



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

Question 4: How much do you support the model proposed in "option A"?

1. Travel and Transportation

- This would appear to be the least awful option, though still forcing less walking, more commuting, and schools away from communities
- The areas could be made to make more sense giving more opportunities to walk to school and be with peers who live locally
- Balances some degree of choice with limited distances to travel.
- I can't agree with this option as I live in the street next to Varndean school. My daughters just take 6 minutes walk to school. This option means my neighbours' children could only pick Patcham school in future, that means they need to drive their children to school or children need to walk 30 mins to/from schools. That's absolutely ridiculous.
- A balance of PP across schools is best but transport can be challenging eg Woodingdean to stringer and prohibitive for some families
- All pupils should be able to go to their local school, travelling miles to school when there is one within 800 meters of the pupils house is unfair
- Any adjustment in boundaries should have a 'reasonable' distance to school considered. Those right on the border of a school should be able to attend that school which could be as little as a 5 minutes walk away opposed to traveling long distances on buses. This proposal would offer the least disruption.
- Any adjustment in boundaries should have a 'reasonable' distance to school considered. Those right on the border of a school (such as Varndean) should be able to attend the school 5 minutes walk away.
- Best option of the 3 as means schools still walkable or easily accessible for most students
- Causes least disruption to people in the area. Scraping sibling link will make life much more difficult for working parents. If FSM get first choice anyway then surely try this first before telling everyone to travel miles to other schools
- Children at the top of elm grove have a very long journey to get to Varndean or Dorothy stringer. Whilst children that live at the top of Varndean school field wouldn't get in.
There should be a number of spaces reserved for children who can walk to school.
- Children living opposite Varndean (surrenden crescent) and stringer with a 2 minute walk and 1 road are being sent on a 20 minute walk crossing 2 dangerous roads where there have been serious accidents (old farm road and carden ave) children who can literally see the school from their house can and attend it
- Children need local schools not to travel miles across the city.
- Children should be able to walk to school safely and if going by bus, it should only be a short trip.
- Children who live literally next to the school wouldn't be allowed to go to it and have to travel rather than walk 2min

- Dorothy stringer and var dean should be available to all chicken within a short walking distance of the doors. Expecting those children to bus to schools over an hour away in traffic is absolutely ridiculous
- Disproportionate for Varndean and Stringer. Hoce has lots of secondary schools. Need to consider students right on the door step that can't walk 5 mins to their school and instead have to travel.
- Children will be travelling the minimum distance to school which is good for the environment and mental health. Long hours commuting should not be forced on children and families.
- Families who live on Varndean's doorstep will not be eligible for that school. Seems crazy to make them travel to Patcham.
- I agree to an extent but not if it means a child is travelling too far and there is a local school
- Secondly, this moves Porthall-based pupils into a different catchment area with the nearest school being Blatchington Mill School (a 45-minute walk) followed by Hove Park (a 1 hour walk to the Lower School). The walk to their closest (and obvious choice) schools is considerably less than this. Far less sustainable and would require more transport links and provisions to cope with the increased influx of students. Option needs to be scrapped.
- Free transport needs to be made available to those being asked to travel further Free transport needs to be made available to those being asked to travel further
- Gives us two options within walking distance of our house
- I am not in favour of changing the boundaries because it will mean many children have to travel and be away from their friends
- I believe the priority should be to ensure children do not need to commute too far to go to school. For most year 7 children, the move to secondary school will be their first experience of independently going to school and back and we should ensure this transition is as straight forward as possible for them. Expecting 11 year old children to make long commute that sometimes involves having to take different buses is not acceptable.
- I don't think there should be a change in catchment areas until the council has improved travel for children in Brighton. The bus system does not serve the community and this needs to change before anything else does.
- It means children can walk to the schools in their area and parents aren't penalised for living in their chosen area
- I live BN1 5DF this pulls my child into Hove schools which are really far away from us & would make it an unsustainable journey. Like many we also moved to this area for the catchment area & it's unfair that some of the much wealthier roads just north of us will stay in it
- I do not have enough information about peoples' preferences (parents and children) across the city, in terms of travel distances and school choices. I can see that this option does most to control travel distances at current levels.
- I find it incomprehensible to cut an area that is within a 5 minute walking distance to two high schools. We did not move to an area where we would now potentially have to drive to our child to their high school. We were conscious of the environmental impact as part of our decision to live where we do.
- I live in hollingdean, my I have 2kids in Downs Junior and am a working single parent. I cannot afford or have my children travelling across the city when I have schools within walking distance. I am on minimum wage and and don't want to be discriminated because I live nearer 'middle class' area.
- It means children who live nearby two good secondary schools have to walk to Patcham which is 30 minutes away. This is unsafe and will increase traffic in that area.

- I object to the fact that pupils are not able to go to their closest school. It does not make environmental sense as so many parents will no doubt drive their kids to school.
- I think some priority should be given for immediate proximity to schools. It makes no sense for a child living a stone's throw from a school to have to travel to another town or village. Walking to school should always be an option where possible, and children should not be forced to endure long commutes where it is perfectly avoidable.
- 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 on 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.
- I think the boundaries have been changed in a strange way, it doesn't make sense to have kids in Kemptown travelling out of the city to go to school.
- I think we need to keep in mind the expected distances some of the children have to travel.
- I think this could be the best option relative to the distance that would need to be travelled.
- I would be forced into a terrible school and have no choice but to move house or send my kids to a better performing school with a huge commute. The choice between a commute to a good school versus a shorter commute to a terrible school is a no-brainer. I'd sooner move house.
- If change is unavoidable. Then this adjustment to the existing model makes the most sense in terms of locality, transport and community.
- It now cuts out 3 streets that were already on the cusp of their current catchment area. It will take the walking route from 30 mins to 50 mins and there are poor transport services from our address to schools in the revised catchment area.
- It makes the transition from Junior or Primary School easier, minimises the carbon footprint and maintains a mix of children at each school.
- It's the least change. However for certain areas it will enforce an unnecessary journey. e.g. live opposite Varndean but are forced to walk 40 minutes to school.
- Keeps children local to their school and mostly journeys to a minimum.
- Of the three models, this one feels the less drastic in terms of damaging 'communities' by forcing children to commute across an already congested City.
- With any changes to school catchment areas, I do not believe roads immediately surrounding a school should be affected, as these roads are part of a community, walk to school, and come with large societal benefits.
- Minimal impact on travel distance and travel time. This benefits all children, however is especially beneficial for children on EHCPs.
- Limits the number of children travelling long distances while allowing adequate numbers of pupils.
- Children should attend schools local to their homes and not have a long commute.
- Least amount of disruption to young people's daily lives with journey times and cost of transport.
- It provides the most certainty on which school, and therefore planning for primary schools for siblings. It results in the least travel time for the city as a whole.
- It reduces the need for lots of children to travel large distances to school.

- It will create more traffic and congestion attendance problems
- Maintains choice and does not increase travel time for children
- Much further travel time for my children and unable to be with their siblings.
- My child will have to travel a long way to get to school. Unacceptable
- Our house is a 9 minute walk to the high school in the current catchment area, with this model, the high school would be 31 minutes walk. It doesn't make sense. We would have to use the car, or public transport more, which means having to spend more money as well as not being environmentally friendly, if this option is chosen.
- Out of the three options provided this is the only one that is at all feasible. However I would like to note that this proposal is worse than existing catchment boundary for those living just north of varndean whose children would have to travel a significant distance rather than to a school they live next to
- Option a is my strong preference negates it allows choice and wouldn't cause children to have to travel across the city to their assigned school.
- Option A makes the most sense if there need to be changes. Making just a few key tweaks whilst keeping the important bonds of the children formed through Infants into Secondary is definitely the route to go. Ripping that up in Options B & C and adding the potential of a child in Fiveways having to travel over an hour in rush hour to Rottingdean is an absolute madness. It's totally impractical, let alone the impact on the environment and roads which is something that really needs to be considered.
- The money saved from not having to provide as many school buses and balancing the carbon footprint should be invested in the schools that are not performing as well.
- retains access that would not use fuel or motor vehicles. We think children should walk or bike to school unless there is a significant need or access issue.
- Seems broadly sensible and won't cause extra traffic problems
- Students will have to commute but not across the city too much
- The majority of children have a local school with most able to walk to it.
- These catchment areas seem to be of similar size and make sense for pupils travelling to the schools within them, i.e the distance is not too long
- This option means our nearest schools would be over 3 miles and over 50 minutes walk which would not be possible for my SEND child. This would increase stress and also make school refusal much more likely. Traffic would be hugely increased and where we don't drive regularly this would mean a daily two way trip.
- Will cause massive disruption to traffic and environment
- Safe and reliable passage not guaranteed for all pupils
- Parents will have planned with current catchment areas. Having catchment areas with only one school means families have no choice! Bus routes to many of these are horrendous. Why are our children trekking through town? There should be schools near the sea front.
- There are parts of the city where the travel distance to secondary school is much further than others. Opts 2 and 3 will mean some of these students will have further or more complicated travel to school
- Seems the one that reduces travel time to school for most children. Reducing pollution and busy roads in Brighton and allowing children more time after school to do homework etc, rather than commuting to school.
- The current system is popular with parents and this option most closely matches that. However I am concerned that attendance levels will be reduced the more children have to travel and am unsure why those streets immediately north of Varndean and Stringer are not included in the catchment area. I would like to see the catchment areas most closely matched to minimising transport and encouraging walking and cycling.
- the maps provided are terrible, i can't even see how it would affect our family, but it looks like we would now be in the catchment area for patcham despite stringer being

much closer (walking distance) and varndean (walking distance) it's crazy that your child could be forced to join a school they can't walk to when there are others on their doorstep

- This option means children living close to schools will now have travel in a car or bus across the city to a school out of their community. This increases danger (traffic) and pollution. Less healthy lifestyle.
- This option would lead to children in the Port Hall area having to travel for over an hour to get to Blatchington Mill or Hove Park Schools. There is not a suitable bus route for that journey. This is likely to lead to increased road traffic and impacts on air quality.
- This allows my child to still walk to his nearest school which was a big reason we moved into the area 7 years and does not have that suddenly taken away from us.
- This could lead to our children having to travel an hour across the city by bus in rush hour as supposed to a ten minute walk. This would isolate them from friends and the local community. It will also add strain to the public transport network or lead to more cross city traffic. It will also reduce their opportunity to be part of after-school activities or sports due to the unfair amount of commuting time 5 days a week.
- This ensures my child travels the shortest distance to one of two schools.
- This feels like a focus on balancing numbers rather than ensuring quality of provision
- This feels like it has the least impact to travel times and distances
- This improves the situation, but is close enough to existing boundaries and doesn't cause too many new issues with long journeys to school, broken communities etc etc Most children have the option of a catchment school within walking distance - the exception being children in whitehawk, which I think needs to be addressed, however this is difficult as there is currently no school in walking distance for these children.
- This is the best option out of all options in survey but still not ideal. Traffic around Stringer and Varndean is already awful and needs addressing. Any catchment where children from further away are admitted will only make problem worse. Children who are not entitled to free school meals or don't have a ehcp plan who live in walkable distance are and will be further severely disadvantaged themselves. We should be encouraging children to go to their nearest school by foot. So many benefits to walking and reduce car journeys
- This is the least bad option but will still result in children travelling to a school when they have one much closer. Children should be able to attend their closest school.
- This option doesn't give children in the porthall area of the city a local school that they can walk to
- This is the best option. Changes to boundaries options B and C will have a negative effect on the city, flow of traffic at drop off and pickup times.
- This is the most logical option and one of the reasons we moved homes to be in walking distance to 2 secondary schools
- This model would make students travel further, not sustainable for the environment.
- This one seems most problematic with travel time for fiveways and Preston park being in the Rottingdean catchment - this is an excessive and very busy traffic route. Traffic would increase making it worse than it already is across the coastal road in both directions potentially.
- Why make such minor changes? I live in an area where the boundaries are moving, and this will result in my child have to travel a LOT further, to a school we are less familiar with, away from their friends. The commute will change from one they'll be able to walk (in time) to my needing to drive, or a long walk/bus/walk combination. Longer commute, less healthy exercise - unimpressed.
- We live just to the north of Varndean School and this would move us into the Patcham catchment - which seems crazy as Varndean (and indeed Stringer) are both just a short walk away.

- This option reduces the number of children at two schools where there is demand. Children who live nearby should be able to walk to school. Not have to travel across the city.
- This option removes the area of port hall/prestonville from the catchment of varndean and stringer making the walk to a non church school at least 50 minutes with very limited public transport options
- This proposal makes most practical sense as it means shorter journeys overall to school - reducing pollution and cost of travel for pupils, which is a barrier to accessibility. Schools will be able to foster a better community spirit and foster friendships between local children. Long bus journeys across town should be avoided as they are expensive and tiring for younger pupils (buses often arrive much before the start of school). There is also a safety issues for pupils walking and travelling long distances in the winter, after-dark –particularly when they have been attending after-school clubs.
- This seems sensible for most, but this would still mean long bus journeys for some kids. Who's paying for those? Are you expecting parent to take their kids?
- This seems sensible, siblings will largely be kept in the same schools as well as neighbours. Children will not have to travel huge distances across city leading to increased traffic and pollution as well as very long days for pupils utterly
- This seems the best option, which avoids some pupils having to travel long distances from home to school.
- This seems the most reasonable option. The catchment areas are relatively small and easy to travel around
- This will cause least disruption, cost and travel issues
- This would be dangerous, resulting in kids having to walk miles across dangerous roads, or take a bus in climate emergency. Such as kids who would walk up the road from Surrenden Crescent, would have miles to go to Patcham.
- This would likely have the least impact on travel across the City
- Walking to school should be an option for everyone
- Those living right by a school for example varndean would have to travel long distances for their educations.
- Provides the least disruption and is must logical in terms of travel and geography
- Pupil journeys to school remain feasible
- This would mean that long standing relationships with schools would be broken and my child would have longer to commute too school
- Children in the Port Hall/Prestonville community will be particularly disadvantaged, severing a decades-long relationship with their local schools. Under current catchment areas, children walk around 30 minutes to either Dorothy Stringer or Varndean schools. Option A will move them to Blatchington Mill School (a 45-minute walk) or Hove Park (a 1 hour walk to the Lower School).
- Pupils are more likely to be placed in a school near their home and therefore travel is kept to a minimum for pupils, risks of them travelling across the city, especially in the dark during winter, is reduced. Pupils will be more safe.
- The problem is stringer and varndean are located at the boundary so this is to the detriment of pupils living near those schools yet excluded and having to make significant journeys meanwhile others will need transport to reach those schools. A transport analysis should be done
- The most important thing is ensure good attendance so children can learn and this is more likely to be possible if children aren't having to travel across Brighton to get to school.
- While option A does not address this, of the options it makes most practical sense as it means shorter journeys overall to school - reducing pollution and time of travel for pupils, which is a barrier to accessibility. Schools will be able to foster a better community spirit and foster friendships between local children. Long bus journeys

across town should be avoided as they are expensive and tiring for younger pupils (buses often arrive much before the start of school). There is also a safety issues for pupils walking and travelling long distances in the winter, after-dark –particularly when they have been attending after-school clubs.

- some catchment areas are far too big. This could mean fewer children walking to school and make the city's residents even more reliant on their cars.
- Pupils should be able to walk to school or a minimum journey.
- I think it is perverse to cut numbers in the schools with the highest level of demand. If this was addressed, then this proposal would seem the most viable as it prioritises children being able to access a school within walking distance of where they live wherever possible
- Best for pupils to attend their local school without extra travel
- I do support children avoiding long travel times so this option most aligns with my views.
- We're creating huge commutes for the pupils north of the city while children in the centre are unaffected.

