

LPLT Admissions Consultation 2020-21 - All responses

Notes on redactions:

- 1. Personal data categories have been removed.
- 2. Personal data within all other response categories has been redacted and will appear as [] in the text.

Form Submission ID	Sibling priority across secondary schools				LPGS Y12 PAN		OTHER					
	1. Both schools already give priority to children with an elder sibling at that school. Do you agree with the proposal to also give priority to children with a sibling at the other secondary school (but not the primary schools)		2. Both schools currently give priority to children with siblings who were external admissions to Year 12. Do you agree with the proposal to discount siblings who joined Year 12 from a non-LPLT secondary school		3. Do you have any comments to make on the proposed changes to the Sixth Form Application Form (External Candidates)		4. LPGS proposes to reduce its Year 12 PAN for external candidates from 100 to 60. It will still be possible to admit additional external candidates, if internal admissions are lower than expected. Do you agree with this proposal		5. Please use this space to make any additional comments that are relevant to the proposed changes in this consultation.			
Total respondents 212	Yes 158 74.5%	No 46 21.7%	Neutral 7 3.3%	No response 12 5.7%	Yes 111 52.4%	No 34 16.0%	Neutral 64 30.2%	No response 14 6.6%	Yes 108 50.9%	No 30 14.2%	Neutral 71 33.5%	No response 14 6.6%

1			Test									
2			Test		Test							
3	Yes		For siblings to be able to travel in the same direction and to create the same ethos at home for learning and behaviour.	Neutral					Neutral			
4	Yes			Neutral					Neutral			
5	Yes			Neutral					Neutral			
6	Yes			Yes					Yes			
7	Yes		The schools are part of the same trust. There are many children who would like to attend the same site as their older siblings yet cannot because they are of a different gender. If the schools were mixed sex schools, there would be no discrimination.	Neutral		None			Yes			
8	Yes			No					Yes			
9	Yes		Reasonable statement and necessary	Yes					Yes			
10	Yes		Local families with a child at one school could be forced to move withoutout sibling priority as catchments are slightly different and mean moving away for the already established child	Neutral		no			Yes			
11	Yes		As a trust working together siblings of different sexes should be able to attend the same trust schools	Yes					Neutral			
12	Yes			No					Yes			
13	Yes			Yes		No			Yes			
14	Yes		(i) At the moment it seems unfair that the sibling rule applies across schools for your staff's children but not mine. The same test of fairness should apply. (ii) The gender of my children should not affect their ability to attend an LPLT secondary school - at the moment it does. (iii) At the moment, two families living next door to each other with identically-aged children to their neighbour, will have widely different application outcomes, depending on whether the son or daughter is the older child. This is not right and makes the current admission criteria seem unjust. (iv) Having my [] at the same site will reduce travel/ traffic and practical arrangements/ holidays problems and. All the other well versed reasons that sibling rules exist also apply. (v) If you are trying to integrate the two schools more (as your previous consultation suggested was well underway), the proposed new sibling rule will help achieve this and help create 'LPLT families' who can support the Trusts work across the two schools, rather than having a second child attend another school and splitting that community feeling.	Yes		I think this makes sense and closes a potential loop hole of some families getting their older child into year 12 (which is currently relatively easy) so that their younger sibling can enter at year 7 (currently much harder). As you state in the consultation document, this will prevent the catchment area going out much further.	None		Yes		Thanks for running this consultation, it will square up a current unfairness in your admissions criteria. My wife and I support your work so thanks very much.	
15	Neutral			No		It isn't fair on primary schools closer to the site such as Oak Lodge and Unicorn.	No		Yes			Any changes that occur should not be detrimental to the primary schools which are closer than those in the trust.
16	Yes			Yes					Yes			
17	Yes		Because my [] and it would be wonderful for []	Yes					Neutral			
18	Yes			Neutral			No comment		Yes			Those attending the secondary schools, and their siblings, should be allowed priority admission to Y12. However sixth form should generally have a college feel and allow students to meet and come into contact with those who have been educated elsewhere for the purposes of learning through variation and from people from different walks of life
19	Yes			Neutral					Yes			
20	Yes			Neutral					Neutral			
21	Yes			Yes					Yes			
22	Yes			Neutral					Yes			
23	Yes			Yes					Yes			
24	Yes			Neutral					Neutral			
25	Yes			No			No		Yes			
26	Yes		[]	Neutral		Concerned that this will potentially limit admission to those in question one.	No		Neutral			
27	Yes		I have [] get a place at the secondary school although []. This will be a cause of much anxiety for him and for us	No		That doesn't seem fair			Yes			
28	Yes			No					Neutral			
29	Yes			Neutral					Yes			

30	No	Boys should not be advantaged or disadvantaged in the admissions process for LPSB simply because they happen to have a sister who is older than them. This is the impact of the proposed change.	No	Once admitted to the sixth form, there should be no distinction in any respect between pupils who attended different secondary schools.	No	The reduction in sixth form places seems very large. I think this should be reduced to minimise the impact on those affected at relatively short notice.
