



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

Question 3: Do you think that that larger schools should reduce in size to create a more balanced school offer?

1. Travel and Transportation

- Why shrink bigger schools? If that's their closest school, children shouldn't have to travel further just to go to a smaller school
- I don't think a blanket approach can be achieved here, surely we should be looking at the geographical locations of school - pupils can't be expected to travel too far to a school.
- Absolutely. The current system has allowed schools to increase their numbers to accommodate more children, whilst other less desirable schools have had well below their PAN - resulting in less money, poorer resources and an self fulfilling cycle that will never be broken without reform. I live in Saltdean and the additional problem is schools out of catchment (Lewes Priory in particular) having a massive catchment and seeming to accommodate everyone who applies whether in catchment or not (numbers have been well into double figures in the last 2 years). This has resulted in growing numbers of pupils travelling to Lewes for school rather than attending their local catchment school - again self fulfilling and exacerbating the problem of social segregation further. The reason for this is partly the concern of poor results at longhill but also massively on a reputation that is often unfair and unfounded. This needs to stop as all pupils would surely benefit from attending their local school with a good tranche of their primary peers rather than travelling for 1 plus hours a day each way to school in a completely different community.
- Are the larger schools larger because there are more families with school age children within their proximity? Would reducing their size mean that more families will have to travel further (adding pollution and traffic to roads, while destroying community of where children live)?
- There are benefits to larger schools in terms of the broad curriculum and extra-curricular they can offer. While ideally all schools are maintained if proper investment put into transport/active travel it could be possible in a city the size of B&H for students to travel slightly further
- Amending admissions is a short sighted solution which will bring about other factors such as great travel times for a huge amount of children, increased traffic in the city, environmental impact from use of cars as public transport isn't quick and reliable enough as well as the safety aspect of 11-12 years old travelling hours on a bus. There needs to be alternative solutions put on the table that will seek to improve schools in Brighton and Hove so that every child has the option to receive a quality education without travelling hours within the city.
- Children being sent to schools that are not close by is not good for the environment or doesn't account for importance of being part of the local community you live in.
- I don't believe there is a straight forward yes/no answer to this. Expecting children to travel far outside the area for school just to balance numbers is unfair

- Free bus travel would be part of this
- I don't know what you mean by a balanced school offer
- Not if it means that children who live five minutes away need to go to a school which is 30 minutes walk away.
- But not at the detriment of having to send children to schools further away from the area they live or remove the option from the closest schools which could separate them from their class mates despite living roads away (varndean and Dorothy stringer). The focus should be improving schools to drive desirability for a range of pupils to attend from the area. I.e Longhill which is having a reducing number of pupils from Saltdean, Rottingdean and Ovingdean despite it being the closest school
- I think schools in areas with fewer school age children should reduce in size to prevent children having to travel large distances
- I think that places should be refused at underperforming schools. Longhill is also not easily accessible for many children in the city.
- I'm neutral on this issue. However I am concerned that with one of the options my child would 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. It would actually be much easier and quicker for my child to travel to a school in Hassocks.
- In theory yes but not at the expense of local children having to takes buses to schools further afield
- In theory I would prefer a smaller school for my children, but how this is practically worked out is very important.
- It depends how they're located relative to school age population. Children should not be required to travel far. Nor other road users put up with the morning traffic chaos
- Personally it will also add over an hour travel time to my family. It will also complicate matters seriously as we will have one child to walk ten minutes to Balfour and one child to support in potentially travelling one hour across the city to another school, so likely reduce by driving.
- Maybe, but not if it means that since students will have to make long journeys before and after school because they are unable to go to the school closest or best suited to them. Teenagers need sleep, they do not need to be walking for 40 mins across this very polluted city between the hours of 8 and 9 am as since of my friends children are doing
- No, these schools are achieving well. Put more money into the below standard schools to help create a better school. If the schools are all of a good standard, those living in the more rural areas and close to the schools will not have a need to try and send their children elsewhere, again alleviating the travel issues, filling more spaces at those schools.
- Not at the expense of sending kids on much longer journeys elsewhere.
- Not if it means children are having to travel further to a not preferred school
- Not if it means children having to travel a long distance and lose out on after school activities and having friends in the same locality
- Not again if it means children are sent a huge distance away from their closest school
- Not if it means my child needs to travel miles to get to school
- Not if it means pupils travelling large distances across the city.
- Not if it means the majority of children have to travel long distances to school. You have provided no data to allow us to consider this. There is no evidence to show us how pupil numbers affect the provisions that can be offered.
- Not if it means unfeasible commutes for 11 year olds
- Where there is a school which a pupil can easily access, which has space for them and which parents want to send their children to, I cannot see the benefit in artificially

constraining school numbers in this way. Particularly not if the result is that children are required to travel long distances, without appropriate transport provision, when there is an alternative close by.

- Not if this means making children travel further
- This is a difficult question. I don't think any schools should close, I don't think this is helpful for the city. I worked with young people when COMART closed and saw the impact of students travelling across the city to a new school which was over an hour away by bus from their community.
- We can see in our city that students are willing to travel a distance to get the best education they can
- Unsure as depends on location of larger schools - main issue is likely to be around transport to schools, so if large schools in areas with good transport links are reduced to keep small schools open with poor transport links that's not ideal either.
- This won't fix the problem it will simply push more children in the schools that are underachieving and make children have to travel further to get to school
- The key issues are about what is balanced. To ask lots of children to travel much further to their catchment area schools than any children travel at the moment is not balanced at all.
- This depends on the impact that reduction would have on pupils in the existing catchment areas. IE if it meant some children having to travel long distances whereas they currently don't need to, I would not agree
- The larger schools are in places where there are more children. Children should be able to walk to school. Not have to travel across the city to boost numbers at other schools.
- The larger schools are already oversubscribed and no one wants their child to travel long distances
- Not necessarily it depends on the spread of pupils, children should not be made to travel long distances to school because the number in a catchment have been made smaller where there is demand
- Not necessarily - when that means that children may have to travel much further to a school
- Not if children have to travel far from home to attend alternative schools
- No, not if the result is children having to travel dangerous distances across town to get to and from school every day.
- No, not if the catchment area requires larger school numbers or at the expense of children having to travel long distances to get to school.
- It's an option. But is it the right option if some children then have to travel miles to school
- It depends - if a school has much wider open spaces, larger classrooms and can accommodate more students at lunch time or in libraries, it is normal that they should have more students.
- It depended on many factors other than size... Such as demand, location etc
- If this means that travel to school is less saving the environment. Fewer cars/pollution.
- Busing children around the city is papering over the cracks
- If schools are popular and 'oversubscribed' it makes no sense whatsoever to reduce these schools in size, just to more evenly distribute pupil numbers across the city. The reason these schools are large is likely due to a high level of pupils living in the immediate vicinity of the school. Reducing the intake in these schools will undoubtedly mean that more pupils will have to travel longer distances to school in a city that is already congested.

- If a school is over-subscribed because there is a high density of population near that school, then what you are suggesting is that more pupils should be subjected to long commutes than would otherwise be required.
- I think that the schools which produce the best results and are most popular should not be reduced in size (even if they are the largest schools). Making these schools smaller will reduce choice for all and will make it more likely that those children who live in their catchment area will have to travel further (potentially much further) to go to school.
- I believe schools that are performing well should be maintained. I would rather my child travel a bit further to attend a good school, than a school nearer us that is struggling with the basics like keeping the young people safe.
- I believe schools doing well should retain present numbers, as the demand decreases due to birth rate those schools will be able to pupils who need extra help and support. But those pupils and their families will require additional support for travel

2. School Quality, Improvement and Resource Allocation

- You should focus your efforts on improving the under performing schools, not reducing the ones that are delivering great results
- I don't believe this should be an issue. I know personally of large schools elsewhere, near deprivation that offer outstanding results.
- But the smaller schools need support to improve in terms of finances, leadership and shared resources
- A larger school should not be forced to reduce in size if it is delivering good education to its students.
- A mix of sizes is good. The numbers should match the facilities.
- A large school isn't necessarily an issue if it's a good school.
- A good school should be able to manage an increase, and then would surely attract the funding to deal with this.
- A good school is a good school regardless of size. A bad school does not become a better school because it increases or decreases in size.
- Absolutely not. Schools that are thriving, in areas densely populated with school aged children, should not be forced to reduce their size. This has huge environmental impact.
- Absolutely not. Leave popular, already oversubscribed schools alone. This is our community you will be damaging
Schools that are struggling to fill their spaces need to reduce their size or consider relocating.
Longhill is failing to fill spaces because it is so difficult to access for so many.
- Absolutely not. The proposals to reduce the size of schools that are performing better than others in the City is a ridiculous one.
- But I also think you should reduce the schools which are requiring improvement at the moment and then fund them better to get them to the same standard.
- Certain schools are too big to support their students
- Clearly the wrong way of doing thing. Size mean nothing, this only penalise school despite their experience and excellence !!
- By reducing class numbers not reducing classes
- Change catchments so Varndean & Stringer pair with other schools - but don't meaninglessly aim to equalise size, so good bigger schools have to reduce their PAN.

- Depends if they are good schools
- Depends on a number of competing factors. Larger schools are not an issue in and of themselves
- Depends how you define large, over 800 is large, over 1,000 is too much.
- But only if it doesn't impact the schools that are performing well
- I don't have strong feelings either way on this, whatever is necessary to provide fair access for all. But if sharing the pupil funding around more evenly will help them, I would support it
- Happy with a larger school with smaller class sizes and a large variety of subjects
- Because a smaller school can do as well as a larger one. School size is irrelevant when compared to distance/travel time to school.
- Because Longhill is not an option
- Depending on the school
- Blatchington Mill, Varndean, Dorothy Stringer and Patcham High have been oversubscribed for the majority of recent years. Their PANs should remain the same, ensuring that families who live in the areas can still send their children to these schools. The PANs should be reduced at schools which are consistently undersubscribed and where admissions numbers are forecast to continue to decrease. These schools should be encouraged to embrace their smaller size and other opportunities this could bring, such as specialising in certain areas or providing focused care for a specific SEN. Tweaking catchment areas to try to dictate where families send their children to school will never work – families with the means will simply move house or consider private schools. King's School and Cardinal Newman Catholic School are both happy and successful schools which are thriving outside of LA control. Children across the city attend these schools and families welcome the opportunities, nurture, care and strong Christian ethos that their Trusts, governing boards and school leadership provide. I am glad they are separate from another LA consultation!
- Definitely not. If larger schools are performing well and there is the demand for them in the area, then they should 100% stay at that capacity! It makes no sense to have their PAN reduced, in order to force children to attend schools much further away.
- Currently unfair over subscribed good schools and struggling schools losing money
- Depends on the demand for the school
- Depends on the schools.
- Depends on their performance.
- But I do think unpopular and unsuccessful schools should reduce in size, even if that makes them financially unviable, and even if the current legal status of academies does not allow this council to control this. I don't think any popular council-run schools' PANs should be reduced in the meanwhile, as this could have a significant bad impact on the allocation of cohorts soon to go to secondary school. I would support a reduction in the PAN of Longhill because I don't think this school is viable or is what the families of this city want.
- Depends on whether smaller schools are properly funded or not. Generally they aren't, making larger schools a better option
- Despite falling numbers and certain schools suffering there needs to be a staged approach to rectify the problem schools prior to reducing numbers. With a low level of uptake in certain schools this must massively impact on funding if on a per child payment scheme that only results in schools reducing the subjects and opportunities offered which further impacts the problem. Maybe the school funding could be better distributed to enable standards to improve and naturally increase attitudes and improve reputation and results to better bring alignment of equal access to education.
- Failing schools need investment and resources to get better, or if they are failing they could close if there is an overall reduced demand.

- Education provision is not just about school size - it needs to also reflect the geographic position of the pupils. Ultimately we should be striving for all schools across the city to have good or outstanding ofsted ratings, regardless of size.
- Do you think that that larger schools should reduce in size! Reduce the amount students in a class or year intake or overall student count per schools (later i dont have the figures for all schools in brighton)
- Do I think Longhill should reduce in size, yes, enough to make it financially viable. Do I think Dorothy Stringer or Varndean should reduce in size, no. This would be a mistake.
- Do you mean larger schools should retain the buildings etc but with fewer pupils? I think it is on a case by case basis. If the larger school is popular and high performing I can't see the case to reduce numbers. Also reductions presumably come with a reduction in funding, but maintaining the facilities will cost the same to maintain. These questions aren't clear about what the problem is and the practical options available. There is no context to these questions.
- Do smaller schools guarantee a more balanced offer? I'm not sure they do.
- Depends. If that school is performing well why reduce it?
- Focus on school performance and enrichment opportunities for students, not size
- Good schools don't need to be a particular size
- Good schools naturally attract higher numbers of pupils
- Good question Yes. How can schools which are not always 'first choice' ever compete with over-subscribed schools? Funding and resources need to be fairly allocated. This goes for primary as well as secondary.
- However a number of the schools earmarked for a drop in pupil numbers are over-subscribed and likely to stay that way. The proposals will reduce the number of children securing their preferred school when in fact the drop in numbers should mean a higher proportion are able to attend their preferred school.
- High performing schools should extend intakes to more not the other way around
- Having a half full schools doesn't seem like the answer
- I don't think it is the size of the school that is important, but their values, ethos, quality of education, knowledgeable and passionate staff, and the way people are treated.
- I don't think it's necessary to reduce the size of a school. I think it's good to have different offerings which suit different personalities and needs
- I think that schools that are achieving good outcomes for students and are oversubscribed should not have their numbers reduced
- There is constant high demand for Varndean and Stringer. Reducing the PAN means you force more kids to go to other schools, but also will push those who are financially able to go private rather than choose a school out of that area. I do believe in reducing Longhill's PAN from 240 to 150-180. It's ridiculous that that isn't on the table here
- I can't understand why not just shrinking Longhill faster so Varndean and Dorothy stringer don't need to change in 2026. Longhills intake of only 94 children doesn't make it feasible
- I do not believe that successful, thriving, oversubscribed schools should have to reduce their intake in order to sustain struggling schools. More creative solutions should be sought, for example merging schools or allowing more collaboration between schools to enable economies of scale and a wider curriculum offer at smaller schools.
- I do not believe that the size of a school matters. What is important, as stated in the previous questions, is that all children should be able to attend a local school, in their community, where they can grow, learn and thrive. Size is irrelevant. How are the answers to these questions going to be used? If only the 'yes' and 'no' data is going to be looked at, the results will be very skewed and not a true picture at all of people's opinions on this.

- I do NOT believe schools that are already oversubscribed should have their numbers reduced, especially considering the proposed re-zoned catchment areas. It makes no sense to reduce numbers in these schools.
- I do not think that schools that are over subscribed should reduce in size.
- I do think there should be a more balanced school offer, but not necessarily through reductions of PANs anywhere. The two are separate issues..
- I don't believe larger schools should reduce in size. This sort of approach undermines larger schools and reduces opportunities for children to attend their preferred schools unnecessarily.
- I don't believe reduction solves the problem if we have faith based school and academies are not subjected to the same rules of reduction . It can't work unless every setting has an equal place at the table and parity carries across all settings
- I don't agree that larger popular, well achieving schools should reduce in size, if there is a demand for the places and the schools are doing well I don't see why they should reduce.
- I don't think the size of a school alone is a barrier to balance
- I don't think school size is the key element to make a judgement on this. I think a good school that should be given continuous support to keep its good work. The schools that are falling behind the required standard, should be given support to improve their performance, rather than getting more students from better schools.
- I see no reason why this should be inherently better at all. Economies of scale are available at large schools, and a large school population can mean enough students to support less common extra curricular activities.
- I see no sense in reducing the places at the good schools that are oversubscribed. They are obviously more popular and more in demand so why would you take places away? It makes no sense at all. If the population is reducing then it would open up spaces for the wider community to have a chance to get in to a better school including more people on free school meals. There are no outstanding schools in Brighton so I think the good ones should stay the same size. From what I'm hearing on the Facebook group, Longhill is undersubscribed. They have more places available than people wanting/taking the places so it makes sense to reduce the numbers there. I understand that the council say it's not financially viable to run smaller schools but there are apparently other smaller schools in the country that are thriving. The council should really focus on improving Longhill by putting more money into it to increase numbers of teachers, support staff and improve pastoral care. I think focusing on this rather than diversity of students at this time would be more beneficial. With the new introduction of VAT to private schools there may be a number of people dropping out of private education as they can no longer afford it. So it makes sense to wait and see how this pans out before drastically reducing any numbers.
- I think larger schools should be able to build on their success and grow to accommodate demand.
- I think schools need to be fit for purpose, if a school has a larger local population it stands to reason it should allow more students and so be bigger. This should not detract from itself, or other schools offering a high standard or education or pastoral support.
- I think it makes sense to take pressure off of the most popular schools by not simply adding more children to where they are at breaking point.
- I think more should be done to balance the school offer through the channeling of funds towards schools that are not succeeding as well as others.
- I think perhaps the schools that falling in numbers should be downsized such as Longhill
- I think secondary schools are too large in general. My ideal solution would prefer a model of a separate middle school and senior school to cater for the very specific

ages and development of children and teenagers. I also think that faith schools and academies PANs and admissions should be looked at as these do affect pupil numbers and 'balance' across the city. I understand a white paper is coming out in the near future and I would like any recommended changes to be implemented. Thinking about the distribution of children in the city, parental/carer preference and the specific factors of why a child/family may choose a particular school, it's easy to see why some secondary schools are more popular than others. Location has a strong factor – very populated areas with lots of families, easy to get to ideally on foot or a short bus ride are very important factors. Each school has its own culture. Some schools have a strong focus on emotional wellbeing, others have a strong sporting ethos. I was quite shocked to hear that some children face 45 minute commutes on a bus to get to school - I also don't think this is acceptable. I think that getting travel to school right will help support good educational outcomes. Cost, distance and journey time are all factors - I would like to see free bus travel and 'express' bus routes for children who have to travel to school. I don't think that larger schools should reduce – rather, make the schools that having falling numbers more attractive and deliver more value for pupils, their families and the local community they are located in. Reducing PANs for larger schools is a very blunt instrument to a complex issue.