2. School Quality, Improvement and Resource Allocation

- You need to make schools better by allocating resources where need is and training staff not messing around with catchment areas
- Best option from a bad bunch. The two schools in our catchment are on course to be over-subscribed, yet you plan to cut numbers at both.
- I believe this supports schools au toning more and the funding for this process could be better used to support underperforming schools in Brighton and Hove.
- I do not think this option provides the desired outcomes but would be a step in the right direction - would need to be done in conjunction with increased resources for those schools currently underperforming to ensure rapid improvement
- It provides the most justifiable solution, however, the reductions in PAN across different schools in the city needs revising in the light of likely demand.
- I don't see the evidence for reducing PANs for Dorothy Stringer and Vardean. Is it based on estimates of how many schools children are in this area? Or an approximation based on how many properties have been removed from the catchment area?
- 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.
- All kids should have a choice to go to their nearest school. If the issue is poor schools, then pump money in to the poor ones and they will improve
- As mentioned previously, please do not reduce the placements at Vardeen and Dorothy Stringer. A better plan is to widen the catchment areas for everyone. The way they are currently drawn up is very random.
- Based on what I've read so far, I do not support the proposed reduction in the intake size of schools which apparently remain in high demand (though this aspect is not set out in the consultation question).
- Doesn't solve the issues you say you want to sort, but least disruptive to existing systems. Put Whitehawk in the DS/V catchment (maybe take Kempton out of catchment) and that will help. But need to really invest and promote Longhill in this context or it will suffer even faster falling rolls.
- Fundamentally the under performing schools need to be improved and better supported. Pushing more kids towards them without prior improvement will not be a success.

- better than the other options but reducing the PAN numbers for Stringer and Varndean seems counter-productive for two schools that are thriving and serve a large community with a high density of school age children
- by reducing intakes in particular schools ignores different levels of demand (actual pupil numbers in current catchments) in different parts of the city, potentially leading to the cutting of places in schools in catchments where demand will remain high and the retention of overly large intake sizes in schools in the city where demographic demand is likely to remain low. Surely the reductions in PAN across different schools in the city needs revising in the light of likely demand?
- Catchment area is fine. Reducing numbers of stringer and varndean is ridiculous!!!! These schools are both oversubscribed and this is before the FSM changes come into effect.
- I don't see the logic for reducing PANs across over subscribed schools in order to increase the number of pupils at Longhill. I also think the Council needs to wait for national policy changes that could give it greater influence over faith schools.
- I don't support the reduction of places at oversubscribed schools. Reductions should be proportional to demand.
- . I think the proposal also requires some engagement with the schools not directly under Council control as the decision is skewed if their numbers cannot be adjusted.
- I think Longhill should reduce in size to reflect its village nature
- I disagree on the basis that this option reduces the PAN in large schools that are currently oversubscribed which makes no sense at all.
- Why are you reducing Varndean Dorothy Stringer when they are popular and over subscribed
- I disagree with all the proposals as they reduce places at schools with continued high demand and increase them in areas where the population is falling faster. I support the new fsm priority admissions which may further increase demand at popular schools like varndean and stringer. This further strengthens the case for keeping PANS high at these schools.
- I disagree with reducing the PAN numbers for high performing schools that are located in areas with high demand, that are usually over subscribed.
- I don't think we should reduce the sizes of popular schools as there is clearly demand for places in these areas and the schools have capacity. This seems stupid. I think we should leave the current catchment areas the same, but give more resources to poorly performing schools to help them improve
- I fundamentally oppose education for profit, this increases the catchment for a business that is not sufficiently educating children currently so why would this be allowed to result in more demand. Academies have consistently poorer outcomes for children and should be abolished from the state school system
- I think you should adjust catchments if you were to reduce PANs. I don't believe it would be in the councils or parents interests to be dealing with a different set of travel arrangements every year based on the random nature of children being sent out of catchment. It is reasonable for parents to understand the likely admissions outcomes. Given some schools in all likelihood will successfully challenge their PAN reductions I guess this will ultimately end up as a version of the inner/outer catchment areas.
- I think the fairest model would be to scrap catchments and make the whole City a lottery. Parents can choose how far they are willing to go. Close down smaller schools that are not popular or make them functional as small schools. (less teachers teaching smaller classes not necessarily of their specialised subject).
- It makes more geographical sense to reduce emissions moving children around the city to use this model. If the schooling standards need improvement in certain schools then the council ought to support the poorer performing schools, rather than ham string the successful ones.

- Prevents those in less privileged part of the city to have sufficient choice of thriving schools
- I would not agree to the reduction in PAN accompanying this model.
- It keeps Longhill viable
- Provides solution to PAN issue and helps FSM balance slightly BUT doesn't give any real choice in many part of the city
- Reducing the number of places in areas where demand will remain high is not ideal
- Reductions in PAN across schools in the city needs revising in relation to likely demand
- If the aim is balancing student numbers with the impending drop in places required, then the option of minimal change is the preference.
- It doesn't provide real choice to parents forcing people to move who were in previous catchment areas. Doesn't address raising standards
- I disagree on the basis that this option reduces the PAN in large schools that are currently oversubscribed which makes no sense at all.
- It's ok but reduces pan too much for schools that are already oversubscribed
- I think all thd schools that underperformed should get investment not new students!!!
- Longhill should reduce PAN more
- Reductions in Pupil Admissions Numbers not desirable. Requires further consultation
- schools should compete and poorly performing schools allowed to die. Survival of the strongest
- Not sure there's justification of reduction of Varndean when it is consistently over subscribed.
- It is illogical to make successful schools smaller - and the schools adjudicator would overturn any of these proposals if those schools object.
- Long Hill needs to be a much smaller school
- more children will be coming from private schools thus the projected numbers will be wrong
- Minimum impact for maximum results but ideally address improving underperforming schools should be the priority.
- Personally for me and my child, this is the least bad option. I absolutely do not think that PAN should be reduced for Dorothy Stringer and Varndean who are doing well and oversubscribed. Please answer how many children with FSM provision were admitted to the schools outside Thier catchment across the city. I am not sure it works for everyone, I worry about children in Whitehawk and Bristol estate etc who clearly need a very good school in Kempton
- Object due to reduced PAN at Stringer and Varndean. If the PAN remained the same at these two schools this option would be more suitable.
- Of the choices shown this is my preference as it means our child would not have so far to travel to school. We currently live in a catchment area for 2 good schools, our oldest attends Varndean and is very happy there. Personally for us the current system is beneficial for us. So I would prefer no change personally. Morally you are asking do I want children from disadvantaged families to do better under a different catchment system. I need to know more about your evidence for this argument. I see Longhill has quite largely reduced numbers for your predicted PAN. Can Longhill continue on a reduced PAN? What would be the consequence if Longhill had to close? I understand your ethical argument and it is a good discussion but I feel I need to know more about the other options and consequences too. I feel it may be very hard to turn a school around that needs improvements. Our younger child would have a 50% chance of attending Longhill under your proposed plans in map C.
- Some catchment areas with schools that are already oversubscribed are made bigger despite PANs being reduced. Would it not be better to simply reduce the PAN of Longhill which its vastly overinflated versus the demand reality and then assess

the results of the implementation of the FSM priority which have yet to be determined?

- Penalising the well performing school who will not be able to keep the good staff that they have
- Plus, reduce the PAN for Longhill
- Reducing PAN in oversubscribed schools seem ridiculous. If people on FSM are given higher priority choice for their favoured school anyway then why should that be a factor.
- Do not agree with reduction in PaN
- The council seem to be penalising children whose parents have worked hard and live in an area with good schools . Maybe if they spent the money they are wasting on this process to help failing schools become it would help the community
- The extra support should take the form of allocating additional funding to all schools in Brighton and extra funding to those which struggle, rather than reshuffle the pupil population with absolutely no resources and the have the wishful thinking that outcomes will improve automatically
- The issue that some schools are failing is a vicious circle that because they are failing people don't want their children to go there and then the failing schools have less funding which makes them fail even more. By forcing families to choose a school that is failing by giving them no other options you are then failing the families and children who are forced to attend a failing school. If better schools have spaces and parents choose these schools why not reduce the official numbers at the failing schools instead. I think the council just wants to save money by them not having to fund failing schools. Schools with high FSM children can have high results with the correct management.
- This is the least disruptive, but still does not fix the issues of the below standard schools.
- The offer of one school which currently requires improvement according to Ofsted for such a large catchment area is not good enough.
- The proposal does not adequately address the declining student numbers at certain schools throughout the city, nor does it account for the increasing pressure on popular schools by reducing their Published Admission Numbers (PAN). This lack of clarity in student enrollment will hinder effective budget and resource planning, leaving us in the same challenging situation. Minimal changes rarely lead to significant improvements; instead, we need bold and innovative solutions to achieve meaningful results.
- This has the least disruption to families and focus can be put on improving failing institutions to make them appealing to students.
- This is the least bad option as it minimises the changes. I would prefer to see the good school keep their current number of pupils whilst the schools that require improvement focus on that task and are provided with additional support.
- This seems designed purely try and boost numbers to Longhill School - a school that fails to fill its PANs regularly, so the intention seems to be to 'force' children away from their preferred choice to towards Longhill mainly by reducing the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer and Varndean (DS & V). This will not work as parents will not impact their children's education by forcing them to travel across the city on poor quality transport. What is the evidence that schools with PANs lower than 180 are not viable? As noted in the report by Professor Adam Bennett (Professor of Urban Analytics, Bartlett Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis, UCL) Analysis of all similar schools in England and Wales shows out of 1163 similar schools, Longhill ranks 496, with 495 smaller open 11-16 secondary schools in existence today. Plus that many smaller schools do perform well.
- This model does not achieve the goals for improving secondary schools

- This only continues to benefit the larger schools and does not make big enough changes to the catchment areas.
- This is the slightly better option (Option B - strong disagree). However, by reducing intakes in particular schools ignores different levels of demand (actual pupil numbers in current catchments) in different parts of the city, potentially leading to the cutting of places in schools in catchments where demand will remain high and the retention of overly large intake sizes in schools in the city where demographic demand is likely to remain low. Surely the reductions in PAN across different schools in the city needs revising in the light of likely demand?
- This is closest to existing parameters - if there needs to be change it needs to be done more gradually to allow people to adjust and allow the "requires improvement" schools to improve
- Also the PAN numbers that were published alongside these measures show this option for 2027 has a PAN number for Blatchington Mill - in spite of this being the option which expands the catchment area compared to the other two options.
- This proposal does not appear to tackle the problem that has been identified and does not give under-subscribed schools the ability to know what their pupil intake will be. This seems to be at the heart of the problem being discussed.https://adamdennett.github.io/BH_Schools_2/schools_wk2.html
Also how have the percentage of children eligible for free school meals in the areas been calculated? I fail to see how taking a section of the DS & V catchment areas that covers kemptown St James St and allocating that to Longhill will improve (reduce) Longhilld % of FSM? I would suggest the higher % of FSM in the DS & V catchment are concentrated in that area and away from the Dyke Rd, Porthall, Fiveways area! Was an average % taken from each catchment? If so that is clearly flawed.
- Why are oversubscribed schools - Varndean and stringer - having places reduced? It doesn't make sense.
- This is the least bad option, but I still think the reductions to PAN are based on the wrong set of assumptions and analysis. So I am either a 3 or a 4.
- This seems to be the least disruptive and positive option. but I would love to see improvements made to Longhill and BACA Tto make them more desirable
- Varndean and Stringer have to be separated. We can't have the two "best" schools in the same catchment area.
- This system currently works in supporting children in their respective catchment schools. If there is a concern about some schools not performing as well, then the Council should look into providing resources to ensure that all children regardless of where they live or their circumstances i.e in receipt of FSM, are given the best possible education and learning opportunities.
- I don't think that popular, oversubscribed schools like Dorothy Stringer and Varndean should be forced to reduce their numbers and I worry about the loss of jobs that will result from these changes for teachers and school staff.
- This option would appear to reduce the PANs for Vardean and Stringer which have high demand for places. How does this work? And presumably a lot of children live in this catchment and the ones around these schools so how does this help?
- This is reliant on pushing more pupils in to schools that or struggling under the current system, I can't see any evidence this is more than a sticking plaster. Surely at some point a limit on catchment size would nee to be considered.
- I support the re-balancing of schools to improve the numbers and retain the funding at Longhill given that the new catchment areas are broadly designed along neighbourhood lines. I do not fully support any plan which does not consist of a new or relocated school in East Brighton
- I strongly disagree because of the proposed reduction in PAN for oversubscribed schools such as Stringer (1000 preferences for 330 places) and Varndean (1000 preferences for 300 places). Longhill received 132 preferences for 270 places. The

council already have a 2030 target for Longhill of 180 places. Leave Stringer and Vardean's PANs unchanged and continue to work towards the 2030 Longhill target.

3. Criticism of the Question's Design

- Without seeing the proposed changes, it's hard to comment on this.
- This question is worded badly as the options 1 to 5 don't match the question. how can the answer to how much i support something be 'strongly disagree'. I don't know if 1 means i strongly oppose the model or strongly support it. But I strongly oppose all models.
- This option is leading and not compliant with the Gunning Principles
- This is a ridiculous question
- The model in "option A2" is far too small to be capable of scrutiny. Which idiot designed this survey - you should be ashamed - in the future test such surveys with real users before their launch

4. Community and Social Impact

- Why on earth would children living next to the school not be allowed to go? Why split them up from friend groups and make them travel further.
- Fully support this idea and it means that children's friends groups from primary schools have a chance of staying in-tact. It also works that the children don't have very long commutes to and from school.
- This option reflects a more reasonable solution to make sure pupils in the area have a chance to be in a school close by where their friends go, and their families can remain engaged and supportive
- This is closest to the current situation. Does it and suggested PAN changes actually reflect potential relative increases and decreases in demand based on where children actually live
- Social Mobility
- Best option if change is needed. Important to keep sibling link during transition if any changes made
- Excludes pupils who live directly next to the schools and forces them away from their peers and friends
- As per last comment, major changes will create huge disruption and will unfairly impact children and families who could become disconnected with their local communities
- I disagree due to the reductions in PAN at stringer and varndean. Even though the catchment has changed much, reducing their PAN will mean children are unable to attend their local school and will be forced (forced!!! Terrible that this is a word that I am needing to use here), to attend schools with spaces - likely Longhill, which is miles away, out of the child's community and without friends.
- I want my children to be able to attend a local school, with their friends, as part of the local community.
- It is fundamental that children can go to school within their local communities. This option is also most likely to reduce traffic and pollution around schools.
- It makes sense for children to get to schools close to them
- I would like to know that the sibling link will be retained for children who are 'displaced' by the changes.

- I live on Shaftesbury road Bn1 4nf. My son is in year 7 at varndean. If my address is no longer in the catchment for varndean my daughter who is 8 won't be able to go to the same school as her brother. The logistics would be insane and I'm a single parent so not sure how we'd juggle it.
- I support this option because the areas are kept small so children won't have to travel to far to attend their school and maintain friendships.
- Personal priority is for school to be locally accessible by foot and bike. This would allow this, keeping schools aligned with their local area, while providing some adjustment in intake to shift the balance of intake demographic, though I recognise not to the maximum extent.
- Seems sensible will reduce stress and anxiety for those communities already familiar with a school
- I want my child to go to school with their friends and havw a choice of secondary school like his older brother did.
- Makes sense - we live in an area (Hollingdean) where there is a good chance we could miss out on a place at our 2 'local' schools because the catchment is large, siblings plus free school meal kids getting places (Which I support!). so this one makes sense for us.
- Sibling link needs to remain
- This is by far and away the most equitable choice. With any of the other options, my child will be ripped from his community, with the possibility of having to travel 2 hours a day to a failing school. This is a crucial time in his development and to be far away from his family and his community is egregious, not to mention the negative impact on the environment and traffic across the city that particularly the Longhill option will result in.
- Keeping a community with a community school helps the encourage respect and appreciation of others. These behaviours should be encouraged alongside higher standards of education
- Out of all the options this is the only option I can fully get behind. This option seems to the best option for a better spread of children eligible for free school meals, whilst also working to retain communities, and most importantly, communities of children who currently go to school together.
- The local school is very important in the establishment of community.
- the map splits Whitehawk into north and south and the community.
- This is by far the best model in that it most aligns to current catchments, including catchment areas for primary school this not splitting up bonded groups of children, or potentially sending children a long way from home away from friends
- This is by far the best option will largely mean siblings can go to schools their older siblings are already in. Current communities are maintained
- This option achieves the ambitions of the project with less potential ramifications for families currently living within catchment that may have made housing decisions based on existing boundaries. In turn should align better with current, established educational paths and peer groups for children
- This option appears to maintain the system in which people who live centrally go to schools within walking distance - which is clearly logical. It also keep communities together
- This clearly cuts across communities, especially in East Brighton in an arbitrary manner.
- This does not give our children the opportunity to go to one of the secondary schools which share the same site as our primary school and is walking distance from our house. thus taking them away from the thriving, supportive and wonderful community we are part of. I strongly believe this will have a detrimental effect on their long term attainment.