		On applying to single sex schools, parents are aware that a sibling of another gender is not able to attend the same school. LPSG and LPSB are treated as separate schools in all other respects in the admissions process and this should be consistent.		I assume there must be only a small number of YR 7 pupils joining the school due to a sibling in yr 12/13 therefore this seems like a petty change with no educational basis.		There does not seem to be any educational argument for any of these changes.
31	Yes		Yes		Yes	
32	Yes	It will mean older brother able to walk with younger sister, convenient if school drop off/pick up is required	Yes		No	Yes
33	Yes	It is sensible and logical given the co-location of the schools. Why should a family in the local area with two girls (or two boys) have greater certainty over school places than a family with a girl and a boy (which is the current situation).	Yes	It's logical.	No	Yes
34	Yes		Yes			Yes
35	No	Secondary school students are more independent and so there is no value in giving priority to siblings in different schools.	No	The entry of external students into the sixth form enriches the school as it increases the economic and cultural diversity of the cohort. External students bring fresh ideas due their different learning and life experiences. The school is therefore challenged to constantly review and improve its practice and thus improve outcomes for all students. The admission of the siblings of external sixth form students will spread these advantages throughout all the year groups and strengthen the whole school.		Neutral
36	Yes		Yes			Neutral
37	Yes		Yes			Neutral
38	Yes		Neutral			Yes
39	No	The schools currently have a fair process for offering places to children. The sibling rule already limits spaces for other children and having this rule would limit it further.	No	The schools currently have a fair process for offering places to children. The sibling rule already limits spaces for other children and having this rule would limit it further.		No
						I feel the recent proposal and previous proposal to limit intake from specific schools is an intention to be elitist and selective by the trust. As a state school I fundamentally disagree with this approach. The schools should be there for everyone and a mix of abilities.
40	Yes		Yes			Neutral
41	Yes		Yes			Yes
42	Yes		Yes			Yes
43			Yes			Yes
44	No		No		No	Yes
45	Yes		Neutral			Neutral
46	Yes		Yes			Yes
47	No	LPSG has a wider catchment area than LPSB. During the LPPS priority consultation, one of the main reasons for not awarding LPPS with priority admissions to LPSG/LPSB was because it would increase the catchment area.	Neutral			Neutral
		It can not be fair now to widen the catchment areas for LPSB due to a sibling already going to LPSG.				
48	Yes	We live [] from the secondary schools with a []. At present, we face our [] a bus to another school further away. The only fair answer is to apply the sibling rule across both, or do away with the sibling rule altogether, I am supportive of this change.	Yes		No	Yes
49	Yes	My []. I have a [] and LPLT would be the first choice school for them	Yes	I agree with proposal as these children have not spent their secondary education at LPLT and it then reduces the availability for siblings for those that have.	Children should automatically qualify for sixth form if they have been a pupil for their secondary schooling.	Yes
						N/A
50	Neutral	The schools are part of the same trust and hence as we do not choose whether if we will have boys or girls when we form a family the secondary schools should be considered as one so that one family can bring both their kids in the same school rather than doing two pick drop offs and pick ups.	Neutral			Yes
51	No		No			No
52	Yes		Yes			Yes
53	Yes	Think this makes sense to allow siblings despite gender.	No	Think once sibling has left and and is year 12, it's not following the same rules.	No	Neutral
54	Yes		Yes			Yes
55	Yes	It just makes sense if a family is already committed to the school run and the academy as a whole that this would prioritise siblings, not just single sex but also opposite sex. We are hoping that our []. We have a [], so this would give her an advantage. It must be said though that our home is well within the catchment of both schools, so the change in admissions policy would not really affect us anyway. It seems fair that schools on the same site have sibling rule.	Yes	I think the schools should keep their intake as local as possible. This is to enhance the local community and to keep traffic to a minimum.		Neutral
56	Yes		Yes		No	Neutral
57	Yes		Neutral			Neutral
58	Yes		Neutral			Yes
59	Yes		Yes			Yes
60	Yes		Yes			Yes
61	Yes		Yes			Yes
62	Yes	This is a matter of basic gender equality and consistency with other policies given both schools are now in the same MAT. Thank you for proposing to correct this current anomaly.	Yes		No more comments	Yes
						This is a sensible set of reforms. Thank you for pursuing them.
63	No		Neutral			Yes
64	Yes	They seem so closely linked and it seems to make sense for convenience and care reasons that siblings can attend either sex school.	Yes	N/a	N/a	Yes
65	No	If you want to be a school for the local community, you should be equally available to all.	Neutral		No	Neutral
66	Yes		No			No
						I do not think that the number of year 12 external candidates should be reduced from 100.