- I think some of the measures that the larger schools have undertaken are working for example Varndean's structure of smaller houses within the school.
- I think that if those schools are performing well then they should allowed be able to continue as such.
- I think that the Council needs to seriously consider an option to reduce Longhill's PAN in 2026 to the proposed 2030 PAN of 180. Only 94 children started at Longhill in Sept 2024 vs current PAN of 270.
- I think that the larger schools are performing well. Why make them smaller? Unless you are going to create a new school in Brighton and Hove?
- I think the best performing schools shouldn't necessarily be reduced in size. They are clearly doing something right and it would make sense to have as many children as possible attending these schools rather than sending a higher proportion of students to poorer performing schools.
- I think that underperforming schools should be looked at, but schools performing well should not be reduced in size. That makes no sense.
- I think the best schools should be maintained to give all kids access to best education
- I think that the schools that are doing well should be left to continue what they're doing and that more assistance and funds need to be given to the less popular schools to even things out and make us happier to send our children there.
- I think the larger school across the city are the ones thriving, and that intervention should be based on school performance not size.
- I think the council should look more thoroughly at this. It's not that larger schools should reduce in size if larger schools have a larger community to serve. It's non-sensical to suggest this is a solution. Is the council suggesting that there will more money poured into public transport to serve so many more children moving around with the proposed alterations or a reduction in school size? I know that this isn't on the table
- I think the best schools should take as many students as they can safely accommodate. Propping up failing schools and trying to socially engineer improvements in outcomes is immoral and is taking risks with young people's education and futures.
- If a large school is well run then it shouldn't be made smaller to prop up worse run schools. Focus should be on improving the standard of the worst schools in Brighton.

- If a larger school has enough staffing, facilities, funding and space that is managed well by making smaller schools within a large school, then it should still be able to work.
- If a large school is performing well, the answer is not to reduce numbers or disperse to other schools but to relocate the method for success at other schools.
- If a larger school is offering an excellent level of education and support to its intake of students then it would seem absurd to make them cut numbers to support and underperforming school to maintain numbers or grow their share of students. The council should also be considering academisation of schools that have shown persistent underperformance and poor results as has happened in other areas of England.
- I'm not entirely sure what this question is asking but generally speaking, yes. I think there should be a maximum of 30 children per class.
- If a school has the capacity to have that many children and they are thriving and succeeding why change that? Also your figures show no information regarding how those pupil numbers will reduce if you keep the catchments as they are. This is highly misleading as PAN may reduce in the same way if you make NO changes.
- If a larger school offers a better standard of education it wouldn't make sense to reduce the school's size unless there was a benefit to the students there.
- If a school is showing that it is successful, achieving good results for all pupils and providing for the whole needs of a pupil then it doesn't seem sensible to reduce the number of pupils that can attend a thriving school. This could have a hugely negative impact on the education of many young people.
- If a school is particularly good and has better outcomes than others then I feel it should take more students to give a better chance to more children.
- If a school is run well and is very good then there is no harm it being a large school for many pupils to enjoy.
- If a school is larger generally that's because it's in demand I see no reason why it should reduce numbers to accommodate other schools. If schools have less numbers it's due to many factors, it's best that we find out why they are not thriving and fix the problem at the source.
- If it gives attention to others and does not impact on learning
- if it reduces the number of places available at successful schools, then no; if underperforming schools are supported to improve, then yes
- If larger schools which fill their places are reduced in size this will give people just outside catchments less choice and ultimately lead to more dissatisfaction with school places, so if this is the case I would say no.
- If larger schools are getting better results they should remain large and benefit more students
- I think this is a fallacy to a degree; if you are saying take class sizes from 35 to 30 it will have little impact.
- If a school is doing well surely it would make sense to keep it at the same size to offer a place to as many students as possible
- If a school is good (take St Luke's for example and the attempted lowering of the PAN, why should it be made smaller?! It makes no sense, let more children benefit from the best schools.
- If a school is large, but thriving then let it thrive.
If a school is struggling, then support it, don't increase the capacity of a school that is already failing to meet the needs of the children already attending.
- If a school is over subscribed they should be funded to meet the needs of the pupil choice not the other way round
- IF all schools were brought up to standard, THEN it may be appropriate to start reducing PAN, but until that happens it is not a viable solution to cap numbers at good schools.

- I think allowing popular schools to expand at the expense of smaller schools is problematic as it means that smaller less popular schools are likely to remain unsubscribed, perpetuating the problem. I also think smaller schools if well run are preferable in some respects as some secondary schools are too big. Many children thrive better at smaller schools
- I think it is a valid option to consider and reducing the size of schools, including oversubscribed schools, in order to help maintain the financial viability of other schools in the city and avoid closing schools is something I would probably support, but it would be very important for this to come with a clear plan on how the schools that are currently less well supported in terms of pupil numbers are going to be supported by the council to improve - what can be done in terms of leadership, governance, school partnership and other specialist advisers, additional resources to help with funding bids, help with budgets etc etc
- If bigger schools are performing well, why cut their PAN? Use the opportunity to offer spaces to children out of catchment of more FSM pupils.
- If a school with a large intake can maintain high standards then I don't mind them staying as they are. Whichever returns a better overall education.
- If larger schools are performing highly then I do not think they should be reduced in size merely for the benefit of a smaller or lower performing school
- If it works for them to operate as such, why should they reduce?
- If numbers need to fall then school places should be kept according to the schools that communities and parents have preference for, are doing well (and therefore will address inequality) and which are accessible. It should not be the case that you cut numbers just based on which schools are biggest.
- I think the size of the school is irrelevant. It's more about the quality of the school/education and the local community that a school creates within the locality.
- If larger schools that are sustainable/thriving (as per question 1) are reduced in size and if that creates longer travel times for children having to go elsewhere, then no, I don't think these schools should be reduced in size.
- If the less successful schools had sufficient investment and support for staff allow the schools to thrive, this would not be an issue.
- If the resources are already available in existing schools it doesn't make much sense to lose staff and have to re-employ new people or create new systems or infrastructure to support it, especially if this would involve additional cost.
- If the larger schools have the funding, provisions and space to accommodate the number of students then I don't see a problem with a larger school.
- If the school can cope with the volume and the children are happy and achieving decent results, why make this sudden change.
- If that school is offering good education, send the displaced children from worse schools to that school
- If schools are large and are full, there is a reason for that, and reducing them in size is just going to cause a lot of stress and issues for the local families, and families who have chosen that school for specific reasons.
- If schools are large and thriving why would you reduce what is working?
- If schools are less popular then they are likely to have specific problems that would be made worse by increasing their size. If a school is failing, it needs help to improve and then admissions will automatically go up.
- If schools are popular they should maintain numbers of pupils
- If schools have space for their current intake and the school is popular then I don't think reducing the size of the school is a good idea as it will result in more children/parents not getting their choice of school and more children travelling across the city to a school they don't want to go to. Increased travel time reduces time available for homework and also reduces the opportunity for children to attend after school activities if relying on an infrequent bus to get home. The priority for children

receiving Free school meals has only started this year so changing admission numbers for popular schools without seeing the effect of this would not seem to be a good idea.

- I think the size is irrelevant if they have the funding to cope with the size. If standard and facilities in an area are equal then so will desirability and you should be able to use school to capacity. If over crowded in areas is a problem look at the reasons why and fix these so you have a balanced population in the city.
- If the academic and pastoral quality of a large school is good, and it has appropriate resources available, I don't think it needs to be reduced in size. This would also lead to a loss in funding for the school.
- If the demand is there (because the school is performing well) and the school can serve that demand - why restrict it. Other schools will need to adapt (not all schools have to be 'large') or improve to make them more desirable / increase demand.
- If the school is big out doesn't mean it's unbalanced
- If the school is doing well then it makes little sense for fewer children to benefit from that, instead of forcing them to go to worse schools
- I think the numbers go up and down regularly so I think we need to support the schools. It was only a few years ago the council suggested changing the catchments and build a new school. Luckily that plan did not go through.
- If the school is thriving, why fix something that isn't broken
- If these larger schools are popular and successful then they should actually be given the opportunity to expand further to provide their successful service to more children
- If these schools are popular, they should remain able to offer the outstanding education they do
- If the larger entry schools are doing well then they shouldn't reduce sizes
- If the larger schools are doing better then they should remain large
- If the larger schools are doing well and the pupil capacity is strong, then why reduce??
- If the school is doing well, then why change it. If the school isn't doing well, then change needs to be made. Look at the school as an individual. Some schools in Brighton are larger than others but have a much better reputation.
- If there are a high performing school with capacity, then on the face of it, it seems logical to increase the size.
- If they are good schools they should provide for as many pupils as possible
- If those schools are successful, why change? Smaller classes in those smaller schools would help disadvantaged children.
- If we reduce sizes will schools who get paid by student have enough budget to run a more balanced school offer? How does the council financially support schools and the increasingly custom offering schools need to provide?
- If you reduce the number of places at Dorothy Stringer and Varndean, there will not be enough places for the children who live in the local area to go to school there. Demand for school places in that area are high and will continue to be high.
- I'm not sure what is best, big schools seem to have more resources.
- I'm not sure, Varndean does seem to have found a good system of coping with their size I'm unsure of how I feel but reducing school places can also have a negative impact on schools
- If they have to space and teachers why not use it
- If this means resources are spread more equally across all schools
- I'm unsure as larger schools can often offer a broader range whereas small schools can't. Maybe all schools should have different offers to provide proper choice
- I'm unsure how reducing numbers in bigger schools creates a more balanced offer
- In my experience the larger schools are managing well and providing excellent education opportunities

- Instead of moving pupils from one area to another, it would be much more beneficial to invest in improving the schools that require improvement to bring them in line with the standards of schools in other areas of the city.
- It depends on the catchment and number of spaces required. If the spaces are needed, no need to reduce the size.
- It depends on the school, it depends on the PAN. If a school has high demand and is doing an excellent job at keeping Brighton's attainment high, why would you reduce PAN and therefore funding to those schools. We should maintain what Brighton is doing very well at. 50% of children are achieving 9-5 grades in English and maths in Brighton, which is well above National & South East average. We should not compromise this.
- It depends on the school, it depends on the PAN. If a school has high demand and is doing an excellent job at keeping Brighton's attainment high, why would you reduce PAN and therefore funding to those schools? We should aim to maintain what Brighton is doing very well at. 50% of children are achieving 9-5 grades in English and maths in Brighton, which is well above National & South East average. We should not compromise this.
- In theory yes but this is a difficult question to answer, it could mean spreading resources more evenly which would be positive. However there also needs to be a fundamental culture and attitude shift towards and within long hill and BACA for this to be a success. Otherwise all that it would achieve is to reduce options for parents even further. Those with the least will miss out the most in this situation.
- It depends what you mean by balanced offer, there is potentially an benefit of larger schools because of economies of scale which will help schools to budget more efficiently. If there are fewer larger schools then expensive or specialised equipment can be bought more easily. However, there can be challenges in administration and for students feeling overwhelmed.
- It depends. It's hardly a yes/no issue. Don't reduce them in size if the places are needed. Do reduce them if they are so large that they have no humanity or community spirit. So many factors, none of which are addressed in this question, or the proposals.
- It is about how good the school is and has capacity to be, the demand for places in the local area, it's ability to recruit and retain great teachers. These are the important considerations. No school in Brighton is particularly large compared to Secondary Schools nationally. Size is a distraction, unless they are small, with empty places, unviable.
- It doesn't follow that smaller schools enable a more balanced school offer. It also risks the investment that some schools have made in certain disciplines.
- It is not the responsibility of parents to fill up failing schools to make them better (nor evidence that this would be the result)
- It is better to have a larger number of smaller schools than a small number of large schools. You do not want to have peoples from disadvantage backgrounds having to travel really long distances and the cost that is associated with that. Plus smaller schools are less overwhelming for a lot of peoples
- Schools will need to reduce their numbers to ensure that none are closed down.
- It would be insane to reduce PANs in thriving schools and send more children to schools that Ofstead think are providing sub standard education.
- Larger schools should not need to reduce in size if they are sustainable and thriving. The real issue is about the dire lack of funding in education. Shuffling student numbers around the city will not make real impact without wider societal and economic changes to address systemic inequality.
- Lower teacher to pupil ratios = better and more individualised teaching with more one on one time

- It makes no sense to reduce numbers at successful, already oversubscribed schools. Numbers at Longhill should be reduced if no one wants to go there
- It makes no sense to reduce PAN at oversubscribed schools in geographic locations of high demand, such as Stringer and Vardnean. Yes, overall numbers of school children are declining in Brighton, but not in all areas. Please be data driven with this.
- It seems counter-intuitive to reduce places at schools that are already over-subscribed.
- It really depends on the resources and the infrastructure the school possesses. It's not sensible to reduce school size if a school could provide good education standard to students.
- It seems very unfair that some schools are taking on more pupils than they can accommodate at the detriment to some of the smaller schools
- It sounds like the way forward is to reduce the sizes of the larger schools though at the same time I worry that this will also negatively impact the children that are not necessarily in the best catchment areas as it will make it even harder to get into the better school options.
- Larger schools should return to pre bulge year PANS
- Larger schools that are thriving and performing well should take as many pupils as they are able.
- Let schools which have successfully outcomes continue to provide this
- No, I don't believe artificially inflating or deflating pupil numbers should be used as a tool to balance school funding. Particularly when factors such as location, access the school policies in neighbouring regions haven't been taken into account. Working within the limits of the previous central government's, funding strategy and not look at what is actually required, and working towards that goal seems short sighted.
- No, reducing larger better performing schools is not the answer
- Not if a school is doing well and in areas with high concentration of kids
- Not necessarily - the best schools should be protected regardless of size even if that means smaller schools closing
- No, I don't think that just "reducing size" is feature of a balanced school offer. There are very good school that do well partly because of their small size (for instance, those for children with special needs). That's only an example, but I think size itself is not a measure. Many other more factors must be considered.
- No, the larger schools are popular for a reason
- Not necessarily because some schools function well as larger sites & visa versa
- Not necessarily. I think that this is not an overriding consideration if it forces educational migration with detrimental impacts. I think smaller schools have been proven to thrive with support and that school partnerships and LA investment and support can ensure that they do so.
- No, the schools that are providing a good standard of education and meeting their students needs should not be reduced in size. It would make sense to utilise these schools to their maximum.
- Not necessarily. If larger schools have greater capacity and are achieving good results, reducing their load may not be appropriate. Diverting the color consultation and change into improving lower performing schools might be a better use of time and funds
- Not if they are deemed to offer a good education and pupil and parent satisfaction is high.
- Not if they are in demand and performing well
- Not if they are oversubscribed.
- Not if they are providing a good standard of education
- Not necessarily - I think we should consider keeping high performing schools at their full capacity so more children can access those schools.