- This is rather unambitious and does little to improve mixing communities and producing more diverse schools.
- Whilst this is the least disruptive for the majority, this causes a lot of change for those living in Kempdown and East Brighton. You are asking a community which is firmly embedded in Brighton and who would currently attend one of two very good secondary schools to travel long distances to go to a school which requires significant improvement and is geographically completely unconnected. The outcome of this would be large numbers of families moving out of Kempdown and East Brighton to the Stringer / Varndean catchment which will negatively impact the primary schools in these areas and doesn't do anything to re-dress the FSM numbers.
- This option seems to randomly cut off a couple of areas from their current catchment, hence preventing children from being able to be in the same secondary school as their school mates and siblings.
- This seems to mean that most kids would be able to access their closest school.
- This soft touch doesn't achieve anything, except exclude people from their communities & local schools.
- This solution offers only very minor changes and whilst I agree with expanding the Longhill and Baca catchments - the central 'golden triangle' belt remains largely unchanged. As a result the FSM numbers also remain largely unchanged and this proposal does nothing to support with the needed socio-economic spread
- This will help to keep siblings of current pupils at the same school and minimise disruption for these families.
- This is the best option proposed, it maintains siblings and communities as they currently are. Will avoid high levels of stress to families living in the city
- This will split children from primary schools from their peers.
- This would limit the impact of your proposed changes. Examples being it will maintain existing local communities and importantly not force children at the edge of one boundary to attend a school miles away therefore limiting the "commute" effect and perhaps limit congestion and any other associated environmental considerations
- To me this option appears to provide the most pupils with some choice, as well as divides the city along current community lines
- 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.
- Whilst the intentions are noble, changing the boundaries has unintended consequences of breaking up the fabric of communities. By taking a chunk of Kempdown for Longhill, you probably cause an exodus of residents to the new Stringer catchment or some will go to Brighton College. Cutting Whitehawk in half risks breaking the fabric of the community with children split half going a long way east or west. Coldean has been used to bolster BACA intake but to balance it, Peacock Lane and the Friar area, which is literally adjacent to Varndean school fields, have been used as an arbitrary make weight. None of the committee is from the Fiveways and Hollingdean ward and if someone was they would know that the Friar area is embedded in the Fiveways community, based around Balfour/Downs and Varndean/ Stringer. The children all meet in Hollingbury and Blakers park and socialise in Fiveways. To redistribute these children to Patcham when they have two schools visible from their windows would be a disaster and would rip the heart out of that community. Patcham has an intake of 225 and so I would suggest it doesn't need the addition of the Friars to ensure adequate numbers. It is also over-subscribed and in Option A its FSM% decreases from 19% to 17% so the Friar area is doing nothing to raise that % which is one of the aims. With the new FSM policy (admission category 6) you will find Coldean residents using that to still go to Patcham if they can. I fundamentally disagree with bussing kids long distances, there are many studies to say this is detrimental to their wellbeing from lack of sleep, less family time, stress of travel, lack of proximity to

geographic peers, pollution exposure if commute etc. Therefore in those grounds, only probably the Coldean BACA expansion makes some sense as they are geographically close to BACA.

- This would make my children in Kempton have only one choice of secondary school being Longhill where several of my nieces and nephews had nothing but trouble and upset.
Also my children attend school in the port hall/prestonville area and under the current catchments mean that they would be able to apply for both Varndean and Stringer the same as a lot of their friends at school are able to. This change would be detrimental to that community.
- We worked hard to be able to move to our current house, specifically because it is in the Varndean/Stringer catchment area. Our son now goes to Varndean and loves it. It is a 5 minute walk from us. We would like our daughter to also go there when she leaves primary school. This proposed area moves us from being in the area to being just outside it. This seems very unfair on us.
- For our family, this option A is the least bad of all three as it still maintains our parental choice. My family live within 400m of both Dorothy Stringer and Varndean. Currently we are in the catchment for both of these schools so have a good degree of parental choice. We moved to this area so that my son could be within walking distance of his schools. As a child, I had to commute 4.5 miles to school on the Underground. Public Transport options were quick and direct, but it still took me over 30 minutes to reach school. I was often late when there were delays to the trains. Also, as a young, lone female child, I experienced predatory behaviour on a frequent basis. No one from my primary school went to the same school as me and I felt lonely and isolated. I chose to live in this area so that my child wouldn't have to experience the same issues. I have wanted to move out of the city for many years, but have stayed so that he could have access to good, local education. With this discussion about changing the catchment areas, and the potential upheaval that may result. I am questioning our desire to stay in the city.
- We should wait at least 2 years to see how the changes in admissions for children on free school meals impacts the schools before changing catchments. Children and families in the Porthall/Prestonville area are particularly disadvantaged by this plan. Children will no longer be able to walk to their nearest schools (Dorothy Stringer and Varndean), it breaks up the community that attend Stanford schools with the catchment boundaries cutting just north of Porthall. Communities and neighbourhoods build connections with schools, friends, siblings, neighbours attend the same schools - the impact of these decisions has a huge knock on impact on our communities. Unless the council has already launched plans for an affordable and safe transport system to get children to school this is not a viable option.
- Also - we need clarity around retaining of sibling link after the proposed changes.
- We live in Coldean and would be extremely unhappy if BACA was our only 'choice'. Our eldest daughter currently goes to Patcham high school and that's where we want our younger two children to go to as well. We would consider this detrimental to our children's education and would consider moving which is such a difficult position to be put in. This was campaigned against a few years ago and we're in disbelief that it's being proposed as a possibility again. So stressful.
- We believe minimising the boundary change is important. Regardless of the change, it is important to ensure the sibling link is maintained for family cohesion and minimising travel issues of having children in different schools.
- We are on Reigate Road and under this proposal my daughter would not be able to attend Varndean or Stringer, her nearest schools, but would have a much longer walk to either Blanchington or Hove Park.

- Ultimately I prefer this one because it's the least changed and I don't want my children to have to go to a school that is far away or be split up from their primary school peers when entering secondary school.
- This seems the fairest of the options provided. However, it feels very harsh to the families who live just to the north of Stringer and Varndean who are cut off from their local and closest school.
- This retains the idea that children should be able to go to school where they live and be part of their local community whilst they receive their education
- This personally impacts me less than other models, but I disagree with the principle of barring many children currently at schools in heart of community from attending secondary schools where they live. I disagree with adding unnecessary commuting time and I disagree with reducing places in high performing schools to forcibly reduce availability and redistribute children like economic units.
- This pays lip service to an agenda of improving social equity, but is transparently pandering to entrenched interests and privilege. We must live up to our values as a progressive community
- This options seems to provide a better choice in closer proximity to where children live
- This option would maintain local communities without disrupting children's preexisting relationships. As well as this it would also support manageable commuting and ability to work for parents.
- This option will cause the least overall damage to ALL pupils in terms of ensuring that current local school and community links and maintained.
- This option leaves too many children with only one option - which is not a 'choice' at all. It would mean that my daughter would be unable to go to the same school as her brother.
- This option is the only option that gives the majority of the children the opportunity to attend their local secondary school.
- This option feels like it is the most viable and it means that my son can go to the same school as his older sister & doesn't have to endure a ridiculous hour long bus journey to school each way.
- This model would largely allow children that are well established in their social communities to progress from primary to secondary with links with existing peer groups, within geographical areas that they are familiar with, and in situations where they can likely have minimal travel.
- This model supports keeping the communities and kids can continue through school with friends from their neighbourhood that they have grown up with and not splitting friends from each other in such sensitive formative years.
- This model reduces impact for changes to current residents, community and children. It minimises travel time for all children.
- This model makes the most sense. Local schools for local children. It's not broken. PLEASE don't fix it.
- This keeps the same issues for families living the Deans who only have one option for secondary school. It maintains a lack of social mobility.
- This enables children to go to their local school and not commute ridiculous distances across the city in the main although still some who are forced around due to lack of local provision.
- These tweaks to the catchment areas don't appear to take into account the relevant community. Considering the Varndean/Dorothy Stringer catchment area in particular, the proposal seems to remove those children who live closest from the catchment area, meaning they would go from a five minute walk to a 30 minute walk to school and removing them from the community they are a part of.
- If you look at the area of Hanover, Queens Park, Whitehawk and Craven Vale... really look at it and get to know it... it is a wonderfully interlaced community of people

from all sorts of communities and backgrounds. Drawing a line through it is brutal partition and it changes the fabric of families and communities that many of us don't feel you understand.

- There is no supporting material stating any evidence that boundary changes will have positive outcomes for pupils on the pages on the council site. With this in mind I will give my opinion which would be as follows: Minimising travel times and ensuring siblings can attend the same school (many siblings will already be in place) is crucial to children's lifestyle and mental wellbeing. Therefore these minimal changes seem the most appropriate in principle so I have said I reluctantly agree.
- The option also includes the reduction of intake numbers for Varndean and Dorothy Stringer; which already are oversubscribed and thereby will exacerbate the issue further requiring children to travel long distances to a school outside of their community. I do not support this. Ignoring the demand for more places on those schools and the excellent education they provide, will ultimately mean poor outcomes for those children who cannot attend, poor mental health for those children due to travelling long distances to a school outside of their community, and a higher environmental impact and strain on public transport systems.
- The children of Patcham and North Brighton can go to their local community school and Free School Meals children of East Brighton get the opportunity to choose excellent schools.
- The catchment areas are small, local and round. They provide children with the possible shortest travel distance to school on foot, It also allows children to build relationships in their local community. More environmentally friendly.
- The balance feels a good idea whilst providing school options that are still local to all
- Sticking with this is important for parents with children currently in both secondary and primary school. I don't want my second child to have to go to a different school when the time comes. They will have been aware of their siblings experience in one school and it will be stressful for all the family to change to a whole different school, but new uniforms etc
- Retains local catchment areas so that more children can walk to school and go to schools in their community.
- Retains communities- children will go to secondary school with children they know/in a familiar locality
- Probably the best of all options though still not hugely in favour. As a parent of children at Balfour their school will be massively split up no matter what option decided on.
- People pay a premium to live near chosen schools; meaning they pay more into the economic system; don't penalise that
- Only consider distance to school. Not free school meals. If attainment is an issue, provide the resources to improve attainment. Don't try to socially engineer 'improvement'.
- On the face of it, making minimal changes would seem to be a logical thing to do. However where the boundaries have been changed is simply illogical for where we live. We live on Friar Road, and both Stringer and Varndean would be a short walk for our children. Whilst our house doesn't back onto the fields (as many of our neighbours do) I can see the playing fields from my house, I can hear when it's break time and kids are out playing on the fields or doing PE. In this proposal our house would be in the Patcham catchment. To me, school is about much more than somewhere your kids go to learn. It is an important part of the community, and we feel intrinsically part of the community where Stringer and Varndean are placed, along with Balfour where our children currently go. From what I have heard, Patcham is a decent school but we just don't feel a part of the Patcham community, because it just is not where we live - and the recently redrawn ward maps support this. It feels like an unnecessary slice has been taken out of a community. Forcing our children to

attend a school that is outside of their community, away from their friends, and with longer journey times to me just lacks common sense.

- Of the three options this is the most viable given the least changes however as a resident of Friar Crescent whereby the back gate of my garden opens onto the Varndean and Stringer school fields, it is absurd that the Friar area would be made part of the Patcham catchment area. The children of the Friar area are embedded in the Fiveways ward and community, with many going to Balfour school. After the upheaval of COVID, these children have re-established friendship groups and support networks with other children, generally based south of Varndean. Therefore to remove these children at the time of moving to secondary school, and give them a 30 minute commute to a school where they have no friends would be disastrous for their mental health and wellbeing, and be detrimental to their ability to thrive. In addition the inevitable car journeys added to take these children to school in inclement weather would directly contradict the councils policy to increase the number of children walking to school. All children in the Friar area currently walk to school in less than 5 mins, and many by walking out their back garden gate and across the Varndean school fields. Put simply, the families of the Friar area (Friar Rd, Cres, Close and Walk) are embedded in the Fiveways school community, socialising with friends in Hollingbury and Blakers parks is a daily occurrence. Adults have established friendship groups providing important support to each other. To move children to Patcham school at the time of secondary school transfer would be highly detrimental to their chance to thrive educationally and would impact their mental health and social connections.
- If pushed, this would be the only model (of the three) that I would consider supporting. However for those whose catchment does change, I would like to see due care and attention given to those families where there is sibling link as having children split across school catchments is completely unworkable (and unacceptable)
- My son will have to go to a different school to his sister
- More inclusion of FSM pupils is super important but so is providing schools within a community where young people are connected to their school and their neighbourhood (also important for inclusion).
- Minimal changes is best, close proximity to the schools is by far the best solution for the children.
- High performing schools and other methods to expand access for disadvantaged pupils could be used other than moving catchment areas. Experiment in Bristol in 2016 did not show a good impact on social equality, it increased wealth ghettos, as parents moved closer, and the schools involved are currently on a 5-15% reduction on FSM pupils compared to local area. It didn't work to enforce new catchment areas, it just stymied parental choice. I'd also like to say, option A does not benefit me at all personally, unfortunately (!) - none of the options benefit me as they ALL reduce my choice - I just can't see the evidence base for huge upheaval of current catchment areas.
- Least likely to disrupt communities and friendship groups amongst children created amongst primary school
- Kids from this area have been going to varndean and stringer for decades and this will divide them
- Keeps some element of choice. Makes current plan more fair. But with students attending schools in their areas
- It's the only option where my child is going to Varndean or stringer. Her older brother and sister have gone there and I don't want her to go all the way to long hill in Rottingdean that's bloody miles away. It's ridiculous.
- It's the fairest and easiest. I think a lot of anger and unhappiness over secondary schools comes from the uncertainty. I think you need to guarantee children in catchment a place at their catchment school. It should be easy to do with falling pupil

numbers and reduced pans. I think it would be very popular with parents if you guaranteed this and would make this process smoother and middle class parents less likely to kick off at you. I do agree with the new FSM criteria BUT people have spent years living in their community and building relationships and friendships and they are scared their child will now not be able to go to their closest school but sent to a school miles away with none of their friends. Just because you can afford to live in the stringer/Varndean catchment and don't have free school meals doesn't make you a bad person that needs your child punished! There is no reason all children in catchment can't be offered a place at stringer/Vardean now, Stringer taking 312 rather than 300 for example, or Varndean 281 rather than 270. It would not be fair to punish those 23 children because their parents earn a decent living. Especially with the rates of mental health issues and school refusals amongst pupils. People just want certainty after years and years and years of anxiety/over subscribed etc. I think giving certainty will win people over with any change you want to make.