67	Neutral		Yes			No
68	No	There is no reason. Secondary children generally take public transport so don't need to attend schools in close proximity	Neutral			Neutral

69	No	By choosing single sex education for their children parents are actively deciding to educate their children separately. This proposed policy is not fair on parents with all girls (or all boys). It's not fair for a girl/boy (eldest or only) child, living closer to the school, to lose out on a place because of the siblings of children (of the other gender) already in the other school. Places should be allocated separately for the boys school and the girls school based on proximity to the school.	Yes	These siblings are very different in age and therefore this would not negatively impact on family logistics.	No	It's not far on the 40 girls who would lose out on places
70	No		No		No	
71	Yes		Yes		Yes	
72	Yes		Yes		Yes	
73	Yes		Yes		Neutral	
74	Yes		Yes		Yes	
75	Yes	Logistically this makes sense.	Neutral		No	
76	Yes	This makes perfect sense to implement. It appears unfair that families are potentially penalised by the current rules which could materially impact key arrangements.	Yes	Otherwise this runs the risk of the system being abused / manipulated.	Yes	
77	No	They are different schools from one another.	Neutral		Neutral	
78	No	I do not agree, historically the girls school has had a catchment area that stretches further than the boys school. Having only [] it doesn't seem fair that a classmate of one of my sons could get a place living further away from the school than us due to this new sibling rule. I understand siblings at the same school getting priority but I feel that after that it should be done by distance to the school to keep things fair for the majority. Having attended [] this has never been the case so I cannot understand the reasoning to change things now.	Yes		Yes	
79	Yes	It would be logistically helpful for siblings to attend schools near each other. Local schools should be for local children.	Yes	Local schools should be for local children first and foremost.	Yes	Langley students should be offered a space in their own sixth form of they have studied there for the last 5 years.
80	Yes	This is allowed between the new Bullers Wood boys and girls school.	Neutral		Neutral	
81	Yes	So siblings can walk to school together. This will not have a major impact on Langley school catchment as will only affect very small number of children but is very helpful to those families.	Neutral		Neutral	
82	Yes	many families do not have same sex children.	Neutral		Neutral	
83	Neutral		Neutral		No	
84	Yes	I have a [] and live just outside of the catchment area for the girls. We would like for our [] school and not to be penalised on the basis of her gender.	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a
85	No	I have a child at [] so would be helpful for my other child [] to be on campus too of which this proposal could affect her chances of taking a place. Further to this, the boys and girls schools have always been separate and I see no reason to change it.	Neutral		Neutral	I think it's beneficial as this would encourage those already at the school to apply and for consistency
86	No	My [] The catchment for the LPGB is smaller than LPGS, the girls school also admits 20 more pupils each year. By changing this policy you reduce the amount of spaces to other children, how many children will miss out on having a space at the boys school due to this change? This will effect parents who have been in the catchment for the boys school for the last 5 years and suddenly find they are no longer sure of a place. If the trust is planning on changing the rules surely both schools should admit the same number of pupils each year to make it a fair playing field. These consolations are unfair and sure LPLT are only carrying them out due to them making mistakes when setting up the LPPS. This sibling rule should only effect those in the primary school as this is one of the promises which was made to parents.	Neutral		Yes	
87	No		Yes		Neutral	
88	No		Yes		Yes	
89	Yes		No		Yes	
90	Yes	It makes sense that siblings in the same household can attend such closely linked secondary schools. It's a quirk that the smaller numbers of forms in the boy's school mean that a sister and brother could credibly end up in secondary schools miles apart rather than next door to one another.	Yes	A year 12 pupil and their family may make the decision to apply for a 6th form college for a variety of criteria and may come from far outside the typical catchment as would younger siblings availing of the proximity rule and taking a place from a more local applicant. I would not be concerned if the schools were not significantly oversubscribed but they are and the fairest approach is to allocate places based on proximity of the child's residence to the school.	This seems fair per response 1 - allowing siblings to attend schools near one another	These should be local schools for local students, and give priority to internal applicants who have come up through the secondary school.
91	Yes		Yes		No	
92	No	Some families may move out of the school's catchment area yet try to secure place using siblings priority. Local children could lose out unfairly.	Yes	Children in local area should not be losing out.	No.	Schools within the same trust should not give preferential advantages to each other. Each school should carry out admission procedure separately to be fair to local communities.