- Not if those larger schools are creating good outcomes and results
- not if those schools are the best performing schools
- Not necessarily. If a school is thriving, it shouldn't have to reduce so that a mediocre school can stay open and full.
- Not necessarily. If the schools are thriving, successful and are popular it makes no sense to reduce them in size
- Not sure, this depends on how well the schools regardless of size are supporting their children's education and development
- Only if that means that all schools will be equal in their performance, ethos and outcomes
- Not necessarily. Size of a school in itself is not an indicator of whether education, behaviour or offering is balanced or not.
- Not sure how reducing the school size will mean it will be more balanced.
- Not sure how this would improve pupil outcomes, and overheads would go up.
- PAN numbers should be reflective of how many children locally need places in local schools. Children should not be made to travel large distances to save an unpopular school
- Keep places at schools that are already over-subscribed. Why on earth would you remove places at schools where more people want to go? You're just forcing parents to send kids where they don't want to. The idea you would remove places at a local school to send my children across the city somewhere they don't want to go is beyond ridiculous.
- Keep Places on better performing schools regardless of size.
- Larger (or schools with higher pupil numbers) schools in this city, have become so as a consequence of offering excellent education and therefore being desirable to families. I do not believe that reducing the intakes of schools which provide excellent education, is a good method of ensuring positive outcomes for children in the city. On the contrary, a school which is performing and is oversubscribed should be supported with additional capacity, to allow for the additional intake and thereby provide excellent education to those children who are eligible.
- Not sure - it depends how well the larger schools are coping with the demand
- Not to hold up underperforming schools, no
- Popular and well performing schools should retain as many places as possible to allow more children to attend
- Popular school should be logically bigger than the unpopular ones
- Popular schools can remain with their PANs providing all schools can be kept open. Wait for the Child Wellbeing Bill which likely brings more kids back into the system from academy and faith schools. Wait for the kids to come back into the system from private schools due to the VAT hike. PAN numbers are not projected to drop much in the next 2 years, caution is needed, wait another year at least to see the effects above. In that time develop a more well considered proposal which is less disruptive. These proposals cause huge unintended consequences to 100s of children in the city from breaking up friendships, support networks, communities and introducing more traffic, pollution, lack of sleep, less family time etc. All to save Longhill which can be saved without this level of disruption with a smarter plan. Apparently Longhill and BACA have good new leadership and are going in the right direction, invest in them more. E.g. Invest in sports facilities at Longhill, make it somewhere kids and parents want to go.
- Potentially, although a reduction in places should be spread across all schools if this has to happen.
- Schools of any size should reduce relative to demand
- The best performing schools should not reduce in size. Poorer performing schools should be made smaller and be provided with more assistance.

- There is a compelling preference argument for oversubscribed schools such as Varndean and Dorothy Stringer to retain their current PANs. Stringer / Varndean both received over 1000 preferences for 330/300 places - where as Longhill received 132 total preferences for 270 places. It would make logical sense to bring Longhill straight down to the councils 2030 PAN target of 180 and allow DS/V to remain unchanged.
- You could reduce the PAN slightly in the bigger schools but don't penalise the well performing, hard working schools that have spent years building up great places for educating the young.
- Reducing the size will not make a difference. Schools should ensure they are maintaining good standards through the curriculum, sufficient resources and extra curricular activities
- Reduction in school sizes means reduction in funding and less facilities for children. Focus less on school size and more improving schools to maximise the potential for them to improve.
- Reducing their size would have a detrimental financial impact on the successful schools
- The larger schools are generally successful, well run and provide an excellent education offer. Why not expand them, or give less successful schools more money to bridge the divide.
- The council need to focus on increasing the standards at other schools so there is real choice for parents.
- The best schools should retain places to provide the best education to everyone.
- the larger schools are the more popular schools.
- The larger schools are thriving, do not fix something that is not broken!!
- The larger schools in the city are performing very well and are hugely oversubscribed. They should have their PANs increased, if anything.
- There should be smaller class sizes and all staff jobs should be protected by any and all potential changes.
- That really depends , smaller schools I better for children , but forcing children into the other school if they are still bad isn't fair and my answer would be no But if we can have smaller schools which are good and let all children thrive then my answer would be yes
- Rationale similar to previous responses. Don't penalise well-performing schools by reducing their intake, and in turn penalise the children who would attend them in order to achieve this 'more balanced offer'. Also, whether this desired outcome would in fact be achieved is unsubstantiated.
- Reduce class sizes not numbers of forms
- Reducing larger schools will mean staff redundancies; I wouldn't want to see that happening Reducing PAN on some schools will reduce parental choice
- Reducing school size means less funding for the school
- Not sure smaller school means better
- Reducing the number of students in large schools is too simplistic and does not solve the bigger problem in schools that do not currently have good outcomes for students. Large successful schools should be partnered with other schools to ensure best practice is shared across schools in the city.
- Reducing the PAN in oversubscribed schools works counter to the current schools' admissions system which provides for parental preference and allocates funding per pupil on that basis. Forcing children to travel long distances to go to undersubscribed schools is unreasonable, will be overturned by the schools adjudicator and more importantly simply won't be acceptable to parents who hold the education, safety and health of their children as sacrosanct. We would personally move house or even town to avoid a situation like that.

- There are certain areas in Brighton and Hove which have proportionally more kids and need these larger schools to accommodate them. Definitely proposal B is not fair on pupils well-being as the catchment areas are so large, it would mean that these pupils will have to travel long distances to travel to school and back. More public transport will be required and the roads will be more congested. Larger schools can offer great opportunities for kids when it comes to making friends and friend choices but also the subject choices a school can offer is larger due to the additional staff.
- There are pros and cons to different sized schools. School size should reflect the numbers of local children, the facilities and access available and many other factors. Both large schools and small schools can be good.
- There are many different reasons schools might be bigger or need to be bigger, such as local population density. I believe children being able to attend local schools within their communities with reasonable journeys, preferably at a walkable distance, is paramount to mental and physical wellbeing, and is therefore more important than school size in the abstract
- There are efficiencies and economies of scale to having large successful schools and these should be encouraged not punished
- These schools are selfish as they don't think about the bigger picture
- They are too big already. They were not built to accommodate so many kids.
- If the intake a certain schools is larger to accommodate the number of children who live near to it and want to attend that school then so be it. Why should a large thriving school in an area that has enough children in the vicinity to meet the current PAN for that school be reduced, forcing children who live nearby to have to travel to a failing school further away, just because someone at the council has arbitrarily decided that the PAN at schools across the city should be 'balanced'?
- This is a yes, but answer. Yes, if the resources are directed toward ensuring that the smaller/less well regarded schools can offer more to their students.
- This would be an incredibly unpopular decision. It makes absolutely no sense to reduce the size of the better performing schools in the city. What kind of 'balance' would this achieve?
- under your proposals to drop pupil numbers the over-subscribed areas will reduce the number of children securing their preferred local school, when in fact the drop in numbers should mean a higher proportion are able to attend their preferred school.
- This represents a pretty big organisational change for those schools
- This would depend- not if reducing some schools in size would negatively impact the education of those it displaces.
- Underperforming schools require more financial support
- unsure - larger is not always bad
- No - I think the smaller schools should have more investment.
- unsure - more concerned with standards and location than size
- Unsure what is implied by 'a balanced offer'. Schools should serve the communities they are in, and serve them well. School Ofsted one-word ratings, which are to be abolished, are not a measure of educational attainment alone, or even that much, they are an indication of the quality of provision of the school across a broad spectrum of factors - improving the quality of the provision of the schools currently 'requiring improvement' will not happen by itself by changing the demographic of the intake - the school leadership and management needs to improve to give all pupils a chance at a better outcome. If the aim is to try to improve those ratings by shifting the demographic of the intake - this feels potentially a lazy and misguided approach. This could be seen as a cynical shorthand to shift the apparent performance of schools by moving around pupils with different 'typical' attainment levels according to background, rather than focusing on improvements of the schools 'requiring improvement' themselves.

- Our education system offers financial rewards to schools with higher PANs, leading to a sink and thrive divide that only fails large swathes of our community. The most successful education systems in the world send their children to the local school, where every child, no matter their privileges or barriers, attends. Schools should reflect the communities which they serve and should be spread equally, in terms of funding and respect, through our city. The idea of 'fashionable' schools is an anathema to what we should be trying to build as an inclusive and progressive city.
- Unsure, as if the schools are performing well then think it is beneficial for them to have max capacity of children
- With pupil numbers falling, it makes sense that the larger schools should take the hit and reduce in size.
- While balancing school sizes might seem like a solution, simply reducing the size of larger schools risks overburdening smaller schools that may not have the capacity or resources to meet the needs of all the children, many people move to Brighton so birth rates are only one metric we can use and its not accurate measure to forecast. We should address the funding method used by Government instead, make it less about number of pupils and more about funding needed to run a good school
- With the falling birth rate would it not be better to rethink and reimagine secondary school provision and maybe even have smaller classes than making popular, well performing schools smaller?
- While balancing school sizes might seem like a solution, simply reducing the size of larger schools risks overburdening smaller schools that may not have the capacity or resources to meet the needs of all the children, many people move to Brighton so birth rates are only one metric we can use and its not accurate measure to forecast. We should address the funding method used by Government instead, make it less about number of pupils and more about funding needed to run a good school
- Yes, smaller schools look better after their children. But when you reduce school sizes I hope you don't mean there will be not enough spaces! I'd rather we had more smaller schools than few big ones.
- Yes, slight small schools with adequate funding would result in a better education environment.
- No as this will impact staffing and money, and schools are already struggling with finances and staffing and if staff leave this will impact the teaching of these kids
- no I am a psychotherapist working with a number of schools and in fact the larger ones can be excellent and size itself is not relevant
- No I believe that the size of the school should not be the determining where school places should be removed. The quality and popularity of a school should be considered.
- Why does the size of the school impact the balance of the school? These seem unrelated. Large schools and small schools can surely be good and bad. I don't see the size of the school being a key driver of how well a school is balanced
- Why reduce good performing schools to bolster ones which are less effective.
- Why should larger schools need to do this?
- Unsure presently. Just because it's a large school I don't automatically presume it to be unbalanced. Will reducing sizes guarantee to make it more balanced.
- Why would you mess with a good school
- Why would you reduce the number of a large school is doing well?
- Yes I definitely think all schools should be much smaller
- Yes but Never at the expense of quality or facilities
- Yes, but only if that actually works for the school and the catchments.
- Yes, but if that leads to equal funding at the schools of the same size. Bevendean, Moulsecoomb and Falmer have a high student population. This means by default less council tax is collecting, resulting in poorer services for the areas hosting

transient students. Which is important, but shouldn't influence the funding of local services.

- Schools that are thriving, in busy catchment areas, should not be forced to reduce their capacity.
- Why would you reduce the number of places at the larger ("better") schools when they are performing well and before you have "fixed" the underperforming schools. Fix the broken schools before increasing the intake and allow the decent schools to continue benefiting as many children as possible.
- Why would you reduce the sizes of the schools that are performing well? That makes absolutely no sense at all. Reduce the class sizes of the under performing schools to help them achieve better. Scrap the price per head in those schools and spend the money that is being spent on this engagement on those schools.
- Yes and No. It's not about how large the school is, it's about the quality of education. The schools not meeting good standards should reduce in size and improve their standards, the schools meeting good standards should expand their catchment areas. This will allow more children to have a good education without impacting too much on school commutes for the children. Reducing the volume of students, or even class sizes, in struggling schools gives the school a better chance of improving standards.
- No if the school is popular I think they should not be reduced.
- No just follow the Varndean School model , have shools in schools
- Whether a school expands or reduces should depend on how well it is performing
- What is the case for doing this? I'm not sure on the benefits or challenges of keeping as they are in terms of school size.
- What about all the additional students due due to the private school VAT increase?
- Well managed schools should and do find ways to manage an increase in size to both maintain the pupil experience while benefiting from the advantages of facilities that this increased scale allows.
- The route of the issue needs to be addressed. Consistent investment is required to make Longhill more attractive, and support given to help it become a financially viable school with a smaller pupil cohort.
- . It does not make sense to reduce the size of our secondary schools so that poorer performing schools can endure even though they are not popular. It would be a real shame to make well-performing schools smaller, as that will mean they can offer less diverse curriculum to students.
- Unsure. Schools that have good pupil feedback and outcomes should continue to do well. However it is hard because not all schools suit all children. There may be some children who benefit from a smaller school.
- To improve access to a good education, good schools should be able to get in more children.
- To an extent. Only if they are undersubscribed
- This seems completely illogical. The school PANs should be based on the demand in the local community they are based in, and this should be driven by looking at the data. It does not make sense to make more children travel longer distances just simply to prop up schools where there simply isn't the demand because there are not enough children living in that area - the schools need to be sized according to the population statistics.
- This needs to happen proportionately and over time so that schools can effectively manage their funding.
- This is not the most important thing, if the school is functioning well and students are achieving it does not matter the size.
- This may be necessary but there is no point in cutting down school to force people into going to a different school. Already, there are places in some popular schools

that are not being filled by children from outside the area because parents/carers want their children to go to their local school.

- This is probably unavoidable given the current pupil numbers but it needs a lot more thought than you are allowing in this survey.
- If school size should be reduced or not depends on the alternative on offer.
- Small schools might be better but not if it means people have to travel longer distances or the range of subjects may not be on offer. A larger school may mean that children have access to a wider range of subjects and extracurricular activities.
- This is a gross over-simplification. If a larger school has the existing infrastructure to support a larger number of pupils, it would be a waste of those resources to reduce its size. Existing schools are limited by the size of their existing premises and the resources available to them. As a parent, I know the size of the classes are far more important than the size of the school, and academic studies prove this to be the case. The Class Size and Pupil-Teacher Ratios in England Study (2002), conducted by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), highlighted that smaller class sizes have a positive impact on learning, particularly in English and Maths. The study found that students in smaller classes achieved better results in literacy and numeracy, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds. The Institute of Education's (IoE) longitudinal study (2004) explored the effect of class size and concluded that smaller class sizes led to better literacy and numeracy outcomes. The study emphasised that smaller classes particularly benefit children from low-income families and those requiring additional support. The council should prioritise ensuring consistent class sizes between schools, with the goal of having as small a class size as possible, and considering overall pupil numbers as a distant secondary concern.
- This could only work if all schools were the same, sadly they aren't. There are very obvious reasons why some schools are oversubscribed and some aren't. Again if all schools were achieving the same parents wouldn't focus on 2-3 schools in all of Brighton and Hove.
- Think this is more nuanced than yesterday or no. Larger schools can be better resourced and supported. Smaller schools don't offer the same opportunities socially etc. I think balancing size with an equal spread of resources, support and opportunity is key.
- Some schools are managed very well even when they are a larger school.
- Some schools are too big
- some schools PAN increased due to a bulge year and was never changed back being unfair on some schools
- Stringer and Vardean and Blatchington have become too big
- Successful larger schools shouldn't be reduced for the sake of unproven aims of social engineering. More children should have the opportunity to go to the outstanding schools not the other way around.
- Successful schools will attract pupils. Failing ones won't. If they can't be improved then should be closed. Council has closed primary schools already in face of falling numbers
- There is no need to reduce school sizes if the capacity and resources are of an appropriate size.
- There is no evidence that links school sizes to education standards. There are plenty of links of to the proximity of schools to communities and commuting time that have a positive or negative impact on education and life standards. This proposal has ignored those.
- There is no evidence that a reduction of places at oversubscribed schools is necessary and in the interest of the students that would lose their place. It will require more students to have to travel far and out of their communities.
- The under subscribed schools may get a small bump in numbers from not as many kids going to the popular and oversubscribed schools but ultimately, I think parents

will take their children out of the Brighton schooling network rather than let their kid be the one that takes the educational hit for 2 to 4 years for the school to go from Inadequate/Requires Improvement to Good. That is assuming it ever gets to that "good" level because of declining birthrates and more parents not being happy to ferry their kids to "bad" schools.