- It's the best of a bad bunch frankly. This option will at least allow the existing communities that we have to remain, to a greater degree, intact
- It splits Porthall and Prestonville into the Hove catchment meaning children from this area will have to travel significantly further to go to school. It also breaks up its community ties to Varndean and Stringer and meaning less children get to keep friendship groups.
- For me personally who is in green, it means I can continue to walk to school, minimising impact on my child and also sibling at Primary school. It would also allow to continue supporting school events in our community as we would be within walking distance. Lastly it increases the chances of friends and neighbours attending the same school further enhancing our communities.
- It does make sense statistically but also looks to cut the whitehawk community in half? Has there been community outreach in those areas
- If these are only tweaks, why bother? Where sibling link exists, trailing siblings should be able to follow their elder siblings to avoid fragmenting family logistics etc.
- I think this option would cause minimal disruption to sibling links, attending new schools with previous class/ school mates, and travel issues
- I think this is fair to protect children who live in an area to be able to go to access a school that is closest to them and enable them to have friends within walking distance reducing the need for car travel.
- I think it is important that children can be with children from their neighbourhood, so maintaining the primary-secondary school link is great. However, in our catchment there is only one school - so no real choice.
- I strongly disagree with cutting off the communities around Stringer and Varndean from accessing those schools.
- I don't support any of the models. But if this is the model that has least impact on current feeds from primary to secondary schools and therefore the 7 years of community and support children have built up emotionally and socially, then this is the best of what is essentially a bad proposal and option mix
- I don't support a model that makes children who live right next to a school ineligible for that school - for environmental and economic reasons and simply common sense
- Sibling impact: My children will end up in primary and senior schools in separate areas of the city - I will inevitably need to use a car to drop off / collect since the bus does not cover the full route.
- Environmental impact. Impact on children's wellbeing and community cohesion. Exclusion of community representation before creating these models.
- I believe not making a huge change to the catchment area is more beneficial and less disruptive for children and families. They will have friends and neighbours going to the local schools and will want to be able to continue this community.

- I believe I am least impacted in this model and will have similar school choices available to my children with this model.
- Ensures that children can go to their local school
- I appreciate that this is not the best solution ultimately but it is the best solution that you are offering. Because lets be clear, everyone voting in this survey will be voting in their best interests (and those of their children). I do think that bigger change needs to come but I do not for one second believe this comes in the form of a change of catchment. Going to your local secondary school has always been about your nearest school. For the sake of the environment, keeping traffic off the roads and for community.
- Children should be able to walk to their local school within their local community.
- Children in Porthall/Prestonville are particularly disadvantaged by this proposal and feels like this neighbourhood has been specifically targeted. By doing this you are forcing these children to travel longer distances, taking away preferred choice of school from most children in the area and have spilt the cohort of children from Stanford schools (many of whom also live slightly north of the school) into different catchments.
- Children going to school in their local community with the group of peers they know is the best option and make the tricky transition to secondary school a bit smoother. It is crucial to have a strong peer network to support good mental health at a vulnerable time in young peoples lives. Keeping the catchment areas as proposed in option A means that the majority of pupils can walk or cycle to school therefore supporting a greener cleaner city. Surely something the council would want to support???
- At a glance this looks fairly logical, however Varndean is on the very edge of its catchment, meaning that children who live on the schools doorstep would have to travel into Patcham. From a social and environmental perspective this isn't ideal.
- As long as you can attend you're nearest secondary school
- Appreciate its not much of a change, however students should be in the catchment to the school which they live the closest to. The map suggests you could live next door to Varndean yet not be in the catchment which feels misguided.
- allows for locality
- A change in catchment breaks the sibling link for many families with considerable disruption to their lives and the feelings of security and equality of the children. So any change in catchment absolutely must be accompanied by a revision of sibling link rules to allow sibling links from different catchments where the catchment has changed. That is, base sibling links on the wider boundaries of the original catchments and phase this out over 5 years. Out of the three, however, this is the preferred option.

5. Broader Educational Equity Issues

- Would need support for the bigger schools to educate more disadvantaged children
- Why reduce the number of places in already popular schools? How many pupils will be pushed outside of their catchment areas due to the cuts and the recent changes that give priority to FSM children, even if they are outside of the catchment area?
- All this does is add to BACA the whole village of Coldean, which is itself made of large council estate housing. We're literally grouping children from disadvantaged backgrounds together. This is a terrible idea.
- Addresses this issue with minimal change in my area and still offers children a reasonable choice of schools.

- Again, FSM should not be used as the only criterion. I think this is a misuse of the Sutton Trust findings
- All the rich home owners have access to the best schools
- Allowing a mix of children from all backgrounds will be beneficial to all.
- 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.
- By keeping varndean and Dorothy stringer together you have the least impact and won't achieve a spread of the best education across the City
- Big change is difficult to manage but good to adjust for FSM
- Any changes to boundaries affect families who have made decades-long decisions and commitments.
- Brighton and Hove City Council has recently introduced a policy giving pupils eligible for free school meals priority when applying for a secondary school place in the city. If the Council is serious about improving the education for disadvantaged children in the city, it would take that change seriously and measure the impact of it before initiating another kneejerk project. The policy change is novel and could provide a welcome insight for other councils into the application of a tool such as this to improve educational outcomes.
- Because we have crap schools in our area that children do not thrive in!
- I am unsure that ensuring equal distribution of FSM children is the one factor to consider. As i understand FSM children have higher priority choice over schools anyway, so I am not sure why this is a consideration at the moment when you have only just announced the new admission criteria. Surely you need to let this bed in before making other changes???? Surely you just need to give more ressources to schools with a higher proportion of disadvantaged children. As a side note, my daughter is eligible for FSM and i do not consider us disadvantaged, she does not struggle with school and so using this one criteria as a basis for significant changes seems arbitrary
- Choice for those living in middle class neighbourhoods, no choice for those in more working class areas. A terrible legacy of failure to improve certain schools.
- Fairer to fsm kids - least impact
- Baca only adds Coldean. The more affluent areas still go to the more 'desirable schools.
- I agree that the proportion of disadvantaged kids should increase in the best schools. We will still only be in the catchment area for a school I won't send my kids to though so I'm personally somewhat biased against this particular solution
- I do not see how this change would have much impact as with the new admissions policy for better distribution of FSM students already in place this wouldn't really add anything new. However, I feel that we should wait to see the impact of the new FSM admissions policy before making further changes.
- There should not be any catchment area boundaries and everybody should be able to choose the best school for the kids
- It's fairer than current catchment areas
- Currently the better funded schools are not catching areas in a far way; varndean and stringer funding models would heed to be mirrored at patcham for example
- It is not a fair distribution of children across the city. There is not a good mix of children from different backgrounds and levels of affluence across all schools in the city.
- I am in the very central Brighton and I don't currently like how catchment area is distributed for me, if I don't want a Catholic school I don't have options.

- I believe a more substantial shakeup is required to address the structural inequity in the current model
- I believe we need choices. Choice of school is for the benefit of individual children, but must also work for families practical needs
- I believe changes need to be made to give our children more and better choices
- I believe none of the proposals add value and address inequality - this one seems to do very little of benefit whilst still creating significant disruption for some
- I don't think the current system is fair when some schools are dual catchment and other families have no choice but are forced to send their child to an academy school or a school miles away from where they live
- I don't understand how this improves the disparity issue. Also it's really unfair on children in Porthall and Prestonville - why change their links with the schools of their communities?!
- I don't think the case for further change has been adequately made and this model is closest to the current approach. I would advocate for their being a "change nothing" option but I haven't seen that - which is surprising. I think the council should wait for the impact of the new FSM admission priority in this years admissions before making any further changes.
- I don't see how moving the boundary of DS and V schools south is fair to families whose homes are within a 5-10 minute walk of a school. I believe that at least a 'chance' to attend one of your closest schools makes sense. I do think that the catchment for these two schools could be split to allow more children a chance to apply for either of them.
- I fully agree with the aim of keeping the number of children eligible for free school meals equitable across the different catchment areas
- I only have one choice of school and it isn't the school I want my kids to go to. Everyone should have a choice. I'm actually equally close to better schools but have no catchment area choice.
- I strongly agree with This option but believe that other indicators such as school absences for example should be taken into consideration not just the narrow FSM data.
- It is incredibly unfair that some catchment areas have only 1 school and others have multiple schools. Everyone has the right to feel that they are choosing some kind.
- It would still be discriminatory to the north east of Brighton which is less affluent
- It would be good to wait and see how the impact of FSM being in the selection criteria affects this. What is the evidence to show a school being viable?
- If this is based on free school meals why not redistribute funding? Also this feels like a biased metric which is liable to fluctuate?
- For Patcham High School, this is just a bigger catchment area and almost the same proposal as Option C. Whilst a preferred option to Option B, there is no second school to provide student choice.
- It goes some way towards dealing with the inequality issues, but it still doesn't address the fact that East Brighton is currently ill-served for school provision.
- It's the most logical. Children go to their nearest school and there is choice.
- It's vital that students are given choice. Why are some school catchments remaining unchanged if they have a smaller proportion of FSM pupils?
- Just put Stringer & Varndean in separate catchments, each with one other school. Then all families have CHOICE - a core principle ?
- More detail on why the boundaries have been changed to spread the children for free school meals needed. All children should have access to a good education, local to them. Will this impact on the travel distance? Is it splitting local school into different catchment areas?
- Decreases accessibility.

- Each area should have the choice of two schools and the guarantee that they will get one of those to take the stress out of the current gamble in school choices
- My main issue with this option is the change to PANs given the reasons I mentioned previously. Also FSM changes are progressive but catchment/PAN changes mean other vulnerable children without an EHCP are less likely to get into their suitable school (e.g. children with SEND, those with mental health or medical difficulties, or young carers). Getting into their local school of choice would make it easier for them to transition with friends and be supported. I would want to see support for these children to access their school of choice. Out of the options though this is the most equitable because it causes the least disruption to communities and travel, however children in Kemptown would travel pretty far to get to Longhill. I am not sure how the council got the projected % of FSM in all options without even seeing how the new FSM policy plays out this year so I would oppose new catchment plans going through this year even if we personally remained in this catchment. I would not support rushing through catchment plans without a year or two of seeing what happens with the FSM policy.
- Preferable option of the three but a better approach would be to invest in bringing schools such as BACA and Longhill, which are struggling and also have higher proportions of FSM children, up to the same levels of attainment as other schools and with proper support for their populations.
- Terrible gerrymandered map where those in the poorer Saunders Park and Bear Road road areas are prohibited from attending the closest school (Varndean) in favour of those from more affluent areas like Queens Park and Kemptown much further away, who get a choice of schools. Not even a choice for those in the poorer north and east of the city. This option perpetuates the inequalities of the current system and is awful. Distance to school would be a fairer system than this gerrymandered map.
- That said, Option A does tweak some boundaries in the East of Brighton to help maintain numbers at BACA and Longhill. As these tweaks are in areas that are not close to a particular school, I think there could be some mileage in these. In addition, with the new policy to allow FSM children to apply for schools outside their catchment (to fill a school quote up to the city average), will likely have an effect of evening up the distribution of FSM children, which is one major aim of this consultation. Please wait for 1-2 years of intake to see the effect of this policy before changing catchment areas as the latter has a huge impact on communities, friendship and support networks and jeopardises the ability of many children to thrive in education for those reasons.
- I live within 150 metres of Varndean and would be absolutely disgusted if my children don't get into their local school. I appreciate the need to level up as such but children walking past their local school is not the solution to a deeper problem whereby we have children needing school meals to survive or certain areas where deprivation exists. Playing with children's schooling is not the solution, people need proper support and proper opportunities not the option to go to a school because you tick a free school meal box. It's a disgrace that in this day and age with the wealth in this country and city that children should have to turn to free school meals to survive. Instead of plastering over the problem with these ideas that will actually have a negative long term impact I wish the council would tackle it head on, fund schools properly, give support from a young age to areas where there are higher instances of poverty and struggling and invest in the actual future of society. And shout louder when you face government cuts.
- Why should free school meals determine where school catchment areas are? I have known professional and manual families claim free school meals! Surely, it is more a case of travel distance and time to school to enable one and two parent working

families to get their child/children to and from school safely, on time and without creating family stress and undue pollution to the city?

- Option A does very little to distribute children more equitably across the city's schools so I'm not even sure why it has been included. It still means parents in the centre can use their wealth to buy a better education for their children. The concentration of higher attaining children in a few schools does nothing to help improve outcomes for those with the least. Brighton & Hove City Council has a duty to ALL children across the city, not just the children of Five Ways, and their parents who have not just the most money but also the loudest voice. I am really pleased this is being discussed (finally) and I'm so grateful to the Class Divide Campaign and Cllr Taylor for highlighting for the rest of the city, what we in the poorer areas have been painfully aware of for a long time.
- There is only one school within each of the two huge catchment areas across East Brighton (BACA and Longhill). The areas these schools cover are the most deprived in the city. It is therefore no surprise the schools both had terrible Ofsted judgements. They have had more funding taken from them than the other schools per pupil as well. If you spread the wealth, you spread the equality and with that you spread the success.
- The introduction of places for out of catchment FSM places will improve the balance of kids with FSM at each school. Meaning there is less need to make big changes to the catchment areas. There has hopefully be some consideration of the capacity of the school with current low FSM and how many kids will be push out of catchment then get essentially no preference, so school numbers need to be able to accommodate this, I cant tell from the information i have if this is the case or has been sufficiently calculated
- The current option means Moulsecoomb and Bevendean families are stuck in a cycle of underperformance and deprivation. The catchments need to change significantly to enable more choice and better balance of socioeconomic backgrounds in city schools
- The existing system works well for the majority of children
- The lesser changes to catchment areas with this option would allow for the impact of the new free school meals initiative to be properly assessed
- The maps are not clear enough to judge, but it looks like you are decreasing options for pupils in Port Hall in an area where a faith school unfairly dominates (and only takes a tiny percentage of children from an atheist background. This is also an issue for current children in the seven dials area, many of whom go to school with friends from Stanford Juniors and are already facing being split from them and having to walk 40-45 minutes on their own to Blatchington Mill or 50-55 minutes to Hove Park lower school. Surely there should be an expansion of catchments for all?
- There are no changes to Portslade where there are a high percentage of disadvantaged children. I can't see how this model, or indeed any model that only changes the catchment areas will have any impact. Different thinking needs to take place. Two ideas would be: Inner and outer catchment areas. Or if each school offered a percentage of their places to students outside of the catchment area.
- No information is provided as to how many children would live within the revised catchment areas, but as they are small tweaks we can only assume they are negligible. Coupled with a reduction in PAN it would likely see more children allocated spaces outside of their catchment area, which could lead to overly long commutes for some. By my rough calculations based on council projections, the 2026 intake would see roughly 20 children not be able to access Varndean and Stringer, assuming the FSM policy is at capacity, if the PAN is reduced by 60 as in this option, that would lead to 80 children being unable to attend school in their catchment area (not accounting for the tweaked catchment area as no data has been provided for this)

- These lines, drawn on a map, split communities, friendships and families. And, again, I implore you to consider the families who will suddenly have to explain to a child, who already at a school in the green area, why they cannot have the same experience. You are defining BACCA and Longhill as lower in standard to the other schools. Surely the answer is to put more resource and funding into them. And I suspect an outcome of what you are doing, for families who can afford it, is that you will drive many children into the private schools in the area. An outcome that I think would be really damaging to the state schools, and create more inequity in the city. Looking at your wish for reengineering the social fabric of the city you should look at this through the other end of the telescope and realise that you could be boosting the fortunes of private schools in the area. Which I think would be unfortunate and a contradiction to your aims. I have heard, anecdotally, a number of families considering this option. It is beyond our reach, financially, but also at odds with our sense of fair play and equality
- This model only offers one choice for my children, which doesn't let families from Coldean to have the right to compare and choose the most suitable school for their children needs.
- These are not the only options. Why are you trying to force this on us. From what I can see the only school to benefit would be Longhill.
- This does not change much in terms of catchment area and leaves large numbers of pupils with only one school in their catchment which provides no scope for choice.
- This gives many people NO choice. We live rather too close to the vague boundary on this to agree that it's a good idea, only to find ourselves with just BACA in catchment. Selfishly, as that is currently drawn, giving us Varndean and Stringer, of course I'd agree that's great for MY child!
- This is just keeping the same. 5 schools in Hove and the rest get one choice
- This is the fairest way of addressing the problems and still giving parents and pupils some choice of which school to pick.
- This keeps choice for parents
- This has been tried before doesn't work sets parents against each other
- This is academic, the catchment areas differ in wealth too much for these small changes to be of any significance.
- This largely maintains the status quo, which has led to a huge educational attainment gap in the city and those facing the most disadvantage having the worst outcomes. Maintaining the status quo is the worst possible outcome.
- This leaves an entire catchment area with only one option. I live in that catchment area, and it feels like social cleansing to keep the poorer children out of nice schools. My child has one option for when he's secondary school age and I'm furious about it.
- This model maintains an unbalanced distribution of disadvantaged children from areas like Whitehawk and Moulsecoomb into schools like Longhill and BACA, while schools like Varndean, Dorothy Stringer and Blatchington Mill retain affluent catchment areas.
- This is a minimal change but will have a big impact on those families in the affected areas without making enough change to impact positively on children currently in more challenging situations
- This means only young people in affluent areas have a choice of school.
- This option fails to achieve the stated aims of the catchment review - to reduce educational inequality in the city, as it leaves the current catchments largely unchanged, with the most disadvantaged areas of the city continuing to be served by the two poorest performing schools, with no other options for those students.
- This option leaves some children with a very slim chance of going to a good school and is essentially a postcode lottery. It just isn't fair.
- This option is highly inequitable and would reinforce the existing disparities in opportunity for children across the city