93	Yes		Yes		Yes	
94	Yes	This makes sense as in a mixed school sibling get priority and they are both secondary schools	Neutral		Neutral	
95	Yes		Yes		Yes	
96	No	It seems entirely unfair that a boy could get priority to the boys school because he has a sister at the girls school. They are separate schools with different size intakes and different catchment distances. The fact that the girls school currently has a wider catchment means that there would be a number of boys that would get priority as a sibling who would live outside of the natural catchment distance for the boys school. This seems extremely unfair and is discriminating against local boys. More local boys will have to travel longer distances to get to school, where other boys who would not usually have got a place at the boys school will be taking up the places. It makes no sense at all and is extremely unfair. Unless the boys school and the girls school are merged into one co-ed secondary school, with one single intake this should not be allowed to go ahead.	Yes	Families should not be able to choose Year 12 for their child just so that a younger sibling can attend the school. The admission for the younger sibling should be based on normal catchment proximity rules.	No comments	There are many local children [] who missed out on a place at LPBS by 0.1 mile. He now has to travel to a school 3 miles away, taking two buses each way rather than walking for 20 minutes down the road. When it comes to his sixth form placement he would very much like to go to his local sixth form which would be Langley and there will be many others like him. The sixth form places should be based on ability rather than whether or not you are already at the school, and places should not therefore be restricted to those pupils who are not already students.
97	No		No		No	

98	Yes	I agree to giving priority to siblings at the other secondary schools (Langley Boys & Girls) but not to Langley Trust primary schools as this effectively makes Langley Turst Primary schools feeder schools which I oppose. I think Langley schools should do everything they can to ensure children who live in the local area and attend all primary schools in the local area (not just Langley Trust Primary schools) are presented with an equal and fair chance to attend Langley secondary schools. I think this was made very clear last year when hundreds of local parents united in this message. I feel strongly about this and feel the timing of this new consultation is deplorable considering the pandemic and being so close to Christmas.	Yes	I don't think priority should be given to siblings of children who enter at year 12, it is not necessary and it will reduce even further the number of children who could be admitted and do not have siblings.	No	I think this is wrong. Langley Year 12 is similar to a sixth form college and has previously given bright children who may not have lived within the catchment or got in previously a second chance at a good education and further education.
99	Neutral		Yes		Yes	
100	No	This is my second response.	Neutral		Neutral	
		Having just read that you are also consulting on granting priority to LPPS in 2023 & 2024 whilst simultaneously increasing the PAN year groups for two years only, I would ask you to wait and see the impact of sibling priority on the proposed increased year groups in 2023 & 24 Is it completely unfair to have a child currently at LPPS but not in the 2023 & 2024 secondary school intake, but in the current catchment area and potentially missing out on a place at LPSB due to the impact of new sibling priority admissions and the potential expanded year groups that proceed his admission year. The expanding catchment area during the LPPS feeder school consultation was one of the key factors to reject it but you are now considering expanding the LPSB to essentially match the LPSG. This is completely unfair on the local community who have put faith and invested in to the LPPS project but are not part of the 2023/24 secondary school admission groups.				
101	Yes		No		Yes	
102	Yes		No		Yes	
103	Yes	So that siblings can walk to and from school together. Feel more integrated with Langley Park Learning Trust if children from both schools can attend.	Neutral		Yes	
104	No	This is part of a longer term strategy to move to an elitist 'LPST only' strategy which I strongly disagree with	No	No	Neutral	
105	No		Neutral		Neutral	
106	Yes	This is a more fair approach.	Yes	This is a more fair approach	Yes	This is a more fair approach
107	Yes	This to me feels very fair and equitable and therefore fully support this proposed change	Yes	I am in favor of this proposed change. It ensures children who already are within the catchment area and therefore 'internal' can access places first.	No comments. I am in favor of the proposed changes.	Yes
108	No		Neutral		Neutral	
109	Yes	I have/had children at both schools. This would have reduced anxiety around applying for a school place for the second child.	Neutral	On balance I would allow it but I don't have experience of this situation		Yes
110	Yes		Yes		Neutral	
111	Yes		Yes		Neutral	
112	Neutral		No		No	
113	No	Priority should be given to sibling of the same sex only.	No	The sibling rule should count regardless of whether the pupil attended an LPLT school or not.	Only collect data that you really require and need.	Neutral
114	No		No		No	No
