill is a massive difference geographically, and completely unfeasible for a child to travel this distance (unless living between the two).
- The catchment areas proposed here seem utterly ridiculous. For the southern catchment area you are grouping together two schools on opposite sides on the city. This seems like a ridiculous proposal and one where there would be a real danger of pupils being sent to schools very far away.

- the central and eastern areas are much too large, and too arbitrary
- The boundaries are confusing as they do not cover obvious geographical districts
- The catchment areas are too large
- The blue and pink area have schools which are extremely far away from each other, considering allocation is random rather than by distance there is a high chance of a child having to attend a school miles away from their home.
- Still need more choice for Saltdean
- Still it's a shame the Portslade has only 1 school.
- splitting varndean and stringer into separate catchments when they are effectively on the same site seems ridiculous. Kids from my area would effectively have no good choice
- Splits Osborne Road in two
- South catchment area seems unpractical
- Some schools are attracting pupils from too far away
- Sending someone in Withdean all the way over to Longhill is mental.
- Seems a bit odd to draw like this but difficult with the lay of the city.
- Some areas still have more choice than others.
- Saltdean has more options.
- Remove the catchment area boundaries
- Portslade has no options
- 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.
- Probably the better option for Coldean recognising that many pupils enjoy the choice of either Patcham or BACA. However, again, these are not the only options. Why are you trying to force these on us?
- Personally, I strongly disagree with this option as a change in catchment areas could not only mean a Fiveways resident like myself could be out of catchment area for both Varndean and Stringer but also a change in catchments would also break sibling links.
- Personally I am happier with this arrangement as my closest school becomes an option. However, I understand that those in Fiveways would not want to travel to Longhill - in the same way that in the current context there is zero provision for children from Whitehawk to attend a school without travelling 4 miles. The situation is, I'm afraid, impossible without drastic changes in funding.
- Parents should be able to choose the best school for their child, as opposed to the logistics of said school.
- As a side note, we moved into our area many years ago specifically because of the choice and variety of local (and walkable) schools on offer - both at Infants and Juniors. To take that choice away by redrawing the boundaries so drastically and depriving children of a school more suited to their needs (which has been available to them until now) is not something I want from my local authority. Whilst I understand the need to address underperforming areas and pupils, it shouldn't come at the cost of those who are performing. Anything too drastic could force parents into difficult decisions of moving away to better the needs of their children or financial struggles of taking them out of the state system and into private - which would cut funding further for local authority schools and effect everyone within the system.
- Open up option of southwick academy to portslade residents
- Only adjustment would to be include PACA in with all the other hove schools. Ideally, everyone would have some element of 'choice'
- Offers more choice to children in the east of Brighton as well as ensuring more social-economic integration which is vital for children to thrive and prosper.

- No ideal. The main issue is the clustering of schools in hove, meaning more options and less time and distance to travel for kids and families. A long standing issue but still deeply unfair.
- More choice for Saltdean which is desperately needed
- More options for Saltdean
- Ludicrous idea to send children from central Brighton Preston area to Longhill School
- Longville is miles away from Stringer.
- Making children travel from Preston to Long hill if they don't get in to Stringer is a poor boundary choice and will have a negative effect on their life.
- Large geographic size of schools, resulting in a lottery that may see many children needing to travel across the city to go to school. This seems inefficient and lacks sustainability from a travel point of view. Bus services on an East-West axis across the city are poor, to put it mildly.
- Long hill isn't an appropriate option for kids travelling from central Brighton or Preston Park areas
- Long hill and Dorothy Stringer are so far apart putting them in the same catchment would now work.
- Longhill catchment would be too big Dorothy stringer very hard to get to from saltdean not a real choice
- It's bizarre. There is nothing organic about this arrangement - the boundaries look gerrymandered and they are. It really doesn't show enough consideration for kids travelling to school. It appears to be an extremely crude attempt a some sort of social engineering.
- It's ridiculous to put stringer and varndean in different catchments where the kids could be travelling miles across Brighton when those schools are next door to each other
- It would be so fantastic to have a Brighton based school option for children in Saltdean.
- It seems perverse to split the catchment area for Varndean and Dorothy Stringer and to exclude those children living close to Varndean potentially having to travel a long way to Longhill High particularly taking into account that pupil numbers at Dorothy Stringer will be reduced drastically, potentially with plans to close the school altogether. I live on Dover Road and the children in my road will be most affected.
- It only gives me the option to send my 4 children to a school I don't want them to go to.
- It is unfair that Portslade only has one school in its catchment.
- It is good to have multiple options within one catchment area unlike the current situation for Saltdean although Dorothy Stringer is quite a distance to travel from Saltdean
- It has Dorothy Stringer in it!
- In this option, Dorothy stringer would be our local school, yet we wouldn't be allowed to go there. We would have to chose a school that is harder to get to
- In practice, this would be unsustainable for children. Pupils attending schools a long way from their homes; where there is an imbalance in perceived school quality and huge geographic distances between schools in the same catchment. Having children travel across the city where walking will not be an option (Longhill School (up to walk of 1 hour and 55 minutes away), therefore local traffic will increase further and reducing the activity of children if they are not walking to school.
- In many events this option has been cited as addressing the issue that some areas don't have choice around schools. Unfortunately this seems flawed given the model doesn't provide choice for children in the PACA area.
- If you live in port hall area you might expect your child to go to woodingdean??? Rather than Varndean???

- If this option provides a choice in each area then this would be my preference again the lottery needs to be removed
- I would also say that catchment areas for patcham areas should include varndean & stringer as they are on the same campus
- I would like my children to be in catchment for Vardean as we live 5 mins walk away in Patcham. It always seemed ridiculous that we weren't in catchment as we are towards the back of Brighton but then children from the seafront could come all the way up. I don't really think I would want them going miles away to BACA though as it is much too far to travel on their own!! We do think PACA should also have more choice, there should be at least 2 choices in all catchments. Why would you have 3 schools in catchment to Hove and only 1 to Portslade? Also Patcham, Varden and DS should be in same top to bottom catchment and Long Hill and Baca in another - and the reason I say this is because getting from Patcham to Baca or visa versa for children on foot is not a safe walk, sometimes they would feel tempted to go through woodland or around the back in dangerous spots. Not good! So we agree with the catchment extension to Varndean for Patcham but think this still is not quite right.
- I think this option makes it hard for families in central Brighton who will not have the choice of schools they were expecting.
- I think this model may add more pressure to the Brighton area schools
- I think this option is OK in terms of the northern catchment, as it offers Coldean a choice of 3 schools, however the red catchment area is not great
- I think we are literally same distance to varndean and to blachington mill. If the division line will go next street on the left, it means I won't be able to consider blachington mill, even though it's same distance as varndean. Also, you have varndean and Dorothy Stringer next to each other, which is 2 schools in an one place. This is currently out of my catchment area just because we are in city centre
- I think this sounds more interesting, especially if the dividing lines broadly aligned with main bus routes
- I think the travel areas are too big, but hopefully this would mix up school catchment areas more.