- This option doesn't seem to make much difference to the current situation
- This option has little change from current arrangements and therefore has limited impact.
- Still offers no real choice for many residents of the city
- Still only one choice of school for the kids in our area
- this option gives no choice to parents
- This option strikes a good balance. Genuine choice for most. Avoiding significant journeys, along with potential adverse health and mental health outcomes associated with long journeys and schooling away from home.
- This proposal is worse than the current system and re-entrenches the existing inequalities in the city.
- This proposal has limited effect on the most deprived areas. If the councils goal is to offer a truly balanced offering, this is not the approach.
- While this option helps students that fall within the economic framework, it does not allow for students that are outside those parameters, but still deserving.
- This would leave most pupils at Coombe Road Primary with their existing lack of choice
- this seems fair
- This option maintains the inequality in choice, for those in more deprived areas
- This seems like the most viable option. It will also allow the new FSM policy to be embedded and the effects of it monitored. It will allow time for the new head of longhill to tun the school around. Smaller changes built up over time to help all children seems much more sensible that implementing drastic changes with alongside other policy changes. Slow and stead wins the race as they say
- This seems the fairest model.to all.children if you need to make changes
- While this is marginally better than the current arrangement, this does not address the inequalities in the school admissions system. As an example, many pupils in one-school catchments are given no 'choice' of school and their catchment school may be one of the currently less desirable ones. Pupils in the relatively more affluent areas of central Brighton are given a 'choice' of two high-performing schools and could conceivably choose to attend one of the nearby undersubscribed ones. This is fundamentally unfair and contributes to social segregation.
- Too wishy-washy and still vulnerable to manipulation by those able to afford to 'buy' a place at the 'better' schools
- This seems to make almost no change to the current situation so it remains unfair
- To be honest I will do anything I can to avoid option B which sends shivers down my spine for me and my 2 SEND needs daughters. It would be utter hell trying to get them across the city to Woodingdean and I feel utterly let down that SEND needs haven't been even mentioned in this, when the system is so broken for us already. We've just had an application of EHCP refused (UNLAWFULLY) for assessment by the LA - not only do they not want to support her special needs now, they might also be fine with making her travel for 1 hour each way each day via 2 or 3 buses losing her daily exercise, more accident opportunities on the roads, exposing her to noise and pollution, and ensure any friends she does make might not be near by. I'm so scared by this at a time when I already feel totally let down by a broken system.
- We need to factor in Kings School and Cardinal Newman Catholic School.
- While it's important to ensure that schools have enough pupils to remain viable, this approach should not prioritize balancing numbers at the expense of vulnerable children, particularly those with SEND and those disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the SEND Review (2022), local stability and consistency of support are critical for vulnerable pupils. Moving children to schools that may not yet be ready to provide the specialized support they need can undermine their educational progress. Moreover, balancing socio-economic demographics, such as free school meal eligibility, should be handled with care. For

example, sending more disadvantaged pupils to Longhill High School, which is still rated as "Requires Improvement", could overwhelm a school still working through its own issues of behaviour management, inconsistent teaching, and attendance. While aiming for equity is commendable, vulnerable pupils, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds, require schools that are equipped with stable resources and a proven ability to meet their needs. As highlighted in the UCL Institute of Education (2021) research, schools in the process of improvement need time to stabilize before they can take on additional challenges. Ultimately, this approach may inadvertently disadvantage the most vulnerable children, as the focus seems more on balancing numbers rather than ensuring the quality of provision across all schools.

- While it's important to ensure that schools have enough pupils to remain viable, the decision to change catchment areas must not prioritize numerical balancing over the needs of vulnerable students, especially those born between 1st September 2014 and 31st August 2015. These children were in their early learning stages during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the SEND Review (2022) emphasizes their need for stability and localized support to mitigate the long-term impacts of pandemic-related disruptions. Sending these vulnerable pupils to schools like Longhill, still rated as "Requires Improvement", may overwhelm a school still working to address its internal challenges with behaviour management, inconsistent teaching, and attendance. This would be detrimental to pupils already struggling due to the pandemic.
- We'd like to continue to have a choice of more than one school
- We're based in Coldean and don't want to be forced into one choice.
- Using kids who have free school meals is discriminatory
- Unfair that Hove has 4 options, Brighton as 2 options yet all other areas only get 1 option.
- To much bias.
- This makes no difference to the number of pupil premium/FSM in the east of the city having access to only one poorly performing school
- This seems a fair option to all communities
- In general, I reject the need to review the catchment areas before the full effects of the alterations to change the school admissions criteria to allow greater freedom of those receiving FSM has been seen. I understand that the admissions criteria has been recently changed to allow FSM pupils to apply to schools across the city and have priority. This is a great initiative and should be allowed time to see the outcome.
- This options does not seem to offer much difference or help for the upheaval it would cause
- This model seems to benefit already affluent areas in terms of school choices. The highest performing schools in the city remain in the boundaries for the richest housing areas in the city. This model seems to do nothing to create more equality in the city.
- This continues to allow choice
- This appears to be a good option to even out numbers and allow for students to attend their local school.
- The wealthiest housing areas in the city still have access to the two best schools - Varndean and Stringer. Even fewer people in the surrounding areas such as outskirts of Patcham will now be able to attend those schools. The poorest areas of the city will still be accessing the poorest performing schools - Longhill and BACA. This feels like a worse model than the current one in terms of inequality.
- The question is why you are seeking to amend boundaries right now. The council have only just implemented police use to provide children eligible for FSM a priority in over subscribed schools. This should be evaluated. Also forcing other children into catchments for currently under performing schools does not seem to be an effective way of supporting all children. The focus must be on improving those schools and having thriving local schools across the city. That might include welcoming academy

chains that have developed specialist skills in turning around under performing schools in areas of high FSM.

- The best option of the 3. However, when look at making accommodations for free school meals children you need to also make the same provisions for SEN children who are being disastrously failed by the current system. My daughter is autistic but without an EHCP so currently has no priority to choose a school that we feel would best meet her needs. If you're looking at ways to make the system fairer, this also needs to be incorporated. All SEN children with a confirmed diagnosis should have the opportunity to select any school across the city which the parents believe could best suit their child's needs.
- Some catchments only have 1 option for a school while others have multiple
- Seems to be a fair division
- Slight improvement in FSM distribution
- It still doesn't really provide a choice for deprived areas
- It sounds like this is an improvement on the existing catchments but does this go far enough to genuinely tackle the inequality that is trying to be addressed?
- Seems like a good balance to retain viability without causing harmful disruption
- Ridiculous that children in Friar Road wouldn't be eligible to go to Varndean school. Why are the faith schools exempt from this? In today's world, how is it not discrimination when children aren't given access to high performing schools because they do not practice religion. If the other schools didn't allow e.g. catholic children to attend, people would be rioting. I'm not sure how this would solve the issues of equality in the city. Won't the changes to FSM priorities fix mix up the cohort enough?
- Option a perpetuates existing educational inequalities and selection through house prices, as evidenced by the distribution of FSM children in the new, marginally revised, proposed catchments. It continues to offer children in poorer parts of the city (to the North and East) zero school choice within the catchment. Whilst this status quo may be the preferred option for many who already reside within current catchments for high-performing schools (and whose political voice is often loudest), it is not a serious option for those interested in reducing educational inequalities and increasing choice for those in poorer communities.
- No choice
- It doesn't really provide choice for all
- It barely changes the current disparities
- No choice in some catchment areas very uninclusive
- Need to wait till fsm data is available to assess if this will actually help. Impossible to do in advance.
- It doesn't factor in the quality of education available to economically disadvantaged communities. Education is one of the best ways to tackle generational poverty.
- Moves us from a catchment of two good schools, one of which is excellent for SEND, to a catchment for two schools, one which is good but known to be terrible for SEND and one which is known for bullying and bad results. No thanks.
- Moves towards a more equitable system
- No choice for people in areas with only 1 school in their catchment. Completely unfair that some areas have a large choice of schools and other areas particularly more "low income" areas such as Whitehawk, Moulscroome, Bevendean and Coldean do not have a choice for their children.
- Means kids in East Brighton have limited choice and limited opportunity exacerbating inequalities
- Having only one choice of school is not good
- It does not seem to be fair to a large amount of children
- Least disruptive to status quo, maintains parental choice. Similar to other options in terms of shift in FSM mix. Varndean and Stringer currently are only 0-4.9% below

current FSM mix for area, which is very "close" to FSM population, according to Sutton Trust, so not clear why change is needed based on the rationale

- Limits options for kids in the lower income areas of the city
- Kids who live next to a school such as Varndean should be able to attend it. Please explain why it is believed that children on free school meals need to be distributed. If a higher percentage of kids on FSM need more services it might be simpler to offer them at schools of high need. Has it been proven that mixing kids so that the more affluent rub off on the financially needy or visa versa? To whom is this considered beneficial?
- It does not need changing, children with free school meals should not be given priority
- I think minor changes will lead to better spread of students without upending established school culture across the city.
- I think moving around the boundaries is good as people move and kids ages change, they should move also it might help other families move into cheaper areas and help with numbers and free school meals should try and be even around the schools
- In the scrutiny committee Prof Gorard suggested that measures to address the attainment gap need to be done in a way that minimises disruption and unintended consequences. With that in mind, making minimal changes would seem to be a logical thing to do. However this option appears to have moved boundaries for the sake of appearances, to ensure people feel a change has been made. With the introduction of the changes to FSM admission priorities, altering the boundaries in this way is unnecessary. Also, with Patcham and Hove Park having the lowest percentage of FSM already, these changes actually reduce the levels further and hence increase the disparities across the city. In this case it seems it would be better to leave the catchments as they are, allow the new FSM admission policy take effect and observe the impact to FSM distribution.
- In the questions or engagement meetings so far, I have seen no strong evidence for changing the existing catchment areas. Based on everything presented, the new FSM policy (which is excellent) should have time to bed in and outcomes measured. I have answered 'Disagree' rather than 'Strongly disagree' because if it or something like it were to be introduced, it would mean minimal disruption compared to other proposals seen so far. It would not have a major impact on travel, traffic, pupil health or the council's finances and the consequences of the FSM policy might reasonably be measured.
- FSMs are not the only measure of disadvantage - see comments from previous answers. An Equality and Impact Assessment on pupils with SEND (with and without an ECHP), PP, BAME, EAL, LAC needs to take place. Likelihood of pupils of starting their journey to school before 07:45am. Likelihood of pupils not being able to access after-school clubs due to travel. Each assessment will give the public more information on the losses and benefits to our children.
- I'm not sure these proposals go far enough and still seem to segregate most disadvantage d from the rest of the city, for me it doesn't go far enough
- I totally disagree with option A, as Kempton area has only a single school option. This lack of choice is unfair and limits opportunities for families in our area. All students should have access to multiple quality education options to meet their diverse needs and preferences.
- I think the council should postpone any changes until they see the impact of the FSM initiative which they have introduced for this year. This catchment change is minimal so the impact from the new initiative would be able to be assessed.
- 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 a lot of families will have bought houses that are hard to afford to ensure their children can go to a school of choice and changing this will devalue those difficult life choices, and will particularly affect those on the peripheries with lower budgets.
- I think all people should have 2 options
- I think it could make my local schools (which are the 2 with poor offers) a bit better but it's not going to do a lot we still have limited choice for our children
- I struggle to see a balanced criteria to assess the benefits of this. It all seems to be tied to beneficiaries of free school meals instead of looking at the more underlying reasons for why there may be failings. It assumes that allowing g children to go to different schools Means they will all perform better. That is not necessarily the case.
- I feel the affects and outcomes of the recent change to allowing free school pupils should be seen and taken into account before making any more changes.
- I don't understand how this addresses the issues that you say need to be dealt with...? Has this actually changed the number of pupils who receive FSM attending the lower achieving schools?
- I don't see how this will achieve the councils objectives in creating better opportunities for disadvantaged children. This will perpetuate the issue of middle class/ well resourced children going to the 'better' schools, aligned with their postcodes and ghetto-ising areas such as whitehawk and bevendean to their, more struggling schools with poorer outcomes.
- I do not think this proposal addresses the target issue of FSM equality. I do not understand why no attempts have been made to address the inequality between the Hove v. Portslade catchments in particular given that Portslade has a significantly higher FSM percentage.
- I do not feel children with free meals should take precedence over other children. My daughter has SEN requirements but not an ECHP and has no support but children on free meals do? This is not creating a fair and inclusive policy.
- Hard catchment boundaries don't have to change for there to be equal schooling opportunities across Brighton
- Hard for me to judge as my children are of Christian faith and we are interested in Catholic schools only.
- FSM kids already have priority on spaces as per the new policy so why change boundaries with them in mind when they can access spaces outside of catchment anyway?
- Depending on your catchment area you can have a choice of 4 schools or only have 1 choice. This is very unfair.
- Established catchments have allowed property values in Brighton to become too inequitable
- Changes compared to the current offer is minimal but this small change stands to benefit FSM children
- Catchment areas at the moment is not very fair. Some areas that would need more support with young people due to for example level of depravation would benefit are being left with only 1 available school.
- Await and assess the impact of your FSM admissions policy change before changing the existing system further. Otherwise how will you detangke the two and ensure you're not creating other problems?
- As parents we are given only one choice of where to send our kid. The most disadvantaged and poorly funded one.
- As long as adjustments are made so that there is space where schools are oversubscribed or just manage expectations so that people don't apply for schools when it's totally unrealistic they will get a place.
- ikely to have the best chance of success and reduced risk of further changes for some time. However the change of Patcham school catchment, that results in an even smaller FSM percentage than now, seems to counter the stated objectives in

many ways. It feels like its original catchment, without drifting further southwards, would be much more aligned.