115	No	I think all children are different and all schools are different, what may have been good for one sibling may not meet the needs of another. Knowing that you at least have a place guaranteed can take the pressure off the decision. So I'm not really for or against the proposal. I don't think the process really has to change as the number of places in combining the schools are huge.	Yes		No	Yes
116	Yes	I think as the schools are working closer together it makes sense for families regardless of what sex children they have - have access to and hopefully attend the same school on the same site.	Yes	Yes because the catchment for Y12 is wider than Y7 catchment it would decrease the catchment area for Y7, and therefore be unfair for local children and put them at a disadvantage.		Yes
117	Yes	It makes sense that siblings can attend schools in close proximity, making lives for families easier and having a positive environmental impact for anyone travelling by car.	Yes	Sibling priority should only apply for children who have been through their schooling from y7-11.		Neutral
118	Yes	It is a learning trust with 2 secondary school on one campus. Siblings should be able to attend each school.	Yes	Children who have been at the secondary schools should have the choice to continue their education there.		Neutral
119	No	The proximity for admissions is materially different between the schools. This proposal would negatively impact local children who would otherwise secure a place in LPSB.	Neutral			Yes
120	Yes		Neutral			Yes
121	Yes		No			No
122	No		No			Yes
123	Yes	Siblings should be at the same school	No			Yes
124	Yes	This will remove the current gender inequality which exists today so that if you have more than one child who are boys & girls rather than children of the same sex you are at a potential disadvantage	No			No
125	Yes					
126	Yes	With the schools both being located on the same site, allowing a brother and a sister to attend the same school site will make it easier for the parents, the children (as they can walk together) and help with cutting down the number of cars on site and thus the environment.	Yes	To keep the catchment within the local area.	No	Yes
127	Yes		Yes			No
128	No	It could significantly reduce the numbers of places available for students who live close to LPSG, and leave them with long travel distances if they are not admitted. IUF siblings are within the catchment, they will be admitted anyway	Yes	Those living locally should have priority	No	Yes
129	Yes		Yes			Yes
130	Yes	This makes admissions fairer for those with children of different genders.	Yes	If siblings of external Year 12 admissions are allowed, this will mean that more local children will be denied a place at their closest school, as candidates for Year 12 are accepted from outside the usual catchment area. This goes against the previous consultation result, to keep local schools for local children.	No	Yes

131	Yes		Neutral			Neutral	
132	Yes	As the boys catchment is smaller this will enable families with girls at Langley secondary to also send their sons to a Langley school. We are in this position but fall outside of the Langley boys catchment. It is extremely beneficial both for logistics and as a shared academic trust to have all our children attend schools within the same trust.	Yes		No	Neutral	
133	Yes	Just makes sense. Current system disadvantages families with siblings of different sexes as they are not guaranteed a place, versus families with siblings of the same sex who are guaranteed a place.	Yes	This seems fair	No	Neutral	
134	Yes	Makes logical sense, given the schools are on the same site to have siblings go to the same place.	Neutral			Yes	
135	Yes	Because of the proximity of the two schools and the inconvenience to parents if one sibling gets in but the other doesn't	Neutral		No	Neutral	
136	No		Neutral			Neutral	
137	Yes		Yes			Yes	
138	Yes	This would enable siblings to walk or travel to the same site together safely.	Yes			Yes	
139	Yes	They are on the same site so it is the logical thing to do and would help families logistically with schooling arrangements for their children, especially those who have moved into the area to access the Langley schools.	No	It wouldn't make any sense. They are already at the school and when and how they got there is beside the point.		Neutral	
140	Yes	Agree as makes the sibling rule non favorable towards certain genders.	Yes	Agree as otherwise this gives an unfair advantage as would allow people to join only in Year 12 and then benefit from the existing and proposed sibling rule.	No	Yes	
141	No		No			Neutral	
142	No	There is no sensible argument for that. It would only deprive a lot of children of an entry chance, reducing the catchment area.	Yes			No	
143	No	That will reduce even more the catchment area of the schools and I can't see valuable reasons for such change.	Yes			No	
144	Yes	It seems a much fairer system to ensure that siblings can have access to the two schools as they are in the same MAT and work so closely together. It would seem very unfair for one sibling to get into either the boys or girls school and their sibling not to get into the sister school.	Yes			Neutral	
145	Neutral		Neutral			Neutral	
146	Yes		Yes			Yes	
147	No	I think this will have an unfair impact on children with no sibling at the other secondary school and I do not feel that it is a good change to the current policy.	Neutral		No	Yes	I am against the idea of a feeder school even if it is just temporary. The school made a mistake promising something they shouldn't have promised. I believe that this will just be a slippery slope into trying to make the feeder status permanent.