- The size of the school should not be of issue if they are adequately supported in terms of funding and leadership.
- The size of the school should inform this decision. The performance / quality of the schools output should be the key factor in this decision. Why disrupt a high performing school just on the basis of size?
- The size of the school is not the issue, it is the disparity of the quality of the schools across the city and the location of the schools that is the issue. Many of the larger schools are doing well and provide excellent education.
- The size of the school is irrelevant if staffing and resources to meet the needs of pupils are provided, children will thrive
- the schools seem to be working just fine as they are at current sizes
- The schools that are underachieving should be improved and if not, the more successful schools should be made larger
- The size of a school should be based on the size it can accommodate, if catchment is an issue parents should have more variety of choice rather than less.
- The size of schools should reflect the need of the local population that it serves, and any schools not of an adequate standard should be strengthened to enhance the quality of the student experience.
- The size of schools is based on demand and it's important that children can walk to school to improve their mental health and reduce air pollution.
- The school should offer a balanced school regardless of size.
- The school size shouldn't have anything to do with whether it is balanced or not
- The reason some schools are large is because there are lots of local children in their locality who want to attend! Please look at the number of children within the catchments and produce some data to support the changes before you rearrange the catchments and PANs to our popular schools!
- The question should be whether the school is thriving rather than the specific size of the school.
- The problem with this is that just reducing the size of larger schools and moving the intake to other sites means longer travel for many pupils. This discriminates against those who for a wide variety of reasons find getting to a school every day a challenge.
- I am not sure that reducing the size of the schools per se would change the balance between children not eligible for FSM and those eligible for FSM if that's what you mean. And I can't see any evidence for this on the presentation. When it comes to reducing school intake, I think this is hard to fully consider this without the geographical distribution of the projected decline in secondary school numbers in B&H over the next 6 years (and further). We have only the raw total numbers on the council's presentation in the engagement and it's hard to fully answer this question without knowing the areas where numbers are declining the most and so where schools are needed in the city. Also not knowing the exact catchment areas that will be used makes answering this hard also. Despite this I think schools that performing better should not be asked to reduce the size of their intake in order to prop up the numbers and budget in underperforming schools. Furthermore, I believe that parental choice is paramount and schools that parents are choosing to send their children to and that are oversubscribed should not have to reduce their numbers. Previous decisions by the schools adjudicator has overturned PANs reduction at some B&H primary schools and denying parental preference was given as one of the reasons. However, if PANs do need to be reduced due to overall decline in numbers of

children in the city, I think it is only fair to look at ALL schools in the city not just the local authority ones. Councillor Taylor said at the People Overview and Scrutiny meeting on 9th Oct 24 that there is due to be a white paper by the government that should give the LA power to control admission numbers at all the schools including the religious schools. I think it would be better and more equitable to wait until then otherwise our successful LA secondary schools could find their numbers reduced unnecessarily.

- The other schools need to be better. Why not reduce places in the schools that noone wants to go to until that are improved.
- The most important thing is that they are good schools irrespective of size
- The most important thing is schools being appropriately sized for the immediate local community they serve. Therefore there should be different sizes of schools throughout the city, with smaller schools that serve the less densely populated areas and larger schools where the school aged population is higher.
- The idea of reducing student numbers at successful, popular, and forward-thinking schools in order to support struggling schools operates on a deficit model that is unlikely to produce sustainable improvement. This approach suggests that successful schools should limit their growth or reduce their intake to distribute students more evenly, but this fails to address the core issues faced by underperforming schools. Instead of weakening schools that are doing well, the focus should be on strengthening those that are struggling by investing in them directly. In any other sector, successful organisations are not penalised for their achievements. No business model encourages reducing capacity at high-performing entities to help weaker ones. In fact, successful businesses are usually expanded or replicated to spread best practices. The same principle should apply to schools. Reducing the intake at thriving schools may result in a loss of innovation, community trust, and student outcomes, without guaranteeing that struggling schools will improve. The real issue is that underperforming schools need targeted investment and support. This includes improving leadership, providing adequate resources, enhancing teacher development, and addressing the specific challenges those schools face, whether that's underfunding, high turnover, or gaps in student engagement. Rather than redistributing students, councils should prioritise lifting all schools to a higher standard through strategic investment. By giving struggling schools the tools to succeed—such as mentoring programs, additional funding, and stronger partnerships with their communities—these schools can improve organically. Ultimately, every student deserves access to a high-quality education, but artificially capping the growth of successful schools is not the answer. The goal should be to elevate underperforming schools so they too can become centres of excellence, rather than diminish the success of others. A thriving educational ecosystem relies on supporting all schools to be their best, rather than weakening some for the sake of others.
- School children numbers in the city are dropping over the next few years. Meaning that children will more than likely get their first choice of school in the catchment area. If then the numbers start to drop, the larger schools can drop a form from their intake.
- I believe if a school is run efficiently and provides an atmosphere where children are happy and enjoy being they will learn and thrive whether a large or small school.
- I am unsure, but I do know our children need smaller class sizes and our teachers need less contact time, more planning time and smaller workloads.
- School PANS increased to accommodate higher student numbers in certain areas, areas of privilege where people bought houses to ensure the school they wanted and the schools kept growing. There are sufficient spaces in the city for all children, those spaces should be shared equally and if there are concerns about standards than that should be the focus of work going forward.

- The highest performing schools should have increase funding to support higher pans, paid for by closing failing schools. Spreading more pupils into failing schools achieves the opposite of the councils stated aim of helping all children to thrive.
- The governors of Varndean school have confirmed that they already are already achieving above their targets for having school population from a diversity of different backgrounds, including children in receipt of Free School Meals and children with Special Educational Needs. Conversely there are 495 schools in the UK with a PAN lower than Longhill's which debunks Councillor Taylor's theory that a secondary school with a PAN lower than 180 is not viable. I went to a secondary school that had 1,800 pupils and it contained children from a wide range of different backgrounds.
- The focus should be on quality not size. I'd prefer a smaller school but would take a big/good school over a small/poorer quality provision
- Some schools are big and some are small. I can't believe that any would have such low numbers that they become financially unviable.
- Some school sizes seem too big for the purpose of education - 300 max. or less in 2030
- Some of the larger schools are popular and have good results
- Some of the schools in B&H are very large which does not benefit the children, Balance is required however, forcing students into schools which are not thriving is also counter productive. There is no good reason why some secondary schools in Brighton are performing badly - this needs to be addressed first.
- Some pupils will thrive in a smaller school, some in a bigger school. It also depends on the size of the school age population next to the school.
- Smaller schools can have single form entry
- Smaller class sizes are much more important han smaller school sizes, but certainly the current model of 3 or 4 large schools being majorly over-subscribed and other schools struggling a) to survive and b) to attract a diverse social and academic mix is deeply flawed. Of course, as a parent in the past and as a grandparent at present, I have been keen for my children to attend a 'successful' school.
- Size doesn't seem to be an issue.
- Size of the school doesn't really matter, it's the professionalism and organisation, that count
- Size is not always indicative of standards
- Shouldn't be an issue as long as class sizes are reasonable.
- Should be up to schools to decide
- Secondary schools with 240 students a year are too big, but understand that this also impacts funding
- Schools with poorer rates should improve their standards
- Schools which have increased PAN sizes have invested in making their school bigger . Smaller PAN means loss of jobs .
- Schools that have larger intakes maybe providing a provision not thought of. For example one larger school in Brighton and Hove has the largest intake of lac students and a high sen provision, but reducing their numbers it will reduce provision for all.
- Schools that are over subscribed should not have their PAN reduced.
- Schools should not reduce in size on basis of creating a more balanced school offer. . By reducing the PANs it will disadvantage pupils who live a walkable distance to their nearest secondary school. The admissions criteria and system in place already allows children entitled to free school meals, EHCP into schools first before distance from school and catchment is taken into account
- Schools can be large but not at the expense of making another school unviable
- Schools become larger Ultimately by being hyper performing, and therefore being attractive to pupils and families, When families are given a choice of a school

provision. I cannot understand why the council would want to reduce the provision of high-quality education, Provided a highly diverse range of students, Ethnicities, And backgrounds (such as that provided by Varndean and Stringer Schools) By Artificially reducing the capacity of high performing schools, Especially those mentioned above that already have a high provision of FSM Students, SEND students, And will now as of this year be taking more patients from disadvantaged background because of the excellent FSM policy: All we are doing is reducing the access to High-quality education for those student populations.Reduction of PAN for Schools should be absolutely avoided

- Schools are large because they are successful and in demand. If the offering in other schools was of equal merit, there would be more demand. We are tackling the issue from the wrong axis. Causality needs to be looked at here. Successful schools with strong management and happy staff shouldn't be punished for creating a strong learning environment.
- Schools are funded and functioning well at present with current numbers.
- Pupils should get the equal education they derive and in larger schools that is harder to ensure as resources send attention are spread more thinly
- Not reducing the size of good schools to prop up failing schools elsewhere
- Not necessarily- there are many wonderful schools across the country that have a large pupil intake this should not affect the quality of education offered
- Not necessarily, the resources allocated per pupil including staff numbers are more significant.
- Not necessarily, if shrinking a school impacts funding (and based on the current govt model it will), then that can be detrimental to the school being asked to shrink. So the issue is with funding and that is just being passed on to the school and ultimately the kids, which is not right.
- No. Larger schools provide more opportunities. The maximum number of students should benefit from them.
Surely school funding needs to be addressed to stop this being a locally managed issue and instead adressed at a national level.
- Not necessarily, if a larger school is excelling then it is worth considering if that is the better option - simply reducing numbers and spreading them out between schools might not help. Failing schools should be helped to improve before thinking that parents will want to send their children there.
- No, as proven by Varndean High School you can divide larger schools into sub group's
- No. It's crazy to reduce the size of outstanding and good schools if you're trying to give access to good education for more of the community
- Not necessarily, it depends on demand for the school and facilities and resources
- Not necessarily no it depends on the quality of education and whether the school can manage its large numbers. Why not ask the educators if they feel the school size needs to change and how that would benefit them?
- Not necessarily because a balanced school offer could be achieved in ways that has nothing to do with reducing the size of larger schools.
- Not if there's more demand for the larger schools
- Not if the school is good
- No. The proposal to reduce the size of the more preferable schools, is futile. They are already oversubscribed. The division will only further, with less funding and resources made available at those schools. They are heavily subscribed for logical reasons of distance and providing a better opportunity of education.
- No: I think that larger schools perhaps are better resourced due to pupil numbers. I like the Varndean model of smaller schools within the school
- Nobody wants their child going to a ridiculously large school

- Not always. Secondary schools are too big but this must be balanced with quality. You cannot keep poor schools open just to reduce schools size. It would still be better to go to a successful school that is bigger than a poor smaller school.
- Not if the school is doing well.
- No, we have schools already. Large schools can be good, they already exist at the capacity they are, very socially important. Smaller class sizes would obviously help more than small schools.
- Not if the larger schools are the ones currently thriving & oversubscribed. Your plans will make the good schools weaker rather than ensuring the weaker schools get stronger
- Not if the larger schools are delivering better education. That doesn't "balance" the school offer, it simply reduces the average outcomes for children in the city.
- Not if that large school is thriving
- Not at all. I think this is crazy particularly given that many of the larger schools are already over subscribed
- No. Instead of reducing overall places, reduce class sizes instead, keeping admission numbers the same. Quality of education will go up.
- My personal preference for my child would be a smaller school but that doesn't mean that larger schools in the city should be made to reduce in size
- My instinct is that this is probably the right thing to do. But if 'good' schools are reduced in size it is likely to meet with resistance among those with vested interests. But, yes, I would agree with this.
- Keep numbers as they are at the well-performing schools and widen the reach of those schools. In addition, the council should be spending the money that it's spending on this consultation process (how much is this costing, BTW?) and instead invest this in improving the schools that require improvement. This would achieve more equality.
- Larger schools provide a greater school offer, enabling opportunities for broader subjects. There are ways to make larger schools feel smaller - Varndean is an example.
- Larger schools should not be reduced for the sole purpose of propping up failing schools. Students stand to suffer
- Larger schools in the area are well-performing. Schools underperforming isn't based on size
- Larger schools has naturally more to offer when it comes to SOW. At what point should we say stop to the difference of what can be offered in one school compared to another.
- Larger schools benefit from economies of scale and can use reductions in costs on reducing class sizes etc. Large schools have in place pastoral support and house systems which value pupils as individuals.
- Larger schools are that because they are (historically) better, change how the poor performing schools work.
- Larger schools are more cost effective (economies of scale). Successful schools should not suffer the consequences from doing well
- Larger schools are an important part of a child's school experience, opening them up to interactions with the broadest possible crosssections of society.
- Larger schools achieving good, or even excellent, outcomes for their students should not be punished for doing well. Reducing PAN means loss of dedicated and skilled staff who would not necessarily transfer to less well performing schools in the area. Teachers will just as easily commute to schools out of area or non-council run schools in the area. A reduction in PAN means loss of employment for key workers, which would be a slap in the face for their dedication and hard work. Reducing PAN whilst also widening catchment areas reduces opportunities for MOST children, whilst benefiting a proportionately small number of children who were previously

disadvantaged. This is not the only way to achieve better outcomes for disadvantaged children, which we all want. Good performing schools should remain large (within overall reduced required number of places, but proportionately larger than poorer performing schools that are less popular. As you state in your engagement paper, 'government policy prioritises parental preference and reputation over anything else.' Therefore it is likely parents will choose the better performing schools and so places maintained. Longhill and BACA places should reduce if catchment areas are widened, but not close. Once the schools start to perform better and school place need improves in the future they can once again be expanded. Reducing PAN takes 'parental preference away'

- It's not the size of the schools but ensuring there is enough teacher to student ratio and the grounds to support the children in attendance.
- It's not size it's quality of teaching. Theoretically less children should equal better quality. If these schools take on more students will they cope
- It's less about the size of schools and more about the number of resources to run the schools i.e. teacher to pupil ratio
- I would look at enhancing the high performing schools and providing greater access to them as well
- As long as large schools have funding to achieve the right number of staff and facilities
- Any reduction shouldn't hit the larger schools, but on the contrary the schools which are less performing. The larger schools could then take on more kids from different backgrounds.
- Are you saying larger schools, that are more popular choices for parents and students and thus larger, should reduce in size? This would be counterproductive. We were on waitlists for almost a year moving from private to state schools in the area, and the 'good' schools that were popular had no space all year, whilst the schools that did have space appeared underfunded, had poor performance indicators, and were very far from our house. I feel that we were let down by the LA during our period of transition.
- As before, I do not believe over-subscribed schools should be cut. Falling pupil numbers may mean that not all schools can be protected.
- As long as all schools are large enough to be sustainable, I don't see any value in trying to artificially even out the intake numbers.
- Balancing size alone will not necessarily balance the school offering
- Because people want choice if you can't keep schools at Outstanding or Good
- I understand that you need to put options forward, and I'm reluctant to criticise unless I can offer something 'better'. However, that said, having viewed the slides of potential PAN reduction for more 'desirable' schools, simply won't work, as per the recent primary school exercise, where these were all overturned on appeal. So when this fails what is the plan B? There was no mention of this at the meeting. This is entirely for the reason that at the end of the day all parents care about their own children and not the wider picture/greater good. This is just a reality. Social engineering has a variety of undesired side effects.
- I don't think size matters
- Absolutely - all larger schools must reduce to allow all schools to be sustainable.
- I think that the good should maintain their class sizes, whilst you focus on improving schools that require improvement.
- A number of the schools earmarked for a drop in PAN are over-subscribed and likely to stay that way. The proposals will reduce the number of children securing their preferred school when in fact the drop in numbers should mean a higher proportion are able to attend their preferred school. Families will rightly put pressure on over-subscribed schools to consider converting to academy status, and therefore have autonomy over their PAN as is already afforded to schools such as Cardinal

Newman. All three proposals will result in significant disruption to children and will mean that some children will find it harder, or impossible, to secure a place at their preferred school despite a drop in projected numbers.