6. Child Wellbeing and Development

- Too many catchments only have a choice of one school, this prevents/makes it far harder for pupils to find a school that matches their needs
- Current models are good. Ensure that pupils don't have to travel ridiculously far and also supports existing pupils with younger siblings can go to the same school. Changing things will be at the detriment to more pupils.
- I believe that significant changes to my area will negatively impact on my family life as it means there is a high change on the network they will build through primary school and in the local area will then be disrupted. Organising working parents life and school life is already hard work to have to then factor in potentially an hours commute each way will I believe significantly affect wellbeing and mental health, plus affect their social lives outside of school. I also feel that the emphasis purely on catchment area fudges the fact that there is gross underfunding in schools overall, plus gross underfunding in more deprived areas in general. I have just moved from a more deprived area of Brighton, purely because I was pretty much terrified of my children going to a particular school but that area had no resources, no funding, and that is an area that needs to be addressed alongside any school catchment issues. Shouldn't we be looking at why so many children in certain areas are on free school dinners rather than just trying to disperse them? I feel like it's a way of deflecting a much wider issue.
- Children should have a choice and junior school attended should affect secondary catchment
- 30 less places in each of Dorothy stringer and Varndean will mean 60 children not able to go to school where they live. I believe that you are ignoring actual pupil numbers in current catchment areas in different parts of the city. Demand for places is high in some areas and will continue to be high. Being at school away from your home, local community, family and friends is detrimental to mental health and well being.
- Children are not getting an option to go to a school that may be more suited to them, e.g pastoral care/support
- Changing catchment areas must not prioritize numerical balancing over the needs of vulnerable students, especially those born between 1st September 2014 and 31st August 2015. These children were in their early learning stages during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the SEND Review (2022) emphasizes their need for stability and localized support to mitigate the long-term impacts of pandemic-related disruptions. Sending these vulnerable pupils to schools like Longhill, still rated as "Requires Improvement", may overwhelm a school still working to address its internal challenges with behaviour management, inconsistent teaching, and attendance. This would be detrimental to pupils already struggling due to the pandemic.
- Children living very close to Dorothy Stringer and Varndean are not able to go to their local school. This will impact their wellbeing meaning they have to travel further to school, either by car or public transport, and do not feel connected to their local community, friends or local area. It is wrong on many levels. The cutting off of a very small section close to Varndean and Stringer is bizarre and illogical.
- Children who presently go to primary schools close to them without catchment areas are thrown into mental distress when being told the school closer to them and their primary school is not an option. And yet they have a choice on their selection form and they get to view schools for options on open days that gives them false hope. There is no option if you live a few streets in the wrong direction

- Least disruption has the least negative impact on children and seems to be best model to allow children to go to their local school.
- Impact to friendships and child social development: this catchment changes means we will be isolated from the school friends at Balfour. This would effectively represent the equivalent of moving to an entirely new area, against our choice and starting afresh with friendships at a such crucial age of social development, placing unnecessary strain on our children. Also noting this would be applied to a generation of children already surviving the impact of COVID and lockdown measures which halted their social development during their fundamental development foundation years.
- For where I live, it maintains some element of choice so parents can select the school best for their child's needs.
- I agree that it is fairer to give pupils who are FSM more choice, but also feel it is important for pupils to attend a school in their local area so that they can feel part of the community, walk to school with friends etc. At a time when we are all so aware of the high rate of mental health problems amongst young people, we need to seriously think of the impact of separating young people from many of their friends and have them travel across the city on public transport to schools that are not in their immediate area.
- I think that all families should get a decent school for their children. Making young people go to the schools riddled with racism, homophobia, bullying, poor behaviour and results is not fixing the problem (BACA). If the issues were fixed then maybe people would be more likely to accept proposals. Option A will only provide poor people with less choice, less opportunity and poorer prospects. It will lead to worse outcomes for more young people rather than improve their prospects. I live in Coldean which is not an area with great wealth. Putting us in BACA Catchment is terrible for so many reasons - including those listed above but also include poor teacher recruitment and retention. Ask any teacher in Brighton if they would send their child to BACA and I would be very surprised if any said yes. The lack of choice for is staggering and the proposal will make those with poor prospects find it harder to dig their way out. Make things fairer.
- I think children should be able to choose any school in B&H according to their gcse offerings. Not all schools offer the same options and it is not fair to limit the options for the children according to where they live
- It's ridiculous to remove children from the catchment area of their closest school and make them travel further. It causes problems with peer groups and community spirit, children should be walking to school in the same direction as they do for their closest local primary school and it causes problems for new children arriving in an area integrating with the community spirit and meeting others in their own road.
Especially when it is right on their doorstep, as it is in the Friars and Surrenden Road area where the closest primary school is Balfour, which is on the Varndean /Stringer campus. Your proposal will cause unnecessary stress and concern to children from this area.
- I want my child (so i assume other feel the same) to be able to choose from the schools in the current catchment as all options have different strengths
- If there is to be a change this seems unlikely to cause much disruption to the pupil experience, and as such I would support this.
- I think the current system works well and means schools are local to areas where kids live which makes getting to school and meeting up with friends easier
- If the catchment was widened to Dorothy stringer and to varndean to incorporate east Brighton this would fairer provide local opportunities and balance the numbers. In Saltdean many children travel by bus / train for over an hour to Lewes / Seaford. This impacts on mental health, wellbeing and is the opposite of what any model should provide but yet given the choices this is the decision for many families:

- It is the option that enables children to travel a reasonable distance to school whilst at the same time maintaining links with siblings already at the schools. In a time when social interaction is impacting our children's mental health, making friends who live locally is important for socialising safely outside of school.
Also, children should be able to walk to school, instead of having to take transport.
- Like the opportunity for parents to have some say where their children are educated.
- This option would change our catchment for our second child meaning that our two children would be at different schools in opposite sides of the city and a further commute time for our second child. This would make family logistics impossible as there are no easy public transport links impacting on safety, logistics, child & family wellbeing, likely hood of pre/post school extra curricular activities and potentially attendance.
- More effort should be made to ensure children are able to go to a school near where they live. Travelling long distances will have a big negative impact on children's physical and mental health.
- Minimum change meets the objective set and appears to be the option best thought through. The pupils impacted in Year 5 of primary have already started to select schools and this group is also one that was heavily impacted by disruption during the pandemic. In these situations incremental change is far better than transformational as you can adapt and adjust.
- Minimal change, means children can stay within local areas. More distance travelled often means poorer attendance and therefore outcomes.
- My main concern is travel time for school children - and the impact that additional unnecessary travel time has on children's performance at school and their lives in general; on transport infrastructure, and on the environment. The vast majority of children should have the option of attending their closest school. If a solution is being sought for problems at particular schools they should be solved another way. Any changes will not effect our children as they are already at secondary school.
- Of the three options this is the most reasonable recommendation. It maintains that children within walking distance of schools are able to attend those schools, with no fear of children having to be ripped from their communities and possibly have to commute over two hours a day across six different buses. In this scenario children will be able to remain with their friends and within their communities, providing the least amount of disruption across the city.
- Going from Infants to Secondary is a huge change, and there need to be constants to help with that. Option A is the only option which continues to keep the catchments aligned between Infants and Secondary. As a side note, we moved into our area many years ago specifically because of the choice and variety of local (and walkable) schools on offer - both at Infants and Juniors. To take that choice away by redrawing the boundaries so drastically and depriving children of a school more suited to their needs (which has been available to them until now) is not something I want from my local authority. Whilst I understand the need to address underperforming areas and pupils, it shouldn't come at the cost of those who are performing. Anything too drastic could force parents into difficult decisions of moving away to better the needs of their children or financial struggles of taking them out of the state system and into private - which would cut funding further for local authority schools and effect everyone within the system.
- Option A would provide the most local options for our three children ensuring they are able to walk to school, plus maintaining friendships and being part of the community.
- Proximity to the schools, children going to a school within their own community is so important for children's wellbeing and security - also for the parents - the idea of either us driving, during rush hour, twice a day is a complete disruption to our

working days and childcare solutions. And if they need to use public transport, how can we ensure that they are getting to and from school safely and on time every day.

- Seeks the address the issue with minimal disruption to children and families
- This gives children a couple of different options to attend (one school may not be as good a fit as the other dependent on the child's needs) and both options are an acceptable distance from home
- The small area of porthall has been taken out of Brighton and shifted to Hove. The children have to walk further and along roads rather than parks to get to school. It seems unfair to extract this small group and move them to hove.
- The best of three terrible options. Why are you proposing to fix a problem by creating more problems? The logical thing to do is focus on improving standards at existing schools that need it, not creating chaos by expecting people in the Fiveways area by expecting them to toss their children onto a bus each morning for a daily two hour journey that equates to 10,000 hours over the five years! Likewise, expecting children to travel from Elm Grove to Patcham. Not to mention the stress and anxiety these proposals are already causing children who are facing the prospect of being separated from some or in many cases, all of their friends. How about a fourth option that proposes that the religious schools in the area increase their uptake and a fifth option that simply proposes to bring Longhill and BACA up to standard. Your current proposal options are all damaging to our children's futures as well as affecting their mental health right now at a time when they are most in need of security and assurance.
- This is the least disruptive option. It does not split friends from primary schools and does not mean kids might need to either attend as school inaccessible to where they live (option b) or have no choice (c). It would make more sense to get rid of the 'zones' completely. I don't see how they benefit children- they reduce choice and they will keep having to be moved depending on demand.
- This model retains the ability for [most] children to walk to school thus supporting healthy, active lifestyles and reducing traffic. This is particularly important during darker winter months where a long walk would increase vulnerability. I also want my child to enjoy the ability to socialise with friends who live locally [and learn locally].
- This option enables children to attend a school close to them, avoids traffic congestion and air pollution through pupils needing to drive or take public transport to commute further to school. It will also support children's mental Health by ensuring they attend schools with local friends, and they can use the travel time otherwise wasted to exercise, spend outdoors pursue clubs etc. it is also more Economical For families.
- Right now the council is failing in its duty to SEN, my child got an autism diagnosis 2 years ago, and so far he has not yet been evaluated for support. He will inevitably lose out on getting the support he needs.
- Lots of disruption for kids who have already had their early primary years damaged by Covid
- Making minimal changes for now. See how this goes and review in a few years. There must be transition period, allow families to adjust and move if they wish.
- I think this option provides parents and children with the most options about where they want to go to school, enabling them to stay with friends if that is their priority or choose a school that is right for them.
- I feel its up to the pupil and parent on where they want their child to go. Accessibility is the most important. How will these children travel to schools that are further away?
- It feels very premature since you haven't even seen how the new policy to prioritise FSM students for intake of 2025. Surely wait and see how this works even before contemplating changing catchment areas. This information doesn't show the demand of children needing a placement in various areas. It is important that children should be able to attend the local school where they live and not to be sent to a school

outside of their community. Displacing children to different areas around the city could be very damaging and cause a lot of children to have lengthy travel each day.

- As a Kemptown resident this puts me in a catchment for Longhill only. I do not see this as fair. We have no choice whatsoever and are expected to send our child to a failing school. This is not inclusive. Everyone should have more than 1 choice in all catchments. With this option my daughter would be separated from all her friends who live in Hanover. All children are different and suit different schools so I feel that you should be able to look around and choose a school that you feel your child would be suited too. My daughter is very sensitive to noise and finds it difficult to concentrate in noisy environments. She also struggles socially. I do not feel that Longhill would be the right place for her. I would not send her there. I have visited the school during school hours and was not impressed by the children's behaviour. I also have friends with children there and they are not happy with the school. If Longhill becomes our only option I will be forced to try and find an alternative option as I definitely will not send my daughter there. I bought a house in the catchment area that had 2 good schools that would have been more suitable to my daughters needs and you are now completely taking that option away from me. This is not a fair option for Kemptown residents.

7. Implementation and Evidence

- You've given us nowhere enough information to be able to tell whether this model has any merit. We can't even see exactly where the boundaries lie. No information on the number of pupils, places, the demand for places, no evidence behind the assertion that there needs to be a particular minimum number of places to make any particular school viable, no information on transport arrangements, safeguarding, nothing.
- Better than the others but still not great
- best of 3 bad options as it is closest to what is currently offered.
- Difficult to comment without seeing boundaries
- difficult to see the map boundaries here - a more detailed map is required. The green area has two very good over subscribed schools in its quite small catchment area. One of these should be amalgamated with the north section or the boundaries should purely be distance from school and abolish the wards completely.
- Current option is better than this
- Having one school catchment areas downs make sense
- I do not think there is currently sufficient data-based evidence from the council to support changing catchment areas, although of all 3 options this would have the most minimal potential impact on things like traffic/transport/emissions as well as physical/mental wellbeing of those being uprooted from their communities and also the council's financial challenges. I would hope the council would take more time to see whether the (very positive!) FSM priority policy would have an impact first before making any changes. After not changing catchments, Option A would be my preference of all the proposals.
- I prefer the boundaries as they were
- I see no benefit from this proposal.
- I prefer no change to current catchment boundaries, but if I had to choose one option - this would be it
- The best of 3
- Although I can't see our road on map
- Although option A is better than option C in my opinion, this is my least favourite because it's still keeps Dorothy Stringer and Van Dean together and only increases the numbers slightly.

- All things considered, amending the existing model is perhaps the best option offered in this survey. The current arrangement has many things in its favour - e.g., travel times to school, some parental choice - and these features should be retained. There could be better versions of this option and one wonders why this is the version presented as Option A - it's almost as though it is designed to antagonise parents in some parts of the city.
- A clean option
- A poorly mapped option that misses the point..
- Absurd lack of evidence and supporting data makes this proposal meaningless
- Again little additional detail has been provided here to understand the aims and expected improvements of this plan. But the lack of consideration of factors and context is concerning.
- A more radical approach would s needed
- Again I feel this engagement exercise is hugely biased by the council - where is the option that requests if families would like to continue with the existing model and the council better fund and support those schools more in need? Also where is the evidence that shows which of these models will best serve the pupils (free school meals or otherwise) and the schools? The idea that moving catchment areas will automatically 'pull up' underperforming schools is absurd. Simply reducing the proportion of pupils with free school meals in schools like Longhill will not alter its performance, this will come through improvements in leadership, governance and teachers as highlighted in their latest Ousted report - <https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/2289417#:~:text=quality%20of%20teaching-,requires%20improvement,challenge%20and%20motivate%20all%20students.>
- Catchment area shouldn't be changed but this option is more feasible
- Can't really see map in enough detail on my phone unfortunately
- Catchment areas need to change
- I do not believe that the catchment areas need to be changed any more drastically than this, at this time.
- I don't believe there has been enough time to consider and review any of these changes
- Extraordinarily poor mapping that seems to make arbitrary changes to boundaries in certain location. It does not seem to do what is suggested in the commentary above.
- I disagree with any changes but this is the least worst option. The option maps are not clearly legible. Is this deliberate?
- I disagree with this model because the changes to boundaries would mean that children in my road which is 5 mins walk to Dorothy Stringer would instead have to walk 30+ minutes to go to Patcham. The only reason for this would seem to be the proposed reduction in size of DS, which I disagree with in principle.
- I don't feel enough evidence has been provided to make a fully informed decision on this proposal.
- Do not change was is currently in situation
- I don't see any evidence of causal effect between the target outcomes and the proposed changes to catchment areas - hence the option with the least change is the one I'd support
- Doesn't change much and so won't change much
- Don't have enough information to make an informed decision
- Don't think it goes far enough
- I don't believe there is sufficient evidence to support changing the boundaries of catchment areas. Places should reflect demand in the local community
- I don't feel adequately informed about how these catchment areas have been drawn up to make an informed decision at this point.

- I don't fully understand this, it's explained poorly and I have a science degree! It doesn't show where boundaries were before or what moving boundaries to new model means for children and schools
- I need more information, showing how each different option will support children in our city to achieve and thrive. The map suggests this is an unbalanced approach
- I need to learn more about this model
- I thought the purpose of this exercise was to move away from the current approach (which is considered flawed). According to your PPT this proposal does not appear to meet with your stated objectives.
- It is impossible to see the boundaries properly in the map provided.
- It's so hard to view, you can't zoom in to read it
- Need more detail
- Minimal change
- What does this solution deliver? What are the projected outcomes? How has this map line been considered?
Unfortunately I do not have enough information to consider this properly, and this information hasn't been made available.
- Impossible to answer without information about supply and demand. Where do students live? What are you trying to achieve with these boundaries beyond numbers in catchments?
- impossible to answer without knowing the detail of what changes are proposed !
- Impossible to see the actual boundaries so can't comment
- Map is awful! Unable to see roads so cannot comment
- Minimal change but still disagree
- Map isn't clear where the catchment area would specifically be. I have raised this on the video calls.
- My preferred option but I still disagree with this option as it does not achieve the aims of the council at all.
- The best of a bad bunch
- The best of a bad bunch sums this option up
- The catchments support numbers of pupils needing to access schools
- The change does very little to resolve any issues. Seems like a facade of change.
- The information and the map is not clear enough to make a judgement nor is evidence base on impact yet clear
- The huge yellow area only has ONE school in this catchment area and isn't providing choice
- Simple effective changes
- Some changes made to support the situation with minimal disruption
- Stays the same for a lot of people. People don't like change much! Will probably get you the least grief!
- Seems to be the best of 3 options that are not ideal
- The colours on the map are not distinct enough to recognise where the boundaries are that they represent
- It is the least bad of the proposals as it has the minimum amount of additional travel.
- It is impossible to see the boundaries properly in the map provided.
- The information provided is not enough for parents, pupils, schools and any other interested parties to make an informed decision.
- The map is such poor quality, it's unreadable on anything other than a widescreen monitor. Most people will respond to this survey on their phone, rendering the above map useless. You should have included a question asking whether respondents support changing catchment areas. This survey is biased and misleading.
- The presentation slide does not really explain the modifications to catchment area and association with each school, there are extra coloured areas in between the

original ones but whether that means an overlap between schools or a new association is unclear.