148	Yes	We have had to move for siblings to be in the catchment of a school and now my child has to travel much further alone to get to school.	Neutral			Yes	
149	Yes	I agree with the proposal to give priority to children with a sibling at the other secondary school (but not the primary schools) because many families in the area have siblings of both genders and there are benefits of having them attend schools with such close links, giving them more of a shared experience and helping them to continue to bond during their teenage years when siblings of different sexes can become more distant. It also has practical benefits such as being able to walk together etc. It will also help the many families who live close to the school with both boys and girls as currently, with the boys school having a smaller catchment area, it means many families end up with their boys in a "no man's land" as they are not within the distance from the school currently required but are not within any other secondary catchment despite their female sibling being able to attend their local school.	Neutral		No	Neutral	
150	No		No			No	
151	Yes	As a parent of [], it would seem to be of great benefit to have my [] as well. There are many logistical reasons for this (including drop off/pick up, environmental, and parental interaction with the trust). This also allows for a shared and consistent education experience for all of my children.	Neutral			Neutral	I would recommend Year 12/13 being combined across the Boys and Girls school, with shared resources would give a better education for all
152	No	Langley girls catchment extends much further than a Langley boys, so boys not within the catchment; will get a priority place, despite people living closer.	No	We missed out on a place to [] because of the distance, [], making their [], much further out than us, and we didn't get a place.	Existing pupils should get sibling rule, but new students shouldn't as they are likely to come from outside the catchment, all be it a small amount	Yes	
153	No	I strongly object to this proposed change. This proposal would only be beneficial to families who have older girl siblings, and would discriminate against families with only boys or who have an elder boy sibling, such as in our case. There seems to be no substantial reasoning behind the proposed changes and I do not consider there to be any exceptional circumstances to alter the current sibling rule. The changes would put families with eldest boys at an unfair disadvantage. I am also concerned about the limited assessment that has been provided as part of the consultation, and whilst a 4yr average of previous distances has been provided, no analysis of how these areas would be impacted has been shown. I consider that analytical data should be provided in order for parents reading the consultation to fully understand how the changes could impact them. In my experience alone, I know several families [] despite living further away from the school purely due to having an older sister already at LPSG. I am also concerned that the timing of the consultation and that the current pandemic situation could hinder the response rate with people's thoughts elsewhere. Having been a local resident for over [], and with our [], I feel very worried that our son's chances of being offered a place at LPSB could be affected unfairly by this proposal.	Yes		None	Neutral	

154	No	It isn't fair that some parents have previously made the decision to send their child to a mixed school to ensure a brother or sister attend the same school. But now this will change. Having been single sex schools for so long, it doesn't seem fair to now change it.	Neutral	6th forms interlink so this isn't such a concern	No
155	Yes	This will benefit me as [] and I'm not sure my [] with the criteria right now as we live on the very edge of the catchment area for LPSG. This sibling rule would ensure my [] get in and I would like to have both my children at the Langley schools for many reasons including them being geographically near each other and home.	Yes	So many people move close to the school to ensure that they are no admitted. They have committed to being part of the Langley Trust schools. If a family like this missed a place due to a sibling who joined in Year 12 from a non-LPLT secondary school, this would be very unfair.	Neutral
156	Yes	It would make sense for parents who have children of both sex to be able to attend secondary schools on the same site. As the catchment of Langley boys is smaller those who would have got into the boys would also have a met the criteria for the girls so, therefore the number of extra girls at the girls school affecting the the total admission numbers would be negligible.	Neutral		Yes
157	Yes	It's in the children's best interests that where they have a sibling they are able to attend school in a similar location not least so they can travel together safely.	Neutral		Neutral
158	No	There is no reason why a sibling at one school should affect the priority of the other sibling in another school	Yes	Yes. The school could be increasing the catchment area footprint.	No Yes
159	Yes		Neutral		Neutral
160	Yes		Yes		Neutral
161	Yes	I fell I would be fair to both the children and parents	Neutral		Neutral
162	No	No, the PAN for the two schools is different with 240 girls being admitted for every 220 boys. The proximity for admission is also very different for the two schools with the girls school reaching 0.27-0.41 miles further in the last three years. If siblings of either gender are admitted, this would significantly reduce the distance of offers for the boys school.	Yes	Sixth form education admissions should not influence admissions of younger siblings.	Unclear what the changes are as only the proposed form was attached and not the current. Neutral
163	Yes		Neutral		No
164	Yes	The schools are effectively as one being on the same site and it is in parents interests to ensure that siblings of different genders can attend for logistical reasons.	Yes	Unless the admission criteria is the same for year 12 as for year 7, this would enable younger siblings to circumvent the admissions criteria thereby putting even more pressure on the catchment.	Yes
165	Yes	As a parent of [], there is a risk my children will attend secondary schools several miles apart should there be an exceptional intake of same gender siblings in the year my younger child attends. This is a pragmatic and sensible tweak to admission rules to provide children the support of siblings at the same site and provide parents with comfort their children will attend secondary school in close proximity to each other. I strongly support this change.	Yes		Yes
166	Yes		Yes		Yes
167	No	Langley Park Girls has a significantly larger catchment compared to Langley Park Boys school. If sibling priority is given to those that currently attend the LPG, it will further reduce an already small catchment for the boys. It would potentially mean that boys living further away (near Shortlands station for example) would be prioritised over boys that are in the current catchment and living in the Langley Park area. I think it would be extremely unfair for those boys whom are living in the current catchment to have to travel further afield to get to school despite having LPB within waking distance.	Yes	I feel it is perfectly reasonable to discount those in year 12 that joined only that year as this is also to do with catchment and can negatively impact those living within walking distance to the school.	Yes
168	Yes	[] who we would like to attend Langley girls but currently have to hope we are in the catchment.	Yes	Priority should be give to children who attended LPLT schools prior to external applicants.	No Yes