-

3. Criticism of the Question's Design

- You should be ashamed to include leading questions in a questionnaire. That's against the RSS code of conduct.
- Slightly leading question
- Not necessarily. This is a loaded question.
- This is a leading question and so I answered no as it's not a question that gives a genuine choice.
- Completely pointless question....
- Leading question
- Leading question - if admission numbers are dropping then better options than those in this survey need to be proposed.
- Not appropriate to begin an emotive issue such as this with such a leading question.
- The framing of the questions in leading terms means this survey is completely skewed.
- Terrible leading question. Shame on the person who devised this.
- This is a another leading question. And absolutely inappropriate for the survey
- This is a horribly leading question.
- This is a leading question
- closed question
- Again a leading question
- Again, what appears to be a very leading question designed to provide some support for an existing plan. These first three questions undermine confidence in the process and the council.
- I don't see how this would help all students. This is a very broad question
- I don't think it's about reducing school size but ensuring a good level of education across the city rather than pockets of it. . Your questionnaire is very poorly worded
- Some of these proposals are an absolute travesty.
- Size alone isn't as important as the quality of education provided. What is a "balanced school offer" - just a word salad. Meaningless.
- This a highly leading question and inadequate information has been provided by the council to respond to this question in a meaningful way.
- This is a leading question - school size should be relative to the areas that serve those schools, and the demand to attend them
- This is a leading question where any reasonable parent would naturally say yes. However, it is evident that you intend to leverage such an answer to advance an agenda that will ultimately disadvantage my child.
- This is another leading question.
- Another leading question, if the proposals go ahead families will put pressure on over subscribed schools to consider converting to academy status to have autonomy over their PAN
- Another leading question. If the proposals go ahead, families will put pressure on over-subscribed schools to consider converting to academy status to have autonomy over their PAN

- Another poor question. The question is not a yes/no one, it is far more nuanced than that. The answer is not all the same. Long Hill clearly needs to be much smaller.
- Because this doesn't take into account the locations of the schools and the children attending them, it's a leading question without any background understanding of the strengths and challenges of each individual school.
- Larger schools can have benefits: Who has written this survey? The questions are completely impartial
- Biased question
- I would say yes if you are proposing to open new schools to make them overall smaller. Again I think it's a loaded question. This survey will be skewed but the way the questions are being asked.
- Who wouldn't want a more balanced school offer...have you used AI to create this pointless box ticking survey
- This is far too leading. It's surely not that simple.
- Very loaded question with no scope to suggest alternatives
- This seems like a loaded question to force people to agree to an admissions plan they might not like for their children.
- This questions is misleading and too black and white
- This questions is misleading and out of context of the other options, is absolutely pointless
- This is not an appropriate question. It is leading and Insufficiently well defined, please design an appropriate questionnaire and repeat the exercise after having done so.
- Again too vague. There are so many factors that play in to this. Some large schools are amazing, and some require significant improvements. I don't see how this question is helpful because again it misses so many influencing factors.
- Again, flawed question as no details to support your definition. Larger schools should keep their class sizes in areas where they are being filled
- All the options proposed are reducing the school sizes so this is a pointless question
- Again, a leading question.
- Again, leading question. But yes, smaller schools improve relationships and enable stronger school cultures.
- This question, is incredibly misleading. There clearly needs to be a more comprehensive analysis relative to the proposals presented to enable parents/carers make an informed decision.
- Again, seeking support for overarching approach without addressing the details of this consultation. Duplicitous.
- Again not as simple as the question suggests
- Again too vague a question to answer yes to.
- This question leading and so I will not answer.
- This question is leading and not compliant with the Gunning Principles
- This question isn't about people's views, decisions should be evidence based. Why is the council suggesting 'balance'? Give people the proper information that treats resident with respect.
- Again, this feels deliberately leading. Most people would want smaller schools and class sizes from an entirely selfish point of view.
- I feel like these questions are not nuanced
- This question is ambiguous and leading.
- This makes no sense.
- This again seems like a leading question to validate the councils proposals to reduce numbers in the best schools and to force children into the less well performing schools which have fewer resources such as Longhill.
- Shameful leading question. Shouldn't be allowed to start a survey this way
- Not necessarily! All questions in this survey are leading!

- Leading question. The schools which are underperforming should be supported to raise the standards of ALL schools.
- Leading question without data on number pupils living in each area

4. Community and Social Impact

- You can't isolate a single strand, of poverty, education for example, and use it to disguise the deep rooted multi generational poverty that some children are born to. Tinkering with catchments in covering the budget deficits for a declining birthdate so stop playing games making children bus themselves across the city every day.
- We are against any changes that will undermine local communities... and all of these proposals are likely to do this. As such we are against the proposed changes.
- This isn't the right answer on its own. This could exacerbate already existing issues without the investment to improve schools so they serve their local community in the most effective way
- I don't think smaller schools are more effective, what's needed is schools of a suitable size to meet the needs of the school-age populations in their catchments.
- I think outcomes for the pupils, the experience of being at school and access/location to a school within their own community are far more important factors than something as simple as size which is not an indicator of quality on any level.
- Children should be able to go to their local school in their area, so it depends on the demands in that area. Its important the children can go their local school in their area to build stronger communities.
- Because that would affect the quality of service they currently and could offer their communities
- Larger schools often grow for good reasons including density of population or attractiveness based on high performance. I went to large comprehensive schools and colleges that served their communities well. Accessibility by pupils and performance are relevant factors here.
- As previous I think focus should be on keeping places that are in demand
- I think you make schools thrive by improving the schools not bussing children from areas where parents have spent their life savings, hard earned salaries on extortionate mortgages so their kids can go to local schools.
- It would be beneficial for all if schools had smaller classes.
I would object if it means that students would not live near to their school. Personally, I feel it is important that students live near to their school to help build relationships and support their mental health.
- Make boundaries and options fair for all communities in the city
- Need clarity around retaining of sibling link after the proposed changes.
- No, children should have access to their nearest school
- No. I believe schools that are performing well, offering quality education in and outside of the classroom and extra curricular activities should not be penalised for the benefit of other schools. It is not mutually exclusive to do so, does not benefit the city as a whole and pits communities against each other.
- Not if it means option B, which will split communities and force city centre students to travel a long bus journey every day.
- Larger schools should not have to reduce in size if the demand in the local community is there
- Not necessarily - this is a much more nuanced issue than the question suggests. I'm not even sure what 'a more balanced school offer' even means - it could be anything. School places should be concentrated around the communities they serve, this will mean some areas need larger intakes than others.

- Possibly it depends on the wider implications for families with children already at secondary school with younger children still to go. I have 2 children in a secondary and my 3rd child starts 2026 and I would want him to go to same school as his sisters. New catchment areas may alter this for us as a family.
- Larger schools should only reduce numbers if that reflects the demand in their local population
- not sure what this means. Schools should be resourced to serve the communities they are in.
- No I think if that school is oversubscribed and achieving well then why reduce pupil numbers and in turn force children out of their local communities and make them travel long distances to attend a school miles away
- Not necessarily, the size of schools should be based on the demand in the local area. Therefore the population density of school age children, which can fluctuate. Whilst numbers appear projected to drop in the next 5 years, there is often a cyclical trend and the council's own document suggests preparation for future population growth must be also considered. I don't think it matters if schools are of different sizes, provided a critical mass can be maintained in each and funding is provided accordingly to assist schools with lower numbers to provide the facilities and standard of teaching to allow students to thrive.
- schools contribute to local community and more so when the children can walk to school. forcing them to get bus etc... 50min away is not a sustainable solution and will disrupt sense of local community
- Not at the expense of local families and residents- there must be another way to achieve this
- Schools closer to communities, but smaller to address falling numbers.
- Schools need to cater to the needs of the local areas they support rather than arbitrarily being compared to each other when community needs (including sizes) are totally different.
- School places should be adjusted to meet the needs of children living locally to them. It is no good keeping lots of places at Longhill if the children living in Hangleton need more school places in that case Hove Park or Blatchington Mill would need to increase
- Schools should be able to offer children in their local community a place. Children should not be made to travel over an hour to be made to go to school. Due to the council failing and Stanley Deason shutting there is a major issue with school locations. They should be focusing on improving all schools rather than reducing sizes due to another school not reaching expected standards. Children should not be punished due to council failings.
- According to studies, large schools and large classes can work well but you need high quality teachers, and my understanding is this is a struggle due to budget constraints. Having smaller schools closer to home will always be better than large schools where you need to travel.
- I believe school sizes should be reduced if there are not enough children in the communities they serve to fill the school. I do not agree with reducing school sizes in communities with lots of children who need school places as this will mean further travel for those children.
- Schools should be able to offer children in their local community a place. Children should not be made to travel over an hour to be made to go to school. Due to the council failing and Stanley Deason shutting there is a major issue with school locations. They should be focusing on improving all schools rather than reducing sizes due to another school not reaching expected standards. Children should not be punished due to council failings.
- Schools should be equipped to accommodate the number of children in their local communities. Every child deserves the opportunity to attend the nearest school to

their home, minimizing travel time and enhancing accessibility. Densely populated areas should not be penalized by having to balance student numbers across the entire city.

- Schools should be sized according to the community they serve
- Schools should be the "size" they need to be to support the local population.
- Schools should be the size to serve the demands of the local community. This doesn't necessarily mean large schools becoming smaller. I believe Varndean and Dorothy Stringer are currently oversubscribed so it is hard for me to understand whether the proposed scale of reductions in admissions numbers is appropriate. I don't believe there is sufficient information in the consultation to understand whether pupil reductions should be consistent across the city or different in different areas, and there is no regard for relative demand in different areas.
- Schools should reflect the size of the population in the community they serve.
- Schools should reflect their local areas, if there are a lot of children, you need a big school, big schools provide a larger range of choice.
- schools should remain at appropriate sizes to serve their local community.
- Schools should serve that local community and population density.
- Schools should serve the amount of children within walking distance - size of school should to match birth rates through the years serving that area. Children should not be shipped to out of area to balance books
- This depends on the changes proposed and the effects these changes might have on all families.
- The schools need to be big enough to accommodate the children from their local community
- School size should be driven by local community need and data
- schools thrive best when catering to their local community; smaller schools are not a preferable option to having to travel a long way
- Schools which are big have become that size because there are families living nearby and because they are popular schools. Supply and demand.
- Secondary schools should be the size they need to be to meet the demands of the local community. This doesn't mean large schools should become smaller.
- Should be based on the needs of the area and choices of families
- The school size should be determined by the local community and feeder schools
- Smaller schools are a benefit if they are within a community shared by their friends and are properly funded and resourced to properly offer an excellent quality of education.
- Schools with a smaller population locally of children that go to secondary school should have their size reduced. Children need to be able to attend schools that are local to where they live not have to travel across the city to safeguard schools in areas full of the retired or students
- Reductions should be proportional to demand in local communities, with a priority of keeping communities together. Let class sizes shrink in struggling schools to improve their outcomes. Transfer 3% of income from full schools to those schools instead of cutting 60 places from Stringer and Varndean (less financially damaging) and further displacing students by oversized catchments.
- Reducing the numbers of the best schools in the area makes no sense. Vardeen and Dorothy Stringer are the two schools I would really want my children to attend in the local area. The two schools are over subscribed. Please do not reduce their numbers. If you are going to reduce numbers, look at the schools that aren't over subscribed, and not as desired by the community.
- Perhaps depending on the amount of children in the area the school is located. If there are less children in an area for example.

- People make major life choices based on schools. These should be local resources, supporting the surrounding communities.
- Not necessarily - it depends if there is local demand for these schools. It's important that kids have a local school that they form a community and don't have to travel vast distances to get to school.
- Not if local communities are fractured as a result
- Not if it reduces the ability to provide children with good education to beat their home in their own community
- No, school sizes should be determined by the number of children living close by who need to use them. If the larger schools have larger local demand, then you need to keep them.
- I think reducing school places should be inline with the number of children forecast to attend the school within their own community
- it depends on building capacity and need in the local area
- I found the considerations in this piece (below) to be informative. I would also ask why Brighton and Hove are not looking to other areas for ideas, and ask for further rationale to be given re the other points raised in how Brighton and Hove came to decide the models offered for consultation. My youngest son is not guaranteed to follow his sibling to secondary school in any of the models, which will cause us and him considerable stress. Sibling links are important for families.
- If a school is serving it's community well, is fully subscribed and is performing at a good standard and meeting the needs of it's pupil's I am incredibly against it reducing in size. There is no guarantee it will continue to meet the needs of its pupils if the numbers and balances change. To reduce the number of places available at 'good' schools, and increase the numbers available at schools that 'need improvement' seems nonsensical
- I'm unsure about this, yes if it means children are attending their local school. No if it means more travel
- I'm not sure. Whatever achieves a more balanced mix of socioeconomic backgrounds, and less distinct social stratification
- I think the size of the school should be commensurate with the population they serve. It makes sense for the school to be larger if the catchment is more densely populated
- I think the most important thing is local schools for local people. Distribute the wealth not the catchment areas.
- I would prefer to have more smaller schools, to ensure all children can go to a local school. If there are financial issues with smaller schools, then perhaps the schools can share management, and some specialist teachers so that all of the schools can have a broad curriculum? I think rather than tinkering with the catchments and pitting parents against each other, we should put more resources into the schools in the more deprived areas, until outcomes start to become even and everyone is happy to send their child to their local school.
- I think that children should go to their nearest or most convenient secondary school and if that school has to take more pupils then they should have the funding to accommodate that. Sending children out of area to plump up numbers at less popular schools is not the solution. Less popular schools should have the same education, opportunities and standards as other schools but also should reduce intake and be made smaller.
- I think parents have the right to request the school they want for their child. When all schools are a high standard, that offering will change. But as someone who went to a comprehensive that had a mixed intake, I think the idea that high achieving kids 'pull up' kids isn't true. The divisions remained the same, but the school could make bold claims about inclusion.

- I believe you can have high quality larger schools and high quality smaller schools, and that the aim should be a provision that is high quality and relative to the local community needs
- I believe that local schools need to support the local population, social groups can be ripped apart by being at school that isn't local.
- I believe it's important for children to remain within their communities and improve the communities rather than this silly idea that hasn't worked previously. I've noticed that children in secondary coming from other areas have been really anti social as they do not feel a local connection. They kick and smash things in the local streets people's cars and houses smashing residents recycling and they don't care as they don't live there and nobody knows them.
- I believe families who are able to, choose the area they live in at no small cost, based on the schools they wish their children to attend.
- I agree but some areas will naturally dictate a larger intake because of local populations. It should not be an arbitrary cap where some schools and local children comfortably secure a place and others where it is much more difficult for local children. It needs to be based on a number of considerations.
- Help the failing schools so children could go to a school near where they live
- Depends on the community they serve. Densely populated areas will have larger intakes
- definitely not - some schools are larger due to larger number of children in these areas - why should their size reduce? completely stupid to reduce places in a school serving a large community and forcing children to travel longer to get to a school much further away!
- Children should go to the school closest to them
- Children should be able to go to their local school
- Children should go to a school near where they live and it's not about keeping schools the same size
- Children should be able to attend the schools closest to where they live
- Children and parents should be able to choose to attend a school near their home. Children shouldn't be shipped around the city just to even out numbers.
- But local children must have the right to go to a local school
- A schools size should meet the needs of its local community. The council needs to think creatively regarding funding so that schools are able to serve their local community. Smaller schools in areas where there are less children, larger schools in areas of more children.
- Allow demand to set local school size, not artificially restricting.

5. Broader Educational Equity Issues

- Yes. This would seem to be the only fair way forward in order to ensure access to education for all.
- Again the larger schools which are well performing could offer children from outer areas school places
- Does this help balance? Surely balance is around improving school offer in all schools.
- But I think that Faith and Academies should be compelled to also reduce their numbers
- All children deserve the chance of attending their nearest school which should provide an inspiring experience

- But not at the cost of provisions for SEND pupils who are already struggling to get access to any additional support to help them to thrive
- Church and free schools should be asked to voluntarily reduce numbers in proportion to pupil numbers
- All children should be able to walk to school where they live. There are other ways to improve school performance that doesn't involve additional bureaucracy to limit the choice of parents.
- Fill ALL schools don't expand 1st choices
- Fewer sites will be more cost effective; maintenance savings can be used to fund transport and support for poorer families
- FSM should not be used as the only balance criterion
- I believe that a bit part of education is about the experience of mixing with kids from different backgrounds & cultures. Done right, there is more opportunity for this in larger schools. I also believe that it makes more financial sense to put money & resources in to keeping excellent, larger schools running at max capacity so as many kids as possible can benefit from a great education & as much of the finances as possible can be channelled directly into education rather than building maintenance, etc.
- Fairness please for a change.
- Given the reducing numbers of pupils it is really important that the larger schools reduce in size to enable a fair and balanced offer for children in all areas of the borough.
- I think all secondary schools should be reduced in size and the existing model should change to include a middle school. The current model is damaging to children from ALL backgrounds.
- I don't feel this would help with much. If all schools were the same size then there wouldn't be different environments to suit different kids.
- I think family's should have a choice of where they send their children, reducing the capacity of schools limits this choice.
- I believe that smaller schools can facilitate a smoother transition for children moving from primary to secondary school, given the size difference. However, any shift towards smaller schools should be approached carefully and implemented gradually to avoid confusion from drastic changes.
- This will give also a chance to assess impact / effectiveness of the FSM change for 2025. We also need to wait to see the impact of the change to add VAT for private school fees.
- This will compound the risk of displacement arising from the changes to FSM criteria that the Council has introduced for admissions in Sept 25, which have not even taken effect yet. Those changes should be allowed to take effect and see what results are produced, before deciding to reduce school sizes.
- I think we can have a mix of large and small school sizes, in fact this will increase the opportunity to create a diverse school offer across Brighton. One of the best schools in Brighton - Kings - would be classed as a small school and it's thriving. Whereas Varndean - a larger school - is able to support a higher than average proportion of SEND children's
- I think we should be able to choose schools. If schools are popular and large their PAN should remain high as then they can have more pupils benefit
- I think widening the catchment area of the larger schools - giving more pupils the chance to attend them - is a better option than reducing their intake
- if a school is larger because it is offering a better education should we not be offering more pupils that opportunity, not less
- If every school offered the same provision and quality of education then yes however you are not focusing on the issues which matter which is the disparity between the schools themselves.