- These maps are poor quality and difficult to read
- These maps are terrible and completely inadequate for the severity of what is being asked of parents. Considering the lack of supporting evidence, the least amount of change is definitely preferable.
- This approach would appear to have the least positive impact of the three in terms of meeting the stated aims of the consultation.
- This is a terrible option
- This is completely unreasonable
- This is similar to the current imperfect system. This is the best of three bad options, because I think the other two options create bigger problems than the one they are trying to solve
- the maps are eligible
- This is the best option of the 3
- This is the best offering
- This is the only viable option as far as I can see
- This isn't too different to the current model.
- This is the most logical option
- IT would have been helpful if this map was more accessible, it is not possible to read the street names for example
- This is the least worst of the options
- This keeps the school options roughly the same for us which is best, as I don't think changing the catchment areas helps solve the problem
- This process needs to be reconsidered. We have seen that children with priority still choose their closest school and we need to understand this first and help equip schools in the areas to get to a standard that is comparable.
- This seems like the least disruptive model of the three
- This seems the least mad of the options, but I don't think changing catchment areas is the answer to a systemic issue.
- This system is the best solution to a difficult situation. It is preferable to radically changing catchment areas and potentially introducing further disorder and uncertainty into what is already a confusing and stressful system. We need to reduce the uncertainty of the lottery system which provides the illusion of choice but in reality simply means that children end up going to a school they have not chosen. This model is the common sense answer.
- This tweak doesn't really change much
- We need better maps
- This maintains a sensible choice for parents and offers sufficient change without trying to reverse social engineer an outcome
- This model makes the most sense and would cause the least stress to families.
- You should provide the proposed boundaries if you are asking us this... you haven't provided enough information to make an informed response, so failing the gunning principles
- This option will require less changes than the others and will be easier for parents to understand.
- This provides minimal impact whilst allowing the council to provide a better balance
- Not enough information to make an informed decision.
- You haven't told me the other options yet, so it is hard to say.
- Would rather no change
- Would be more useful if you could see the details of that map.
- Would be good to see all options and reasoning behind it before making grading in the survey

- This map is not clear enough to allow me to see how it would impact my family & local community. However, I would be less angry about minimal changes rather than some of the other very drastic options.
- This map is unclear where we would be located
- This map is very hard to read. The image is too small. Unhelpful.
- Won't make much difference to status quo which has its advantages and disadvantages.
- Without the proper information or maps that are readable with road names on them, the consultation isn't really a consultation. I have only agreed with this option because it is closer to the current model and so less disruptive than the other two options. But there needs to be proper time for a real meaningful consultation with parents that lays out the full information transparently.
- Without seeing any data it is impossible to judge this option (and the others). Based on the statement that it makes minimal changes to the catchment boundaries, I would question how this helps the disadvantaged. Where is the data related to the impacts of the FSM priority change? It seems obvious to allow that change time to bed in and show measurable results for the disadvantaged before making catchment area changes.
- This would be easier to answer if it showed how it would be different than the current catchments. Either way, for some areas of the city such as BN41 where I live, there is no choice of school whatsoever, just one school.
- Will not achieve your outcomes.
- Why change?
- I am visually impaired this map as an accessible to me
- There is not much change with this model in terms of choice
- What is Option A... how can I vote if I don't know what it is
- We don't have clear information to understand this. Therefore disagree with proposal.
- Visual is too small/low quality for me to be able to properly assess so I'm having to make assumptions without clear data on boundaries. Provide clear data if you're seeking an informed response.
- Very much keen on this option and less disruption
- Very difficult to ascertain from the models drawn which colour represents a catchment area.
- This seems to be least disruptive of the three proposals.
- We have not been provided with enough data and evidence to make a proper informed decision about any of the proposed options. They are impossible to assess on a broader city wide scale as I cannot tell what information has been used to draw the boundaries. I can therefore only speak on a personal level or with more general points.
- This is the best of 4 bad options
- there is not enough information provided for parents to make an informed decision. Specifically, a lack of information about the spatial distribution of the projected decline in the secondary school cohort across the city.
- This data & survey are not accurate so should not be used
- There is not enough information about what these changes would look like.
- The other two proposals seem absurd to me.
- The least bad of the three options
- Not enough data provided by the council to understand the efficacy of this model, for the reasons set out here:
https://adamdennett.github.io/BH_Secondary_Admissions_Analysis/BH_Sec_Sch_Analysis.html
- Not bad to keep it same or similar. Changing admissions criteria is preferable to areas I suspect

- No evidence has been supplied to support this model and allow an informed decision
- None of these three options are good
- Please specify how many students are currently living in the current catchment area and how many students are living in the proposed atachment area. Please specify the spatial distribution of the projected decline.
- Parents need more time, information and understanding as well as the means to suggest amendments and alternatives. Please do not proceed with this consultation.
- On the mobile view there was no table to view the details. Again this survey will be flawed in its results, I don't think the council are doing enough to ensure details are explained enough. And I don't see any options for other languages or accessibility support.
- Not clear what is being proposed
- Not enough information has been provided to make an informed decision. Please see the concerns raised by Professor Adam Dennett, which I endorse. Of all the options provided here, this feels like the least worst option. If this survey is asking people to 'vote' between the 3 options, this is the one I would vote for. But that isn't the same as agreeing with it - I haven't been given enough information to know why there's a need to reduce places at specific schools, what the threshold of 'viability' is for a school etc etc
- Not enough information
- Not enough publicly-available clear analysis of the data used to design this proposal be able to make an informed choice.
- Not really any differnt from the current situation
- Of the three proposals offered, this is by far the most preferred.
- Of the three this is my preference but this is the best of the bad options
- Of all the options, this one is best on the table. Although, I don't think it will massively change anything.
- More details on travel, catchment area, support for families with low income, etc etc. very little info is given therefore I cannot make an informed decision
- not sure enough info has been given here
- However I still question the decision to rush these changes through without more research and longer consultation period.
- Least disruptive
- It's fine probably the easiest
- Least bad of the three options, but a too op not good.
- Least disruptive option
- Least bad option.
- It looks pretty good
- It is very hard to say because the map is almost unreadable
- I don't support any of the models over the existing model, but this is the best of the three options.
- It minimally changes the current situation
- It seems like the council is making this survey intentionally difficult. Wouldn't it make sense to have visuals of these 'options' along with the questions?
- It seems to make no significant difference to the supposed aims of the council.
- Liaise with Parent Support Group for Option D
- Least bad of proposed changes
- Least worst option, ideally no change
- It's like the status quo
- It's hard to choose before seeing all options
- It might need some tweaking around the edges but it's essentially fine.
- It is not that different

- Firstly, this visual is not fit for purpose. It's highly inaccessible and in no way of a high enough standard to support a proposal of this magnitude Your graphics team should be ashamed of themselves for submitting such poor visual aids.
- It is probably the best of bad options
- It is the least worst option. I think we need more evidence and less-rushed consultation . We need more options of why and how to amend the existing model.
- It is not possible to critique the options effectively. The information provided is not adequate and there is a lack of equality impact information.
- It is the least disruptive option but why not just decide by distance to school. It's not a perfect system but these different catchments make no sense
- It has the least amount of impact for the majority of families of school aged children whilst trying to address the viability of all secondary schools across Brighton
- It is difficult to know without seeing the existing catchment areas to compare the change
- It feels like this is still a sensible catchment based on population density and distance to school
- I think it works and should be changed
- i think it would be better to consider more radical options such as relocating a school, but in the absence of that option then this looks better than what we have at the moment I think, in terms of more balanced catchments.
- It feel most balanced
- Insufficient information is provided to be able to answer this question. But this is not an option as an answer provided above.
- It appears minimally disruptive but you haven't provided any information regarding why it would be good or bad so I can't really say.
- Insufficient information has been provided. Ideally, we should be able to know the number of pupils likely to attend in each catchment area. So this can be compared To the proposed reductions in PAN. for each school
- Insufficient data to support this proposal so impossible to understand rationale
- In the short term this change is more likely to supported. My view is the transition to change catchment areas should be more gradual. Perhaps changing slightly each school year
- If a proposal for changes to catchment areas is made I would prefer smaller changes to assess impact, rather than more drastic changes.
- I think there needs to be an overhaul of the catchment areas
- If this keeps schools open and allows equal opportunities then it seems sensible to make some changes with minimal negative impact
- If changes absolutely must be made to catchment areas I'd like to see minimal changes. I implore you to look at other alternatives.
- If changes are to go ahead, I would prefer this model. However, I am not in support of going ahead with changes at present.
- In order for meaningful engagement I would like to know the evidence base and rationale for each proposal. How where they reached? What was the evidence and link to sources, and what proposals were excluded from this engagement excercise. It is a concern that this information is not provided, and from what I gauged from the online meeting, it has still not been provided.
- I would strongly prefer that catchment areas and boundaries stay the same as they currently are. Option A is the option that suggests the least changes and therefore I strongly support A compared to options B and C
- I would need to see the changes of the boundaries
- I think the council need to present more than the three options available for consideration
- I can't see the model!

- I can't see the existing boundaries but assume as you say, its not that different
- I cant see the map properly and we are on the border of this big decision when we bought our house four years ago to ensure our daughters went to either varndean or stringer NOT patcham. I am very stressed about this and my daughter will be devastated to be spilt from all her friends in fiveways. What a shambles
- I don't think we've been provided with adequate information to understand how this would affect the children.
- I cannot read this map.
- I can see benefits to this model and not changing things too much would probably keep more people happy. From a parents perspective I would not have chosen this option as my preferred choice.
- I can't really see or understand what this means from the drawing
- I can't view what "amendments" would be involved in this option. It isn't very clear but it looks similar to the set up we currently have
- I do not have enough information to be able to agree or disagree. What difference does it make for my child?
- I feel that these proposals are being rushed through and residents are being asked to answer closed questions without enough information
- I think rather than just agreeing or disagreeing with a number of set options we should be involved in a proper consultation where we can present our own ideas on an interactive map with layers for pupil numbers, transport options and socioeconomic status.
- I think no changes need to be made
- I like the existing model
- How can residents answer this question when only seen the one option so far
- I don't think that changing catchment areas is the way to achieve your stated objectives
- How can I comment without being able to see all the options and... it not being a clear road map?!?!?! It's a child's drawing..
- I can see the merit of making some adjustments to the existing catchment areas, reviewing the impact, and then making further adjustments if needed to achieve your objectives. This option is more evolution than revolution, allowing time to see the real life impact of changes within a complex system.
- I CAN'T SEE THIS AWFUL MAP?
- A Venn diagram approach should be considered with some overlap and a priority system in the overlap
- Doesn't seem clear it will address the issues raised, marginal changes.
- I can only speak for the Balfour area which is already oversubscribed without access to the background material i can't say - surely you can do better than this
- I don't think amending catchment areas is the answer
- I don't see much change to this so I'm impartial
- I believe there is not enough information provided for parents to make an informed decision. There is a lack of information about the spatial distribution of the projected decline in the secondary school cohort across the city.
- I can't see where the options are. I've gone back to the main page and there's no obvious link. It's getting ridiculous now, how can I answer this question if I can't access more information about the options! Farcical! I cannot proceed past this question, so am forced to put neither disagree or agree - it is a joke!
- I am choosing strongly agree because I think this is the preferable option over the other two put forward. I am aware of Class Divide's position, and think they are an impressive organisation, whose aims and values I fully support. However, I do not think the necessary infrastructure, transport options in particular, are in place to support option B and so I cannot support it.

- I am happy with the current arrangements.

8. Geographic Distribution

- You will still not have enough pupil intake for Longhill due to low primary school throughput and outflow to East Sussex schools to the E and NE. Whitehawk becomes a community divided in N and S. Having two large schools at the very edge of a catchment will cause an increase in pupil passenger miles and average travel time for pupils attending Varndean/Stringer. You'll have cherry picked a number of children currently attending City Academy, Balfour, Westdene, Hertford road (and probably others) and removed them from their peer groups as they move through the school system.
- I would feel disappointed if I lived just north of Varndean or Dorothy Stringer and fell outside of the catchment area despite living very close.
- It really would be helpful to have all three models together to get an idea of the differences. Could you have included the population size of each catchment area? Just a bit of feedback.
- This option would mean that people living on Surrenden rd and areas that literally back onto Varndean and DS would need to get a bus to Patcham instead of walking out their back gate to go to school. It doesn't comply with the city's climate plans and if I lived there (which I don't) I'd be livid.
- This option would see people in the existing Stringer and Varndene catchment losing access to those schools. Changing the Stringer and Varndene catchment (to my knowledge) has been tried twice before and failed because of parent pushback. More recently, attempts at reducing the size of popular primary schools such as St Lukes have failed for the same reason. Unless the Council knows something that I do not, trying the same thing again seems like an enormous waste of time and political capital. In addition, this option divides Whitehawk in two. Why not keep existing PANs at Stringer and Vardene and expand the existing catchment to include all of Whitehawk?
- Catchment areas do not allowed fair choices for our children , the are so much choice of secondary schools in Hove area then any other parts of Brighton . That's should be free choice of secondary school without boundaries.
- It is still highly uneven in terms of choice for some areas
- The larger oversubscribed schools took on extra classes in the bulge years which has pushed their facilities to the maximum. They were always going to have to reduce back down after the bulge years were over. Catchment changes are always controversial but these are nowhere near as bad as the last one where the council tried to push Hove kids to PACA and not offer them a school in Hove which was ridiculous.
- This option would unfairly disadvantage pupils in the Port Hall/Prestonville area who would no longer have access to Dorothy Stringer and Varndean (both a 30-minute walk), and instead be moved to Blatchington Mill School (a 45-min walk) or Hove Park (a 1 hour walk). While my family live just north of Port Hall in an area not affected by the catchment change for this particular option, it would mean my children would likely attend secondary school with very few of their local primary cohort so it still has negative repercussions for my family.
- This would cause no choice for the partners of Woodingdean and rottingdean
- Without picking up and moving school sites, your options as a Council seem limited. This gives everyone geographically a good option. It's hard to comment without also understanding the densities of where the young people currently live.
- I am putting 'agree' because I guess it makes sense to keep the catchments the same, but with declining birthrate students from outside the catchment will get places in non-catchment schools.

- This would cause the least disruption to catchment areas in my view.
- Vardean and Stringer are the closest schools to our road (Withdean Cresecnt) but we would not be in the catchment area for either school.
- With this option East Brighton has even more limited choice!
- You are removing choice from less affluent areas. That is deeply unfair. I am also fundamentally opposed to academies and several less affluent areas only have an academy.
- This would change the catchment area of Kemptown dramatically and put off families moving here
- The other options penalise Hollingdean residents. No options penalise Hanover residents
- Very little change in effect this would not achieve much, the able students in saltdean will go to PCS and seafood head, the able in Woodingdean will go to Lewes Priory.
- We live two roads above vardean. My son could walk there himself. This would see us unable to access the school we can see from our house.
- yeah fine. don't see how it will improve the BACA or Longhill situation though.
- Why is Portslade not included? Surely Hive Park and Kings can be part of the same area as PACA
- Why are the roads that are RIGHT next to Vardene excluded from it's catchment area?
- Whitehawk needs to be further divided into other schools
- We live in the Port Hall area which is in Brighton but in this proposal we can expected to send out children to a school further away in Hove or to attend a faith school. Our children's friends are mainly in this area or in the central Brighton area and if this proposal is adopted their friends will not live close by.
- We live in Patcham and would like more choice, we live 5 mins from Vardean but are children are not in catchment
- We live in Coldean and part of the reason we chose to live here was to have the choice between two schools, to enable us to decide which would best suit our children. Models A and C remove the choice. Our eldest child goes to Patcham HS and we are very disappointed that you are looking to take that option away. This was already consulted on recently and rejected, I cannot believe our council is putting terrible proposals forward once again so soon.
- Very difficult to assess without more data but looks unfair that in Hove (bigger houses, more money) you have more schools and less travel than in the East . Also don't know what the catchment is for primary schools; how are these borders affecting kids who've gone to primary together?
- We have purchased a house in a specific area of the city precisely because of the secondary school catchment in that area. Changing it would make us consider leaving where we live and moving away from Brighton
- This would still mean that children who live in very close proximity to a local secondary school may now find themselves out of the catchment area. These secondary school catchments do not correspond with primary school catchments meaning friendship groups will be torn up and parents will find themselves in an impossible situation having to get different school age children into different schools far apart.
- This will likely result in the closure of Longhill as families opt out of the catchment
- This would move us out of the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer and Vardean. We live in Prestonville and our children go to Stanford School. There are long established close ties between this neighbour and these schools and there is a footpath connection to Preston Path which means the walk is under 30 minutes. I object to moving the Prestonville/Port Hall boundary into the Hove catchment area.