169	Yes	This will remove uncertainty for families within the catchment for one school but not the other, and avoid families having to face the prospect of having children at 2 or more geographically separated schools, which can be difficult to manage.	Yes	This change removes an unfair advantage for families who do not live near to either school and which (currently) has the potential to disadvantage those who do.	No Yes
170	Yes	The 2 schools currently have a reciprocal arrangement regarding the transfer of students between the schools for the sixth form, which recognises the relationship that exists between them. Furthermore, the admissions criteria were recently amended to allow reciprocal sibling priority admission between the two schools for children of staff, similarly recognising the relationship between the schools. That change also recognised the benefit and logic in allowing children of the opposite sex to attend schools in the same location. Where parents choose a single sex secondary education for their children, it is hugely important that, where there is a relationship between a girls and boys school, that all of their children can attend the schools- it is as close as they can get to sending their children to the same school. The only way to give families that opportunity is to allow a reciprocal priority admission for siblings across the schools, as the catchments won't be the same year on year (and there is a difference between the girls and boys school anyway due to the larger pan of 240 in the girls school). Making this change will also bring the catchment areas for both schools more in line with each other, which is helpful for parents looking to position themselves for the schools and will relieve the pressure on the prohibitively expensive house prices in the vicinity of the school. It is also really important that siblings can walk to school together for their safety and it gives them reassurance knowing that family members are close by.	Yes	It makes sense as otherwise year 7 siblings of year 12 children will be given an unfair advantage over other year 7 entrants who actually live closer. It produces similar inequality on Y7 entry as last year's proposed feeder primary changes would have (had they been introduced).	No Yes
171	Yes	I think it's important that siblings can walk to school together and, where a sibling attends a single sex school that has a relationship with a single sex school for the opposite sex, a sibling can attend that school rather than possibly having to attend a totally different school, miles in the other direction. Also it's not fair that children of teachers get admissions priority across both schools when other children don't. The reasons for allowing children of teachers priority apply to regular kids too (ie. Logistics of getting kids to school in 2 different places and benefit of having children at corresponding schools).	Yes	It isn't fair that siblings of children in Yr 12 can get priority over children joining in Yr 7 who live significantly closer.	Yes

172	Yes	Siblings will both be able to have an education that follows the same learning/teaching ethos due to them both attending a school within the same trust. This will provide consistency with the education given to siblings. Also, the siblings will be able to travel to and from school together.	Yes	I feel strongly that children should be able to attend their local school if they so wish and numbers allow. By discounting siblings who joined Year 12 from a non-LPLT secondary school, this will give more priority to local children who might otherwise lose out on a place because places have gone to candidates who live much further away than pupils typically admitted to Years 7 to 11 simply due to them having a sibling in Year 12 who was an external candidate. I also feel it is fairer if priority is given to children who have had siblings that have attended the LPLT trust schools through Years 7-11.	Yes	
173	Yes	So that brother/sister are on the site next door to each other and can travel to school together.	No	Easier for parents if children at the same school.	Yes	
174	Yes					
175	Yes					
176	Yes	This is long overdue, it makes sense to have siblings at the same site.	Yes		Yes	
177	Yes	As a parent of [] its illogical to have to send them to schools on different campuses.	Neutral	I am unaffected by the proposal so remain neutral	None	I am unaffected by the proposal so remain neutral
178	Yes		Yes			
179	Yes		Neutral			
180	Yes		Neutral			
181	Yes	It makes perfect sense for children who live in the same household to attend a senior school at the same location	Yes	It would be unfair for a child of either senior school to miss out on a sixth form place to an external candidate. If a child can continue their education within the trust that makes sense		
182	Yes	It is easier for parents to have children at the same schools in terms of logistics. It is better for the environment for just one drop off.	Neutral			
183	Yes	If you have two children at the same address it makes sense for them to attend the same school.	Yes			
184	Yes	I agree with the proposal, it makes sense now the schools are part of the same academy.	Neutral			
185	Yes	As the two schools form part of the same trust and are on the same physical site, it seems ridiculous that the sibling rule across the two schools is already not in place. Logistically, my 2 daughters are/will attend the girls school, but my son will not have the opportunity to attend the boys school due to the smaller catchment. Allowing siblings to go to school together not only benefits family life, but also will improve the environment (family travelling to and from one site only).	Neutral	For the same family and environmental reasons as stated above, no it makes sense to allow siblings from sixth formers to attend, regardless of which school they came from. However, I have ticked neutral as I do believe sixth form is a different category- sixth formers joining are much more independent and therefore I can see the argument that they should not open the floodgates for their younger siblings from outside the area.	Yes	
186	Yes	For children travelling to school together this will cut down on pollution and traffic in the lane if two or more children are travelling / being dropped off together.	Neutral			
187	No	The schools should be for local children. That this is the feeling of the community the schools serve was very clear from a previous consultation the Trust undertook in 2019/20. Looking at catchment data it is clear the girls's school recruits from a larger radius than the boys's school. This change would create a gender disadvantage for local boys meaning they are less likely to be able to go to their local school if they do not have an elder sibling. This new consultation is an attempt to keep seeking preferential feeder routes into the school which disadvantage other local children, despite previous and recent strong feedback against this. The Trust is exhibiting bad faith toward its local community and fails the Nolan principles of Objectivity, Accountability and Openness for leadership in education.	Yes	Yes, the schools should be for local children.	Neutral	For children travelling to school together this will cut down on pollution and traffic in the lane if two or more children are travelling / being dropped off together. Although not in the scope of this consultation I thought I saw in previous communication that the Trust was consulting on having bulge year groups to accommodate a miscommunication to Langley Park Primary School parents regarding feeder status. Again this would serve to disadvantage local children unless measures were put in place to accommodate any siblings for subsequent year groups as well.