- I think this is impossible to answer without considering all the state secondary schools in Brighton and Hove. Therefore we need to include the schools not currently under the local authority's control. Between them Cardinal Newman, Kings, BACA and PACA represent 36% of the current PAN. If the proposed reductions to PANs are implemented and no change is made to the 4 schools outside the council's remit this will increase their share to 38% in 2026 and then 42% in 2030. A realistic proposal for reducing pupil numbers across the city needs to include 100% of the places, otherwise all that will happen is that fewer of the existing PAN will be under the direct control of the council and unable to be adjusted to meet the city's needs. It is particularly concerning to me that 20% of the existing PAN relates to faith schools when Brighton and Hove is officially the least religious city in England (according to the last census) and that these places are excluded from the considerations of the council. It seems odd that Cardinal Newman, the largest Catholic school in England (according to their website), is educating so many pupils in a predominantly secular city. I would remind the council that being non-religious is a protected characteristic under the Equality Act and I strongly believe the council has a duty to take this into account when considering their strategy in relation to school places in order to ensure parental choice. It is also the case that, according to data from the Sutton Trust, Cardinal Newman takes almost 10% fewer children on FSM than the rate in their catchment would suggest. Surely bringing their FSM intake into line with the other schools in the area would go some way towards relieving the problem that the council seems to be trying to solve. In addition the recent changes in admission criteria to improve the selection of FSM children has not been allowed to bed in yet to see if this improves the outcome. Therefore it would seem more sensible to wait for the Children's Wellbeing Bill to be implemented, as government has indicated will be done imminently, in order to be able to engage with the four schools currently excluded from this engagement exercise. This would enable the council to take a true 'city child' view. Otherwise this exercise will simply be a waste of precious council time and resources as it will need to be redone next year.
- If larger schools cost more. But actually if larger schools can take more pupils. Satisfying the same agenda of inclusivity then that's better
- Not if it is at the expense of threatening or reducing opportunities for those who are already thriving
- If this is to the benefit of all children then yes
- If the larger schools offer the best educational outcomes I don't believe they should reduce in size. Priority should be on equality of access and high educational standards.
- I'm not sure what this means. The school offer is impossible in Brighton because you have an academy which you have no control over and two schools next door to each other
- It makes zero sense to decrease numbers in already oversubscribed schools, especially in light of the FSM initiative set to commence in 2025.
- Let people vote with their feet. With reducing numbers we now have the possibility of giving everyone a genuine choice. Let's do that.
- No. I think that schools should provide a quality education and meet demand. I think children and parents should have a choice about their schools and not be limited. If there isn't the ability to scale up and down to meet demand, this sounds like more of a cost saving measure than it does a consideration of the education needs of the area.
- if a large school is required by the area it serves then it does not make sense to reduce the intake for this school
- It takes different school set ups to suit different children
- More places = more choice

- No - this makes no sense. If the idea is to give more children access to good schools, then why reduce school places at big schools? Allow more children to access those places from more parts of the city, not take them away.
- No. I think you should prioritise parental preference in line with the admissions code. I don't see how levelling down popular schools is going to improve school standards across the city.
- I'm not sure. I don't really understand the ins and outs of this aspect. Probably yes, it would be good if larger schools reduced rather than smaller schools having more dramatic cuts to their funding, but at the same time having the option of a smaller school would also potentially be more appealing to me as a parent of a SEND child, as long as it didn't cause catastrophic levels of cuts, so it could have a more positive side. Could there be more partnership working between the larger schools with more resources, and the smaller schools?
Presumably overall though, since the largest schools are so excessively large now, cutting their numbers would be the less damaging option.
- In an ideal world quality, results, and opportunities would be consistent across all schools. I believe this balance to be an "ideology" that is dependant on a multitude of controllable and uncontrollable factors and therefore there will always be some disparity between schools that fluctuates across time. I support reducing the attainment gap for disadvantaged children. I do not support forcing children away from their local schools and communities to drive a balance - this is perverse and damned approach that as we have seen will cause a huge negative backlash from negatively impacted communities. Brighton and Hove which (unlike London for example) has council estates located on the outskirts of town - and therefore there is an inevitable inconsistency in FSM as part of the geographical make up
The only way to truly balance out FSM% across schools is to artificially move children from other areas into that school (an unpopular move) or to close that school and merge everyone into the remaining schools which is something the council clearly don't want to do). I believe we should accept the inevitable and focus on addressing the issues impacting poor performance in the local schools and in parallel, working on the other factors that children who experience social and economic disadvantage, suffer. To reiterate this point the expert advice sought by the council Ref: Professor Stephen Gorard eludes nowhere in his published "studies of improving attainment in other ways", to the changing of boundaries or catchment areas. He does recommend alternative ways of improving "attainment at schools by spending money, focusing on disadvantaged pupils, other than using money directly as an incentive for students and families. It covers studies of health and nutrition, careers information, counselling, community involvement, and the use of technology." By applying this logic - schools in disadvantaged areas with a high pupil premium would be provided superior education quality and standards to offset their disadvantage. A school that applies this would both effectively serve its community and reduce the attainment gap. Good schools and deprivation do not need to be mutually exclusive - City academy Whitehawk is well run and achieving good results for its local community. The pupil premium % is about 66% and with super high SEND - it got outstanding on 4 of 5 categories in the July 2024 ofsted report. This demonstrates you can have good schools in areas with deprivation
- Larger, more popular thriving, sustainable schools should definitely not reduce their PAN numbers to prop up schools that are evidentially failing and in areas of the city where there just aren't enough children to maintain them at the standard they were originally intended. If a school has the space to take lots of children but only has 90 Pan this year, then the council should just repurpose part of the building for something else. SEND numbers are growing exponentially. What about a specialist inclusion unit. This seems an obvious solution to me.

- Not if reducing the size means less children and families are able to get their preferred choice. If a large school is doing well and popular it is unfair to make them smaller, giving less opportunities for preferred choices and giving longer commutes
- Not if these schools are oversubscribed as you are taking away more opportunities for children to get their preferred schools
- Not in relative terms (PAN to birthrate). If a school is thriving, keeping its relative numbers gives more children in the city access to a good education particularly with the new FSM priority policy.
- Not necessarily I don't think size is the main issue here. It's about fair access and choice
- More focus on young people in smaller settings.
- More strain on smaller schools. No noticeable personal effect on changing school sizes for years and by that time, the vulnerable cohort of kids who require extra support, will have left the school system
- Much smaller schools and more provision for SEN kids
- Not necessarily - demand should be a consideration
- not necessarily as this requires forcing some pupils to less good or popular schools
- Not if the schools are the preferred option of many parents
- Not necessarily if it means a reduction in parental choice/ ability of schools to deliver interventions/support
- It is vital that schools reduce their numbers to ensure that ALL children across the City have a fair and equitable opportunity at education.
- People should be able to choose where they would like to send their children. If they are happy with a large cohort so be it
- Possibly but this surely needs to be done across all schools including the academies and faith schools.
- Provide more places as the most popular schools to enable more children to access them
- It is not about school size but giving children the opportunity to attend the school which best meets their needs.
- Not necessarily I think it should be about ensuring opportunity for all.
- Our national system recognises parental preference as incredibly important. Schools that are popular should offer as many places as popular to give parents greatest choice and access to those schools.
- Reducing the opportunity for children to go to large, well resourced schools in favour of smaller under invested in schools does not make sense. So the question, when you apply it to Brighton is not as simple as stated.
- Reducing the size offers less choice of where children can go
- School sizes are not relevant if they are properly resourced and managed. School sizes should reflect the demand for education in the area.
- Smaller schools will be able to provide better care and education for the most disadvantaged pupils.
- Religious schools should have funding reduced as many kids in the council aren't comfortable to use them.
- Surely choice is about supporting the schools that are thriving
- The 3 options don't do this. They reduce spaces in just a few schools, and will increase demand for academy/religious schools that do not have the same restriction in attracting pupils which help their funding. Meanwhile these displace children across the outer parts of the city which are not particularly quick or easy to access.
- The balance of schools should be based on how good they are, not their size. If the free schools and academies have extra spaces, they should be the ones to reduce sizes, not the schools that are oversubscribed.

- This is at the heart of the issue. Reducing numbers in schools like Varndean and Stringer will disproportionately effect those on FSM as there will be less spaces available for them.
- size of school is less important than ensuring pupils have a choice in where they attend school and lessening the disparities between school performance.
- Smaller schools are better learning environments and more suitable for SEND too
- There are a lot of catholic families in this city who should be allowed to choose a catholic school.
- We need to allow time to evaluate how the FSM initiative impacts the school allocation system, before making other changes to PAN and catchment areas.
- Where would these students go?
- This makes sense to provide schools across wider area and ensure more equal access
- They should accept more pupils across different backgrounds so reducing size would not really help
- Think that if a child is best suited to a particular school, they should be able to take as many of those kids as possible
- Thriving schools should be supported to continue to thrive and as many places as possible opened up to increase parental preference.
- While balancing school sizes might seem like a solution, simply reducing the size of larger schools risks overburdening smaller schools, which may lack the infrastructure or resources to meet the needs of an influx of students, particularly those born in the 2014-2015 cohort. These children are already vulnerable, having started school during the pandemic, and they require more than just a "balancing of numbers." The SEND Review (2022) emphasizes the importance of consistent support across schools, especially for pupils whose early education was disrupted. Schools like Longhill, rated as "Requires Improvement", need time and resources to develop the capacity to handle additional high-needs pupils from this cohort. Research from the UCL Institute of Education (2021) indicates that meaningful improvements in school infrastructure typically take two to three years, making it risky to shift vulnerable pupils to such schools without first ensuring readiness.
- This will level out opportunity.
- This can not be fairly implemented across the city due to academies and faith schools
- There should be fairness
- This should be looked on as a school by school basis. If you have the opportunity to reduce the volume of children at a large school then great but otherwise keep the large school.
- With the context being that your proposals to drop pupil numbers the over-subscribed areas will reduce the number of children securing their preferred local school. Clearly to give all children and parents an equal choice, the drop in numbers should mean a higher proportion are able to attend their preferred school.
- To allow a wider range of children to mix in the schools we have. I do not support closing specific schools - this will have the effect of further concentrating inequalities
- While the disparity in quality between schools remains, it seems illogical (and obstinate) to not let more children go to the schools they want - as long as there is space. If we get to the point when all schools are good or outstanding - then I'd be happy to answer yes to this. Also - bigger schools can generally offer more subject choice - which is a definite priority for my children.
- Schools serving more populous or thriving areas might be bigger as a result, and that's fine. There are other ways to ensure equity for individual children than seeking to make all schools the same
- We first need to factor in Kings School and Cardinal Newman Catholic School.

- Yes as long as the other schools are supported to offer the same standard of education especially in regards to SEN provision. To achieve this new schools would likely be needed the gulf between schools like Varndean and Longhill is currently too big for example and Longhill needs immediate action.
- School sizes should be moderated to offer a mix of experiences but enable the benefits of being of a scale that offers transparency and flexible support. Is the school is too small then there is an impact on the quality of education offered. If a school is too large it become too systematic.
- While balancing school sizes might seem like a solution, simply reducing the size of larger schools risks overburdening smaller schools that may not have the capacity or resources to meet the needs of an influx of students. For example, schools like Longhill, which is still rated as "Requires Improvement", need time and resources to stabilize and improve their infrastructure before they can adequately support more pupils. Additionally, the UCL Institute of Education (2021) notes that schools undergoing improvement typically need two to three years to see meaningful changes. If larger schools are reduced and their pupils are sent to schools like Longhill, this could exacerbate existing issues such as inconsistent teaching and behaviour management. The council should focus on improving the quality of education in struggling schools, rather than simply redistributing students, to ensure that all children—especially those with high needs—receive the best possible support.
- Too many pupils equate to larger classes which dilute the teachers ability to ensure equality
- 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.
- Larger schools are able to provide a diverse curriculum (any GCSE) which allows more to students to succeed. Removing places just removes opportunities in to succeed for those lost places.
- Not necessarily. Parents should have the choice to choose the best school for their child and not have a school imposed on them just because some schools are failing due to the lack of investment by the local authority!
- Larger schools provide a wider array of GCSE topics because of their numbers. This create more opportunities. Removing students from those schools is therefore a net disadvantage to the city.
- I think there are economies of scale with the larger schools, reducing the size of these won't simply translate to a more balanced school offer and equity between schools.
- I don't think that would be successful as a strategy - need to look at other habits such as SEND and Arts and STEM provision, academic success, financial viability etc not size!
- Is there any way to change the admissions criteria of the Faith schools? I don't agree with the current faith based admissions criteria as this is unfair on families with no religion, or a different religion to the schools. At the very least, I think they should agree to be bound by the new rule about taking more children on free school meals, as they have the lowest figures for this.
- I feel there should be more choice in the obviously more deprived areas of the city
- I do not feel the size of the school is what matters. More what the individual school offers and to who it offers
- But balance the size with a freedom of choice based not only on geographic location and a distance based selection policy. Poat codes should not determine educational or academic futures.

- Depends on whether this is sustainable. If you can reduce size will you still keep existing schools open. Maybe you could modify existing sites to be 2 separate schools with smaller numbers? You need to set up more SEN only schools.
- Dependent on their popularity- parents should have the option to send their child to a thriving school rather than having to prop up a failing one.
- Demand is created through the density of students within a local area. Certain schools are already oversubscribed or will be through proposed changes causing more disappointing and reducing families from being able to access local schools.
- But choice over what school to attend must be maintained
- Any changes to school size must be informed by a full and proper equality impact assessment. Including assessment of how that impact will be felt across different parts of the city.
It cannot be that schools are closed because they are deemed to be 'failing'. Schools need support and investment to deliver quality education and support for their learners.
- The proposals draw heavily on balancing the number of pupils on Free School Meals (FSM) at the expense of ensuring children can attend a local school to which they can travel independently. The council has already introduced an oversubscription priority for secondary schools that entitles children on FSM to be considered for a place at their chosen school ahead of all other children in the school's catchment area.

6. Child Wellbeing and Development

- Whilst on paper this may make sense, the reality is that due to population density, and both the physical and human geography of Brighton, reducing and increasing intake of schools will mean children having to make ridiculous commutes across the city. This will have a huge negative impact on their physical and mental health.
- I do not think it is a good idea to have schools with 10 form entry. Varndean and Stringer are too big to offer the level of attention pupils need
- Depends on what this would. Mean for all children affected
- Children take time to visit schools and weigh up their preferences before school applications are submitted and yet there has been no attempt to engage them directly on how they would feel about missing out on their preferred school and instead travel long distances to an unfamiliar part of the city. This suggests that the proposed new catchment areas are not based on children's wishes and feelings but are to force children to travel longer distances to balance the proportion of pupils on FSM in each school, whether they want to attend that school or not. Children should be able to choose their local school if they wish.
- Whilst balancing out pupil numbers between schools may seem logical on its own, in reality it brings many issues, such as distance to travel, will parents want their child going to a school that's not their first choice etc. All these factors and consequences need considering.
- Big schools are more impersonal and children don't receive the same level of pastoral care
- but ONLY if it means that all schools get support to change and offer pupil lead solutions which support children to achieve within their own level
- I think rather than forcing and social engineering children, we should make more schools attractive and think about children welfare more than trying to make changes to serve grown up egos!
- If schools are funded on a "per pupil" basis then the question must be asked. What services, activities, clubs or facilities will be lost due to a reduction in funding

because of the reduction in size? How does this support children to "achieve and thrive" as per your previous question?