- This seems designed to engineer Longhill in particular. It has minimal impact on other schools and BACA seems largely overlooked.
- This seems close to the existing system. I do think children living in central Brighton should go to a Central Brighton school. Do not think Varndean and Stringer should reduce numbers as many children would like to go here and currently do not get the opportunity.
- This represents logical catchment area
- this removes Port Hall from the Stringer and Varndean catchment which is presently where most children from Stanford go, so while you say this only enacts minor changes to the catchment, it drastically changes options for all Stanford children.
- This reduces choice as some catchments are limited to one high school only
- This option still leaves all children in the Deans with only one option for a poorly performing school, while central Brighton and Hove have access to multiple good schools.
- This option prevents children from going to their local school (some of which live next to the school grounds).
- This option offers no other choice for those in Portslade than a poorly performing school while the other areas have options.
- This option is unfair to residents in the Coombe Road, Bevendean and Moulscombe areas. I live on Kimberley Road, closer to two schools which we do not get an option to send our child to under this option
- This option gives BACA as the only school choice for those living in Coldean
- This option excludes the Porthall area, which is currently in the existing catchment area for schools with good standards i.e. Varndean and Stringer. Expand the catchment area, don't exclude areas in the existing catchment area.
- This model still keeps Varndean and Dorothy Stringer in the same catchment
- This model significantly reduces choice of school for children in the east of the city. Our postcode in Coldean would require us to send our children to BACA which requires improvement. Something that we do not want to do.
- This model reduces the free school meal (FSM) percentage at Patcham High school which would enable more children on FSM to choose it, whether living in and out of catchment area. This would be good unless it raises applications to such an extent that children living in Patcham would not get a place at the school. On this model the north part of Whitehawk is in a different catchment area to the south part. It should either all be in the catchment or all out if it to avoid the situation where children living on one side of the road have a choice of Stringer/Varndean but this one the other side only have a 'choice' of Longhill.
- This model leaves large areas with no choice of school, just the one they are in the catchment area of.
- This model gives students in Hove and Central Brighton far greater choice of schools. Equally, the areas with the greatest choice of schools correlate with higher house prices /rental prices, allowing wealthier parents to 'buy in' to their desired catchment area. East Brighton is disadvantaged with singular options.
- This model fundamentally keeps the status quo - with Varndean and Dorothy Stringer largely maintaining their 'advantaged' catchments and includes an inexplicable decision to divide Whitehawk in two.
- This maintains choice for parents and children of schools that suit their needs and avoids shifting boundaries significantly where many people may have bought properties/ moved homes already to be within existing catchment areas for current schools.
- This isolates a growing residential area for families in Kemptown and east Brighton and forces them to go to a school which requires improvement.

- This is the best of a bad bunch, I don't fully support it because of the breakup of the Preston Park community with many children in the Friars area not being able to attend a school that they live right next to.
- This is a better solution than the other options but still not ideal. The catchment distribution more closely matches the distribution of children in the city, but leaves some areas with only one choice of school. You could consider overlapping catchment areas to address this.
- This doesn't affect my area much at all so don't have an issue with it
- This excludes us from Ds/V, and doesn't seem fair on Whitehawk
- This doesn't offer any choice to students in the catchments of PACA BACA Longhill or Patcham
- Saltdean only have 1 option which has had the lowest ofsted report last 2 times its not improved at all
- Several catchment areas only have the 'choice' of 1 school
- This could be one of the options but still seems unfair on those living literally metres from a school that can not attend that one
- seems like a sneaky tweak on existing already unfair boundaries
- These choices seem to make geographical sense.
- These catchments have been drawn to allocated school places based on where the high volumes of children live.
- There is only one option for east Brighton and further eastern areas
- There is no real choice of school in Portslade, pupils there are in the catchment for a single school (PACA) while half a mile down the road pupils have a choice of 4, Hove Park, Blatch, Kings and Newman. You're presenting the pupils of Portslade with the illusion of choice.
- There is no choice other than Longhill for Saltdean children, you absolutely need a choice regarding secondary education
- There appears to remain a lack of options for those in the East
- The system as it stands works , but you are trying to save one school at the expense of the Brighton community , apart from effecting Hove , obviously!
- the least disruptive in terms of the options we thought we would have from here (Hollingdean Terrace)
- The current catchment areas are unfair as some of them only offer 1 choice.
- The current boundaries are fine as they are. If you're going to change them then this should be the option chosen as it makes minimal changes to the catchment area.
- The catchment areas seemed to favour the more affluent areas with the more popular schools
- The boundary for the Patcham catchment has been extended almost to the door of Varndean, and close to Dorothy Stringer. This is bound to result in some bizarre outcomes for children living very close to the latter two schools yet unable to attend them.
- Surrenden Road should be in the stringer and varndean catchment area. The timid is more aligned to the Surrenden and Fiveways area as a community
- Strongly agree as the best of the three however seems crazy that the Friar roads would not have access to Varndean/Stringer given the gardens back onto these schools
- Some areas have only 1 school so no choice
- Saltdean has extremely limited options.
- Reduced choice for some areas
- Prevents those in less privileged part of the city to have sufficient choice of thriving schools
- Portslade only has one school option which seems unfair, we live closer to hove park than paca but can't have that as an option.

- Portslade has no options
- Portslade children are being overlooked again
- PortHall / prestonville area has been put into Hove schools despite not being walkable where 2 schools are
- People should have a minimum of 2 choices this catchment limits some areas to only one this is not fair.
- People living a few minutes walk from Varndean will be in the catchment area for Patcham. This is silly and makes no sense
- Patcham catchment area has only one school serving a densely populated suburban area, with no other option whereas other areas in Hove and Preston Park have at least two options.
- Not enough choice for those in Portslade
- Only some catchments have a choice of schools, although I agree with the seafront being moved into Longhill catchment
- Of the 3 options, if I had to choose, I most agree with option A. I would prefer no change to the current catchment boundaries.
- Of all three options this is the best as it doesn't mess around with the current boundaries too much.
- Not sure it changes much for the catchment our children are in
- No change for Saltdean
- Need more options for Saltdean
- Nearest for our house
- My child is at Downs Junior School - this is the only model that allows him and the friends he has grown up with through infant and junior school to choose the same secondary school. The other options divide the children at Downs Junior School according to which side of Ditchling Road they live on: the rich side or the poor side.
- Moving catchment areas will have a knock on effect on house prices - often pricing many families out of the market. Any changes need to go through very rigorous consultations
- Moulscroomb has been taken over largely by students end result is less families in the area,
- Minimal choice for those in east Brighton
- Minimal boundary change
- Makes sense to adjust the Brighton areas if the purpose is to maximise support for free meals
- Makes no difference to where I live. Still unfair distribution of schools with some areas (fiveways, Hove) hoarding them.
- Makes a lot of sense geographically with the schools as they are.
- Many children in the East of the city would only be in catchment of BACA, which does not offer choice. There would also be a large number commuting to Longhill, having to travel far for a low quality education.
- Longhill & BACA have huge catchments, and little desire to go there.
- Long Hill is not a viable option for most kids in the central areas. It's too far
- Living on the Portslade side of city boundary, not being CofE, no option but PACA
- Limiting children in Portslade to one school catchment is highly unfair
- Limited options for some areas
- Least geographical disturbance for children
- Lack of choices in current catchment area Bevendean
- Kempdown will suffer and you will have no families living there. There are already a limited number. This will be a disadvantage for Kempdown
- It's unfair that residents in West Hove/Portslade only have one choice of school
- It's the one that least affects our current options from Hanover.

- It puts our road out of the catchment area for stringer and varndean, two successful and thriving schools. It means a large proportion of households only have one choice of school, so no choice at all!
- It seems clear that schools in Hove are evenly distributed, but not in Brighton. Longhill appears to cover a wide area but perhaps has a smaller intake to other Brighton schools.
- It would allow my kid to choose between two schools, which will be important since his current classmates are from many catchment areas. However, it's horrible for the residents next to Varndean, such as Friars Crescent, as kids should be able to attend a school they can walk to in a couple of minutes (remember that Google Maps will not take into consideration walking across the field etc. so distances might seem distorted there).
- it's missing Friars and Surrenden Park
- It's of minimal impact - for good and bad
- It will cause least disruption and people have latest planned their lives and homes well in advance based on similar catchments. Makes logical/geographical sense for Coldean to go to BACA. If BACA and long hill get larger catchments like this it will make them more viable. Keeps schools more 'local' to their student population.
- It is unfair that Portslade only has one school in its catchment.
- It makes no sense to remove houses so close to Varndean from the catchment of a popular and oversubscribed school.
- It looks like gerrymandering. It affects my catchment area the most, and the only option for my children will be to attend one that requires improvement.
- It is unfair that a large proportion of the city north of Bear Road are only given an Academy school as their only option. Currently a very poor school according to ofsted.
- It has t changed, mouscoombe still only has 1 choice
- It doesn't make sense to cut off streets which are backing onto one school field and make them a catchment for a school much further away.
- In some areas you are limited to 1 school option
- If this achieves the council's desires for opportunity and pupil distribution with the least disruption, then this should be the way to go to minimise distress to your residents/constituents and MAINTAIN PARENTAL PREFERENCE. However, i do think it is utter madness to cut the northern boundary of the Varndean/Stringer catchment where it is. The houses directly behind stringer and backing on the Varndean playing fields should logically be in this catchment. Making them go to Patcham away from the community of friends through primary school is nonsensical. A 5 min walk to school through their back gates or half an hour to patcham? Ridiculous. Please reconsider the boundary for the Friars
- I think this is fine, but I'm not sure it does enough to address the educational outcomes for the kids in east Brighton
- I strongly agree with this change. We moved to Coldean solely based on the school catchment area of Coldean Primary School and Patcham High School. The fact that all three of the proposed options put Coldean in the catchment of Brighton Aldridge Community Academy is unacceptable given the problems that are well-reported/documented by Ofstead and the Molscoomb area. We will move out of Coldean or even Brighton before I accept this option.
- I only agree to this option because its the closet to the current catchment areas. However, I do not understand why you are considering changing the catchment areas at this stage
- I live on Swanborough drive and have limited options - I.e. only Longhill. I would like my children to be closer to town where I work rather than even further away. It will be more practical for my family.

- I live in Hove and can see the schools we would like in the catchment bar 1 – Varndean
- I live in Saltdean and under no circumstances do I feel that the current option of Longhill would be beneficial to my children, ofsted have said it needs improvement and nothing seems to ever change (in fact it gets worse). Having other options would be much better. I would rather homeschool than send my children to Longhill.
- I like this option. It makes sense geography wise and makes sure there is a continuation of students from primary to secondary
- I don't understand why the northern bounty of Varndean and Stringer catchment needs to change. Students currently going to Balfour will be split from their friends and I can see the benefit of doing this.
- I don't think it's fair that certain places in the city are only given 1 option only especially when it's a school that you really don't want.
- I don't believe there are enough secondary schools in Brighton and Hove
- I don't believe stringer and varndean should be in the same catchment area but this is the least bad option
- I do not support any catchment proposal that does not incorporate distance to school into its allocation priority. This gives us only 1 choice of school in our catchment - which is 5 times further than my closest school, requires a bus and or a significantly higher risk route to school
Neither of my closest schools are available to me in this catchment
the catchment changes proposed for Patcham High reduce the projected FSM rate from the current (22%) to 17% which completely contradicts the aim of the initiative
- I do not have an issue with the boundary changes but I do have an issue with people living in Patcham still having no choice. It's unfair that some families get a choice of schools whereas those on the Patcham catchment have no choice. The school does not suit all children and parents should have a choice.
- I disagree as this would put Coldean into the BACA catchment instead of Patcham. BACA has had very bad reports, including of racism and bullying, and I would strongly object to my children going there.
- I don't think BACA needs Coldean for numbers and FSM redistribution can be done via the new admissions rules. Longhill might need to take a small amount more of e.g. Kempdown to bolster numbers but better to invest in the school and fix the root cause rather than a sticking plaster which causes upheaval for residents.
Moving the Friar area and Peacock Lane makes no sense. It is a handful of children being removed from their community when Patcham is oversubscribed. The Friar roads are pretty much built in the school grounds of Varndean and Stringer.
- I believe that opening out the catchment areas would be the best approach.
- I agree with some changes however disagree with not having the choice of varndean and stringer.
- I am answering this in self interest, however it seems very unfair that kids directly behind varndean wouldn't have the option of going there!
- Having catchment areas with only one school option means we as parents/pupils have no choice for secondary schooling places. This diagram also shows all "poorer"/ socially deprived areas within the city having one school option only whereby Hove/ City centre have multiple options/ access.
- Hove has 5 secondary schools in one catchment area. Why can't Brighton and the Deans have 1 catchment for it's 5 secondary schools? This way you would reduce pitting communities against each and increase potential choice for people that currently only have 1 secondary school in their catchment area.
- East and West have just one school in catchment
- Ensures in our catchment area the schools geographically closest to us remain

- Doesn't address the fact that Longhill is surplus to requirements. The local school, geographically, for Whitehawk is Stringer. The local school for Saltdean is in Peacehaven.
- Coombe road area still does not have a choice of school
- Children in the Port Hall/Prestonville community will be particularly disadvantaged
- Children in Rottingdean, Saltdean etc, should not only have Longhill as an option.
- Children in the east of the city will continue only to be able to attend Longhill, a failing school.
- cant see the changes from the previous catchment, so cant choose an option, but it is clear, that there is five schools in Hove and only 2 in Brighton and the ones outside (East, North, North West and West have only 1), so clearly Hove schools need to be included in West and North) and a new comp school in (queens park area)
- BACA is a school with a series of terrible OFSTED report and is part of an unpopular Multi Academy Trust that is divorced from the local community. It also uses its funding from central government to pay ludicrously high salaries to a small number of people. It is not fair or reasonable that every child in North East Brighton (on free school meals or not) should have no choice beyond BACA. I would rather see families from North East Brighton have a wider catchment area that includes BHCCC (to whatever possible degree) faith schools. This would bolster their numbers, funding and provision at the cost of BACA. A positive thing.
- At present the Coldean area is in the catchment for Patcham & BACA. In option A only BACA - no thank you!
- As we live in kemptown, this change would result in us a)only having access to a single school b)having our kids at a school outside of Brighton c)we previously had access to 2 good schools, now only one (requires improvement) school d)we chose to buy our property based on this factor e)this change will bring down the value of our home.
- As we live in kemptown, this change would result in us a)only having access to a single school b)having our kids at a school outside of Brighton c)we previously had access to 2 good schools, now only one (requires improvement) school d)we chose to buy our property based on this factor e)this change will bring down the value of our home.
- As a resident of the Coombe Road area, I'm still unable to go to the school which is geographically closest (Varndean) with this model.
- As a resident of Friar Road with a daughter who will go to secondary school in 2028, it's obviously not an attractive solution if she can't go to the school that is round the corner (Varndean).
- As there is still only one school in the east of the city, this change makes no difference whatsoever to about a third of the residents of the city.
- As mentioned in my previous response, Reducing the catchment for the excellent schools in the centre of Brighton, Can only have negative effects. However of all these "bad options" This is probably the least bad..
- 5 schools in one catchment area