- Not sure that size of school is directly correlated with performance. Spatial distribution of children, travel times and public transport options, and school performance among other things is much more important to consider than a broad statement that larger school should reduce in size
- smaller class sizes would make more difference
- Smaller classes could focus better learning
- Children's needs can get lost in larger schools.
- Centralising of specialist teaching leads to better outcomes of all spectrums of ability
- I believe work by my husband Adam Dennett has shown that the geography of the city that this will involve children living next to large schools doing well will face long journeys to schools not doing well, increasing pollution from cars and taking time away from rest, community and homework. I also understand there is evidence from studies showing that shipping better off children into failing schools doesn't help the children who live locally to that school.
- I think the larger schools in B&H struggle with meeting the needs of some children. Smaller schools struggle to be sustainable. The main issue is the location of schools in Brighton. If there was a school on the COMART site, with a mixed Deans, Whitehawk, Hanover, Kempton catchment, you would achieve a social mix, less travel time for Whitehawk children and a sustainable school. It could be paired with BACA so parents get a choice of school, with distance/ease of transport one of the priority categories (after LAC, EHCP, FSM, SEND support, young carers etc) in the event of oversubscription
- Having a child who has just left Stringer and with friends with children at Stringer and Varndean it's clear the schools have got too big and they've lost control, by trying to bring about control they are not teaching children as individuals and giving them opportunities to thrive, they are trying to operate a command and control principle. In contrast BACA and Longhill are much better at treating children as individuals but due to the low pupil numbers have a lack of resource to be able to thrive as a school community
- Larger schools are very difficult to manage, it is hard to look after the needs of all children in a huge setting, difficult to look out for signs of bullying because of sheer number of students, more difficult to provide differentiated curriculum based on ability
- some areas have more kids and need larger schools or there may be less schools in a particular area which means the schools that do exist need to be larger to accommodate kids from the local area without them having to travel further across the city - large schools can offer great opportunities for kids when it comes to making friends and choices available due to larger schools which can mean more subject options etc
- Individuals need an individualistic approach. Children need nurturing - smaller schools will offer this opportunity
- We have seen the impact of the closure of Stanley Deason School and the impact that had on the children in the Whitehawk Area. They have no choice about where they are educated and currently they either attend Longhill or Brighton Aldridge City Academy (BACA). Only Longhill has a direct bus to the school. Those children who attend BACA have an even tougher journey because they have to get 2 buses to school thus resulting in them needing to leave home much earlier than their peers at other schools. This impacts on their performance and energy levels at school. The closure of any school will have a huge impact on children. The way to ensure that schools will not be closed is to reduce the number of pupils
- No sure, it would depend on what school can offer to children's needs
- Pastoral care in huge schools is difficult to deliver well. Better to have smaller schools where teachers can know more pupils well.

- Some children work well with large school environments and some with small
- That relies on an assumption that social engineering will solve your problem which I don't agree with. So the Council allows a school to fail and then the solution is to send children from a school performing well to an underperforming school miles away from their home? This would negatively impact children's futures so I don't see how anyone could support this
- That would definitely help with children that struggle in a very large school environment that can be too noisy and overwhelming.
- The current model of large intakes does not support the social and emotional needs of all pupils. This is an opportunity to offer more support.
- Making children travel longer distances will lead to a number of issues - including poorer attendance and lateness, not being ready to learn for the day, breaking up communities and support networks, impacts on mental and physical health, less ability to actively travel and take part in extracurricular activities, as well as more congestion and emissions.
- Sending children from Woodingdean to Lewes is time consuming, expensive and has a negative impact on children's mental and physical health. By sending children from Fiveways (DS/Varndean catchment) to fill the empty spaces, the problem just gets bigger and more widespread.
- No not when they are currently oversubscribed and the outcome will be bussing children around the city to attend schools far away from their home when they could so easily attend a school within walking distance.
Issues that will be caused are:
Traffic problems / pollution
Safety for young children commuting well over an hour to school.
Department for Education Travel to School for Children Statutory Guidelines for Local Authorities states that the journey time for a secondary pupil should be 75 mins maximum but it would be more than that for my child if they had to go to Longhill
Detrimental to wellbeing, health, sleep
Loss of community
Loss of time for homework and hobbies
- Schools like Varndean have subdivisions into "small schools", which means the individual student does not get lost in the crowd despite the school being quite large
- Too much teaching to the average rather than allowing talent to grow and excel
- The balance that this would achieve is purely from the school's perspective and not the children's. More specifically it creates a balance of numbers across the schools which is at odds to the distribution of children across the city. The net result being that it forces more children to have to travel long distances to school than would otherwise be necessary if the schools were sized appropriately for their local communities. Reducing the size of schools in densely populated parts of Brighton, simply to force them to go to schools in less densely populated parts of Brighton feels like a blunt instrument to subvert their choices, by taking away their options. Making children travel longer distances will lead to a number of issues - including poorer attendance and lateness, breaking up communities and support networks, impacts on mental and physical health, less ability to actively travel and take part in extracurricular activities, as well as more congestion and emissions. As per my earlier response, this means that the whole system cannot support all children to achieve and thrive.
- I think the option to choose a larger vs smaller school is important to parents and the needs of their children. There is an important opportunity to offer larger schools
- I had, before my first child started at one of the large secondary schools, worried about the size of the school. But I have revised my concerns as it seems to me that size gives the school the ability to scale and gear up for different needs, in a way that smaller schools probably couldn't. Children are not one size, so there is no schooling

approach that can fit all. It feels logical, and in my experience works, for a school to have the scale, size and community model that can dynamically section off into different needs - emotional, physical, learning ability and personal circumstance. To me it seems that the two large schools you are probably referring to (Varndean and Stringer) have in their own way built the large scale model into a positive operating system that the proposal could break. Our own experience of Varndean is very positive, in that it is well set up for dealing with lots of different kinds of children as they enter early adulthood, and all the emotional and mental challenges that come with this stage of life. Parents of children who have siblings looking forward to the same experience will be understandably feel greatly concerned that your sweeping proposal will curtail the schools ability to build upon the benefits of working at this large and community based model. And, again, to create such an unequal experience within families, between siblings, is cruel and inconsiderate of the longer term consequences.

- Concentration of specialist facilities and teaching staff a larger school can provide will help all of the ability spectrum. Centralised excellence is the delivery model that works in healthcare and higher education, it is obvious that it would benefit secondary education
- As long as teacher to pupil ratios are reduced as a result to support the evidence that this is typically in the best interest of children
- Balance is a must not only for the children but for the teachers as well

7. Implementation and Evidence

- You only increased number five years ago
- I do not see this as a point of principle as implied by the question. It all depends on the detail of the proposed options...
- Define 'balanced school offer'? This questionnaire is has been composed by a moron. Do senior management review these questionnaires before they are published?
- Going to school locally with neighbouring children and being offered an education that good for each child is important. Please define larger schools - is it large compared to the smaller ones, is there an enrolment number tht is too high. Please explain what a more balanced offer is. Each child needs their school to be local, you can change school sizes arbitrarily.
- I do not have any detail or analysis to arrive at such a conclusion
- I don't mind how it's achieved but the current approach is unfair
- I don't believe this could be applied as a blanket policy
- I don't understand enough about the context of the question to appreciate the link between reducing schools and a more balanced offer
- Proper data analysis is needed to assess this. The data would suggest the only reason you are reducing some schools is to artificially push kids out to a school they wouldn't choose. Children should not be treated as a budget tool in this way.
- Reducing The school size does not necessarily mean that the school offerings will be more balanced
- Is that the main driver of inequality between the schools and the main way of fixing it?
- If demand is there, perhaps some schools should maintain numbers. Can you explain more about why reducing numbers creates a more balanced school offer - what does this mean?
- More balanced how?
- it very much depends on the wider impact, not a question that can be answered in isolation

- Larger in and of its own provides no information as to other key points such as whether a school is oversubscribed and thriving. It would seem nonsensical to seek to fix something that ain't broken
- 'more balanced school offer'? What is that supposed to mean?
- I don't understand the question. I don't understand what the balanced school offer is. Being literal, I say no as it makes no sense to reduce numbers at a popular school.
- I don't understand this questions. What is a balanced school offer?
- Reducing the size of schools that are performing well seems nonsensical. There are many more factors at play than simply school size when considering a balanced school offering across the city. This question is an oversimplification.
- School size does not necessarily correlate to offerings, why is this stated as fact?
- There are more creative solutions than this brute force one
- There isn't sufficient information in the consultation to understand broader pupil reductions across the city and what is appropriate. There's no regard for relative demand in different areas.
- I think that secondary schools in B&H are too large but that it is potentially disingenuous to suggest that reducing sizes will create a "more balanced" offer
- Not sure what a "balanced school offer" means???
- There are some benefits and some drawbacks to larger schools - it's not an either or option. Some should be larger than others for various reasons
- Yes, with shrinking pupil numbers that follows from my previous answers. But the largest secondary school in the city, which also has the smallest proportion of PP pupils, is not included in the Council's proposals for reductions.
- Wouldn't it be more useful to ask people for their ideas about how to address their concerns around schooling? Or present a genuine range of policy ideas for respondents to rank
- Outside of education professionals no reasonable reader can be expected to understand the various options and their pros and cons, that can be used to create 'a more balanced school offer'. The data from the question isn't useful as people are effectively answering the question based on what it means to them rather than a shared understanding of what it is actually asking
- the assumption here being that the former will automatically ensure the latter
- There is insufficient information available to have a meaningful fact based opinion on this question
- There is no accessible information in the consultation to give more context. There is not enough information for people to give a genuine and informed answer to this question. There should be clear links to additional information for those who would like to know more context. Again - another shocking leading question
- There is no enough information for me to reply to this question
- There is not enough information to decide if this is a workable proposal. You should be ashamed of yourselves.
- This is not a simple 'yes' or 'no' question - there are so many factors to consider
- This is not a question that is possible to answer as you are not giving an alternative.
- This question does not provide a summary of the evidence around impact of school size on outcomes
- There appears to be a lack of evidence to support this as a proposal that will increase 'balance'.
- This is a hugely complex question to be putting to the general public. There are lots of factors to balance and this is your decision to make with DfE input and others. Big schools have upsides and downsides, just as smaller schools do.
- This would be better and give more options.
- How would school size reduction create a more balanced educational offer?
- This would depend entirely on how this would be done.

- This would depend entirely on the specific circumstances of the schools in question. More information needed to provide a sensible answer.
- Unsure depends on impact Unsure depends on impact
- Unsure of implications of this
- for some yes, for some no - it depends entirely on context. And this context may include demand, supply, geography (absolute and relative location compared to where student populations are). Cannot answer this question without more information supplied.
- Evidence about school sizing impact is not clear in proposals
- Without knowing the background this is a very leading question. Why would cutting places in larger schools create more balance? When you know the context what you're actually asking is should places be cut in good & outstanding schools to force more kids into requires improvement schools then my answer is no. This is simply placing more children in schools with lower outcomes.
- Without further info, it's hard to answer that another. If you reduce larger schools do you make smaller schools bigger?
- I think the schools should comment on this and evidence provided for me to make an informed decision
- While the question is misleading, the right question is, why do we need to reduce the numbers from well-functioning schools with plenty of kids living nearby.
- Where appropriate that makes sense.
- What does a more balanced offer mean? Very badly phrased questions so far in this survey
- This would need detailed analysis of current demand and could not be deployed without evidence based review
- What does a 'more balanced school offer' entail.. This is opaque and needs to be examined in far more detail than a yes or no question. (it should read 'offering')
- What is the benefit of this approach? Without meaningful context, this question has low value and little ability to support your decision making process.
- Unsure without data
- This is an ambiguous Q - you have not defined "a more balanced school offer".
- This feels like a very rushed plan, why reduce pupil numbers in well performing schools?
- This depends on various factors meanin a simple yes or no is too simplistic.
- No data has been provided to confirm the impact of reducing the size of the larger schools on the outcomes of those schools or the impact of broader factors stemming from this approach such as the impact on student travel across the City as consequence of the options presented.
- The information provided is not enough for parents, pupils, schools and any other interested parties to make an informed decision.
- relocating a failing school to an area where there is actually a demand for it would be surely be a better use of time and energy. This seems very experimental. I hope the champions of these proposals will be held accountable.
- Please elaborate on how a reduced size would create a more balanced offer
- Perhaps, but there are more options which would also achieve a more balanced school offering
- Not without an evidence based analysis on what this would do to funding and how it would provide long rather than short term solutions.
- not using the plan you're suggesting
- Not sure of the question
- not necessarily. I don;t know what is meant by 'a more balanced school offer'
- Not everything is the same. Stop trying to socially engineer everything.

- Not enough information to make this assertion. It may or may not be the right approach
- Not enough information to decide pros and cons.
- Not enough information
- Not clear what a 'balanced offer' means. How does school size relate to that?
- Not clear that this exercise will achieve that....
- Not enough information has been provided to make an informed decision about this. But my instinctive feeling is that it doesn't make sense to reduce opportunities for children to attend good schools
- not as a rule, no
- Depends.
- Depends what that really means
- No I don't think that is necessarily a solution
- No idea on what evidence this question is based on
- No - I don't see a connection between size and offering of a more balanced school offer - the two things are mutually exclusive!
- I do not believe there is any evidence in the literature that suggests social engineering methods and displacing large numbers of children from communities with high performing local schools, and requiring them to travel many miles by public transport to attend schools requiring improvement, will achieve the same goal.
- Just because a school is large it doesn't mean it isn't balanced or doesn't provide a balanced offer.
- It's unclear what 'a more balanced school offer' means
- It doesn't matter if I think yes or now this should be based on carefully analysed data not opinions.
- It depends.
- It depends on the situation,
- It depends on the situation. Can smaller schools accommodate all pupils both now and in the future?
- It depends on the impacts. It's such a big question for a binary yes/no
- Impossible to answer this question without contextual information. Large schools may be an excellent solution in many cases.
- I'd need more information on what that reduction should be before committing to this kind of question.
- I'm not sure if school size is one of my major factors, and I'm not sure what a balanced offer means.
- I'm not sure the best approach here
- If this is what is necessary
- I would need to see evidence to show what the proven benefits and disadvantages are of large or small school sizes
- I would like to see evidence as to why this would be helpful in Brighton.
- I'm unsure about this because nowhere in your background documentation have you furnished us with the information outlining what the repercussions of doing so might be for that school. What are the thoughts of the teaching staff on this matter? Again, all we are being presented with is a rather bland overview document with three different ways of cutting up a cake.
- I think this impossible to answer without know more data.
- Any consultation would need to show that there would be enough spaces in each school for the projected number of children in that catchment - so I'd like to see breakdowns on the projected pupil numbers by area, if you decide to have a full consultation. We don't want to end up in a situation where some catchments have too many children and some miss out on a place.

- I haven't seen evidence that reductions should be targetted at larger schools, rather than, for example, poorer performing schools.
- I have chosen 'no' but what I really mean is 'not necessarily'. A thriving, successful school should not necessarily reduce in size. Surely there are economies of scale in education and schools need to be of a certain size to provide value for money.
- I don't think this is an appropriate yes/no question. For a start, what does "more balanced" mean? And what possible downsides could there be to this approach?
- I don't think this will solve the issue, and causes other issues in terms of travel and poor sustainability planning. There are other far reaching problems pertaining to decades of under funding, austerity, cutting funding for sure start centres and the cost of living crisis which means that schools are in desperate need of long term investment and funding.
- I don't think it's been made clear how this would benefit all schools
- I don't really have enough information to inform a decision on this.
- I don't know whether school size alone is a relevant metric
- I don't know what you mean by a balanced school offer
- I don't know enough about this
- I don't know
- I don't see how reducing larger schools is needed to 'balance' the educational offer of others. Reduce the size of those struggling so more pupils get to go to the better schools instead.
- I am not sure what the evidence is for this. Is the issue the size of the schools, or something else? If the largest schools are also the most successful ones, what is the rationale for reducing them?
- I don't see data to support this statement and would point to many large schools in other urban areas that achieve excellent pupil offerings
- I don't see how a school being large makes it better
- I don't know that smaller schools will create a more balanced school offer
- I don't have enough information m, this is very cryptic a question.
- I don't see how this has an impact really
- I am unsure and would want the heads of education and teachers to decide what is best
- I am worried that oversubscribed schools are a disaster waiting to happen: How can the infrastructure adequately support such uncontrollable growth?
- I don't know enough to answer this question
- I am not sure how size impacts balance
- I don't have the expertise to answer this question and there is not enough information provided within the consultation for me to provide an informed answer.
- I don't have a view on this question
- I am not willing to answer this question as it is far too leading. You have not supplied adequate information to answer this question
- If there is data or analysis that shows larger schools are demonstrably higher quality than smaller schools by virtue of their size, that there is a minimum or optimal size of school to maximise quality, and the improvement in quality is worth the 'costs' in transporting additional pupils from more local larger schools to smaller schools then that is missing from this proposal.
- Can you provide more context around this question? I see no issues in larger schools provided this doesn't mean that child to teacher ratios are different across schools. For example, larger schools can provide more opportunities for children who struggle to find friends have the ability to find a group of other children with similar interests or maybe a more diverse extracurricular offering. However, the if class sizes are increased instead or extracurricular offerings are oversubscribed then this would just be devastating

- I am unsure what the purpose of making all schools the same size would be (if that's what you mean by balanced?). Size of school should surely be dependent on distribution of children throughout the city, demand for type of education being provided, size of school site etc
- I am not sure what a balanced school offer is (I have googled this and have no further answers).
- How is this possible?
- Based on the little evidence presented I don't believe I can answer this question.
- Anything that provides a more balanced offer should be considered, but what do you mean by "more balanced offer"?
- Another weird question that makes little sense without context. Do larger schools not create a balanced offer? Citation required*
- Again, the question needs more context but in principle, the answer may well be no.
- (Context and qualification important here)
- "That that"? Fewer larger schools, or more smaller schools? more smaller.

9. Geographic Distribution

- Yes, there needs to be a more even spread.
- Places should be proportionate to the demand in the local area.
- School size does not necessarily equate to balance. Brighton and Hove is a large city with specific needs for each area.
- only if new schools are built
- I don't feel this is important and schools that are larger should have a greater catchment area.
- I am not sure. I think that in the city as a whole you want schools that excel in certain areas, and this might imply some degree of scale might be needed (I am thinking not all schools can have swimming pools for example). I think key is transport. I lived 10 miles from my secondary school, but there was an easy bus link so it was fine. So while all schools should be accessible, this can be done by transportation, so you can't look at schools without looking at transportation (BTW - I am a professor in educational economist at Sussex - hence the fairly academic answer).
- I not sure reducing the size of schools achieves this aim. There should be sufficient school places at good schools close to where the demand is
- If they are located in densely populated areas and are popular then they should not be forced to reduce... perhaps they could take over/partner with other schools? Like the London Challenge?
- As long as all children in catchment area get a place
- I'm not sure actually. I'm just not sure how you make middle class kids go to Longhill and BACA. Maybe pick up Stringer and put it in Whitehawk.
- In theory yes. It is good you are planning ahead and considering how birth rates may affect places needed. Given that our council has such a high level of debt, I do question whether it would be better to sell one of the spaces. I do understand if you lose facilities it may pose problems in the future. My children have nearly completed their secondary education but I wouldn't like it if a school near me closed. That said children are travelling across the whole city unnecessarily to reach schools where own criteria are applied.
- I think the size of the school should be dependent on the surrounding immediate population.
- I'm unsure. I think if families in East Brighton want the option to send their children to the larger schools in Brighton and Hove, the PANs should not reduce at this time. But

I also understand that this would make things even harder for BACA and Longhill. This is a constant debate in my head that I can't resolve.

- It should be about where the students are. It is not a tick box exercise.
- If the city wishes to improve the outcomes for children in schools that are under performing, I believe it is the responsibility of the council to deal with the root cause issues with those schools, by providing increased human and financial resources and sharing proven teaching methodologies from high achieving schools, to improve its performance. A good example of a school which has recently trodden on this path in the city, is Balfour primary school; which received a 'needs improvement' OFSTED report a couple of years ago, and following a change in leadership, support from other high achieving schools, and the support of its local community, is now a 'Good' school, and achieving fantastic results.
- Larger centres of population naturally need larger schools. If our larger schools are succeeding, maintain their size to maximise the chance of pupils benefitting from high quality education.
- Only if any reduction can be offset by other quality schools within a mile or two of the school reducing in size.
- It's completely dependent on the level of demand in the locality.
- Not without seeing a detailed analysis of where pupil numbers are concentrated in the city. Some of the biggest schools are in areas where there are higher concentrations of pupils living within walking distance. Surely we would still want pupils to be able to walk to their local school, rather than have the additional burden of taking motorised transport of any kind to get to a school miles from their home, just for the sake of evening numbers?
- Numbers of students should be spread evenly across the city. There should be an even distribution of advantaged and disadvantaged students across all schools.
- Only if it means that more children can go to school close to where they live.
- Only if it positively impacts all children in the catchment area
- School places should be located based on demand (a product of population, public transport accessibility and popularity). Children in more densely populated areas should not be forced to make long journeys to create schools of balanced sizes.
- Without offering the most deprived areas more than one option of school, reducing the numbers in larger schools will have little or no effect
- Whether large or small the school in this area need to be available to all People.
- Schools should serve those that live closest to them to avoid unnecessary journeys in an already polluted and congested city. Your proposal doesn't set out where you expect pupil numbers to fall - is it throughout the city or in particular areas. The schools should reflect the number of pupils living nearest to them.
- The infrastructure is there - why waste it?
- The larger schools seem to be in higher populated areas, so it doesn't make sense to reduce the places available. This will just mean that more students will have to attend currently failing schools, which is not up to them to improve.
- This could affect geographical access, with disparity across the city
- This doesn't make sense - school size should be determined by the number of children in the area, so that all children can attend a local school.
- Unsure, larger schools in larger catchment areas might make sense to best serve the local population. Ideally we would have more schools with a more equal spread of students but I don't see more schools opening as likely
- What is this based on? Shouldn't schools be where the kids are? Where the parents are?
- School size should depend on how many people in the area need the school; I would rather my child go to a larger but local school than a smaller school that they have to travel in gridlocked traffic to get to.

- What is a "balanced school offer"? Balanced geographically across the city? All schools the same size? Some children will thrive in small schools, others will benefit from the wider opportunities a large school can offer.
- We only had the choice of one secondary school so if it was smaller my children would have had to travel a long way and pay a lot to do so. We were told that they were not able to apply to the other 2 secondary schools that were within walking distance as not in our catchment. There was no choice at all. What schools need is proper funding to buy resources and to pay for experienced teachers rather than having no money for those teachers and just employing inexperienced ones. There needs to be a balance.
- Unsure- this might depend on concentration of children in different areas and the ability to provide good facilities and educational standards for all of these schools This would significantly reduce parent choice
- The fact this city offers a range of size of schools is a good thing! Some children need a smaller school to thrive. Quieter corridors. Closer relationships with pastoral staff. An easier transition from a smaller primary school. Other children benefit hugely from the breadth of curriculum options and extra-curricular activities that a larger school offers. As a city we embrace diversity: this should extend to our schools as well.
- The demographic of each school should be similar for each school to give each child the same opportunities in their education. Size should not be the predominant factor, equal opportunity should be the prime rationale.
- the best school should be the closest school - but some local schools are chronically hampered by larger schools hoovering pupils getting larger budgets - not something that can be solved by LA alone as the distribution on funds is based on pupil numbers
- Please listen to data led analysis such as that by Adam Dennett to see that reduction in PAN at oversubscribed schools is not the only solution. Accelerate Longhill's PAN to your 2030 target, or re-situate a school to better serve East Brighton rather than trying to re-locate children in from an unreasonable distance in terms of health and wellbeing.
- The 2025 applications (with new rules for people with free school meals) hasn't happened yet but it is likely to have a significant impact on numbers and makes boundaries for the purposes proposed less relevant. That makes this process incredibly poorly timed. Where are the option to remove the boundaries entirely, retain the existing boundaries or changing the selection process another way? Almost all the options look terribly cruel ways of making proportion of families lives harder, more expensive with longer commuting distances and more traffic... for what? To force people into schools they don't want to go to, as a way to make a temporary adjustment to chronic underfunding?
- Young families are being priced out of the city. However with rate of new affordable new builds flying up, surely you are addressing this and hope to boost numbers in the city?!
- Schools should be balanced but the drop in pupil numbers is a cyclical phenomenon- just a few years ago you were planning very similar changes to catchment areas because pupil numbers were going up....why not invest money in the worse performing schools instead of costly consultants and catchment modelling exercises
- Schools of fingerling sizes should not be an issue. This will change as different areas flex as their population ages and regenerates
- Schools need to meet demand so schools in areas with more children need to cater for larger numbers
- School sizes should reflect demand. If the area around the school has a high population of school age kids then I feel it's unreasonable to reduce the school size

and expect children to travel far to an alternative school just to keep schools across the city a similar size

- School sizes should be gradually shaped to suit the demographic and transport adjusted geographic needs of the city, according to forecasts that withstand scrutiny, in relation to outflows/inflows expected with other LAs (e.g. East Sussex), with detailed models available to the public.
- School applications reflect demographics and parental choice. Reducing the size of popular, well-regarded schools is ignoring the information parents are sending you. Rather than reduce the size of the city's most popular schools, expand their catchment to allow more disadvantaged children to join them.
- Reducing school places need to be in line with demand. The Brighton Aldridge Catchment has significantly more places available than demand would suggest. Whereas The Hove Park / Blatchington Mill and Varndean / Dorothy Stringer Catchments currently appear to have more projected demand than places available. therefore it would make sense to not reduce spaces from the Hove Park, Blatchington mill, Varndean and Dorothy Stringer and instead reduce spaces from the Brighton, Aldridge catchment area.
- Pushing for greater blending of intake is the only way to uplift schools currently forced to take all the kids from communities the other schools don't want. Brighton & Hove is a small city! It should be possible for all local children to be 'in catchment' for all bn1, bn2 and bn3 schools
- Pupil numbers should be spread out across all schools within Brighton and Hove
- Possibly, but in direct correlation to very available demographic data, not just according to "directive". Such data should be made public and part of any consultations, without which the exercise does not carry much meaning.
- Popular schools are too big, but the history of Brighton schools has shown how difficult it is to expand less popular schools.
- Only if the demand for these schools is not there. If there is demand due to its location in the city, and the quality of provision, I see no reason to reduce its capacity. Schools such as Longhill which have an unrealistically high capacity should be forced to reduce in size, as the demand clearly isn't there.
- Obviously schools shouldn't be overcrowded
- Not necessarily. Schools in areas with the most children should stay as large as they need to be. Schools in less populous areas should reduce.
- Not necessarily. Some sites are larger than others, some in more densely populated areas than others. If schools are already established to cope with scale, why alter them?
- Not necessarily. It has to take account of local context (population, proximity etc). And not if the outcome is shipping children around the city to balance things.
- Not necessarily. If a larger school has better facilities and can support the children that live close to that school then I don't see that it matters how big or small the school is. The number of places should reflect the proximity of pupils in the areas so that they can go to a school that is close by. Overall the distribution of schools in the city is really unbalanced which is a problem in itself.
- Not necessarily. Ideally there would be larger schools in larger catchment areas and/or higher density areas. Either that or more schools.
- Not necessarily if the school can cope with the size and it means children can attend their local school
- Not if the schools are larger because more people live in those areas or because more people want to attend those schools. It would then seem perverse to reduce the size of those schools. The reductions are also skewed by the schools that are outside the Council's control, and I think there needs to be engagement with those

schools over how their numbers might need to change so that the effect of any changes is distributed more evenly.

- Not if it means the catchment areas then have to swell so pupils from really far away have to go to that school
- Not if it means my kids have to go to school in Ovingdean
- No. It depends on demand in the catchment area.
- My answer would be sometimes yes, but this needs to take into account whether it would be helpful to have options of larger and smaller schools (as some kids will thrive in bigger or smaller environments). It should also take into account housing density, and density of children looking for schools, as a larger school being placed within an area of higher population density makes more sense.
- Maybe smaller schools in the more deprived areas of the city might help them run more effectively.
- Larger schools with less attendees means better education standards. The city is growing, we should not reduce school sizes as it'll bankrupt the city to expand them again in the future.
- Larger schools tend to be in areas where there is higher population of children. I do not believe that by reducing numbers in schools that are already oversubscribed due to high numbers of children in that area is helpful. There is no evidence to suggest reducing school size will balance school offers - where is the data for this?
- It makes sense to try and distribute pupil numbers more evenly across the city and use resources fairly
- It is important to prioritise travel distance and parental preference. Do not cut PANs for oversubscribed schools and force people to travel a long distance to another school, this is completely mad. Longhill is already improving but even those who live near it currently don't want to go there - only around 30% of children in its catchment actually take a place there. You should focus instead on improving the school so that local communities want to use it. This is already happening so you should give the new headteacher time to make these changes. It takes around 2-3 years to turn a school around, which is not a long time. This could fix the problem you are trying to address, along with the new FSM admissions priority.
- It depends on the area. If that area has a high density of children then it makes sense to allow them to go to these bigger schools rather than force them elsewhere.
- In theory but this is not practical given the make up and location of schools in Brighton
- In B&H we have a disproportionate number of very large secondary schools
- If that is what is necessary yes ie. if we were to open a school serving East Brighton better
- If larger schools are serving a larger local population and are well subscribed it does not make sense to reduce the numbers. If they are undersubscribed it may make sense to look at reducing numbers to reflect the demand of the local population.
- If a school is currently oversubscribed due to its location and popularity then reducing its size is the worse thing you could do.
- I would prefer this option that to mess not too much with existing school catchment areas
- I think unpopular distant village schools should be closed. Please don't prop up Longhill when already families are choosing Lewes and alternatives. Or Reduce class sizes and keep the schools.
- I think this should be looked at against current primary intakes and areas. That should dictate the future. If a school needs to close or reduce due to falling levels of families in Brighton whilst dad is the better option than having kids cart around Brighton city to parts they have never visited. We moved here to walk to school and have friends and support on our neighbouring streets as we have no family here. Without school friends we support we would be totally isolated.

- 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.
- I think that school sizes should reflect the number of children living in the area. I am happy if this means that some schools will be larger than others as a result. There are pros and cons of larger vs smaller schools, and different school sizes may suit different children. However, I do think there is a real issue for children in Whitehawk who don't have a local secondary school. I am not sure how this can be addressed though without creating a new school and it was a shame the proposed school at Elm Grove a few years ago fell through. I think this needs to be explored again, perhaps considering whether an existing school could be relocated to this site.
- I think that school size should be considered within the context of the number of children who need access in the surrounding area. I do not think that larger schools should reduce in size if this means pupils having to travel much longer distances to access an alternative school.
- I just don't think that's the answer. Build a new school for the east
- I don't think successful, oversubscribed schools in dense catchments should be forced to reduce numbers to balance the offer across the city. where demand is highest, numbers should be maintained or increased.
- I do not. For example, there are larger schools such as Stringer & Varndean that are oversubscribed and are in a geographical location with lots of secondary school children. Forcing these schools to reduce PAN, and in doing so forcing children local to these schools to attend schools miles away, outside their community, is just bonkers! What the council fail to be looking at is that although pupil numbers as a whole are declining across the city, this is not the trend in all areas. Demand for varndean and stringer remains high, as does their local population. Demand at other schools, such as Longhill, does not remain high and perhaps that is reflective of the local demand (and the fact that many local kids choose to travel to Lewes). Bussing kids across the city to ensure schools with lower numbers get more bums on seats is not the answer! You should see where the demand is and ensure the PAN for each school is aligned to that
- I believe the larger schools are necessarily large due to the dense population surrounding them. I feel like the schools across Brighton & Hove are appropriate to their neighbourhoods
- But only if there are less pupils in that existing catchment area
- But not in areas where there is a high demand for school places.
- As we've seen in the past, birth rates rise and fall. We will be in crisis again with no school places
- Analysis of the distribution of proposed pupil reductions in catchments pays absolutely no attention to current and likely future demand for places based on where in the city pupils live. In fact, the proposals do the opposite - they propose more severe reductions in intakes in areas with already high demand (where more pupils

currently live) and keep intakes more steady in areas where demand is already lower.

- Among other things, different areas of the city have different population densities and accessibility to public transport services so by reducing school sizes you could be forcing children to travel further distances to get to schools. It is also my understanding that schools get funding based on the number of pupils, so by reducing any school in size, you're effectively reducing their budget, which will result in pupils of that school having less opportunities than they currently do.