188	Yes		Yes			
189	Yes	It's safer for children with an older sibling to travel to school together.	Yes			
190	Yes	It makes sense as most children are local to the school and younger pupils can travel with the older sibling. This could also potentially reduce the secondary traffic around Langley and therefore safer for all.	Yes			
191	Yes	This will bring consistency between siblings and foster a greater community spirit in the Langley campus and local area. Environmental factors – it will reduce traffic and pollution in the community which has an impact of health and wellbeing. Sharing of resources between schools will be optimised which will reduce duplication, waste and reduce costs. The joint 6th form is an excellent example of how well an integrated approach works.	No	It circumvents the current eligibility criteria for admissions which will have a detrimental impact on local families having access to their closest school.	No	Continuity of education for existing students.
192	Yes	More practical to have siblings at the same school. Can be very difficult for parents to juggle commitments when kids attend schools far from each other.	Yes			This will impact LPBS applicants.
193	Yes	More Practical.	Yes			
194	Yes	It would make it more feasible for parents to manage their time effectively and enable them to attend more school functions.	Yes	No comment		This will affect LPBG applications.
195	Yes	This is long overdue	Yes			
196	Yes	[], we agree with this proposal as it supports [], in coordination with Langley Park Learning Trust. This is a precursor to the consultation due at the end of 2021 for the temporary (2 year) change to admissions to give priority (feeder status) to children from Langley Park Primary School to both Secondary Schools.	Neutral			
197	Yes	Equality, it is sexist not to.	Neutral			
198	Yes	[], however I understand that we are not currently in catchment.	Yes			
199	Yes	We have applied for our []. [] - []. We are local and so understandably want them to be located in the same area.	Yes	In our minds it seems disingenuous for a child to gain entry ‘via the back door’ due to the fact that an older sibling has gained entry to year 12 despite the fact that they live outside of the usual proximity criteria for year 7 entry into the school; at the expense of other children who live more local.		

200	No	The catchment areas differs significantly in size between the boys and the girls. The catchment area for LPSG has been larger for many years, this is due to their being more pressure on boys places. I have 2 boys and I think if the proposal goes ahead the LPSB catchment will get even smaller. This is our nearest school and its 0.7 miles away we may not be able to send our children to their local secondary school LPSB. There are very few schools in Bromley we will be in the catchment for if any by the time my sons are ready to go to secondary school. We will therefore have to get our own children to take 2 buses to get to their nearest Bromley secondary school if we are still in the catchment area for those schools. Changing the admission criteria will have a very detrimental effect. Personally I think if you want to change it so that siblings from either school can attend the 2 secondary schools have to merge into one and therefore the it becomes 1 co-ed school. Otherwise you will be in a situation where boys who have older sisters will have more chance of a place at the school. I really think the trust should focus on providing education to the children who live most local to the school.	Neutral		Neutral	
201	No	Let places for those of us who don't have siblings	No	Let places for the rest of us.	No	
202	Yes		Yes		Yes	
203	Yes		Neutral		Neutral	
204	Yes	When managing family life, it makes sense to bring all siblings to the same site for their schooling. We are aware that the schooling and sports are of a very high standard at the trust. For us as a family, with current intake areas, this would mean that all of our children would benefit from the Trusts' investment in them and would enjoy continuity through their learning journey.	Yes	In this instance we feel that the current admissions policy would mean that many year 7 children will be drawn in from a much larger area. Whereas by discounting those that are external in year 12 from a non-LPLT secondary school then it is clear that people who live closer to the schools would be served better. There is more likely to be a greater sense of community.	None.	Yes It seems that the trust are wanting to become more cohesive, despite still being single sex schools in their own right. It makes sense for children of the same family to be given priority to attend the alternative school on the same campus. At our current address our daughter would be able to attend the secondary school, yet our sons would not. This consultation is very welcome and we hope for the best.
205	Yes	Siblings will be able to travel to school together or be dropped off/collected at the same time. With both secondary schools under The LPLT, this brings the two schools closer together for both learning and administration; such as term dates.	Yes	Allowing this to continue reduces the number of spaces in the two secondary schools for local children, whether siblings or first time applicates.	n/a	Yes n/a
206	Yes	I think it's unfair on families splitting their children and having to possibly send them to a school a distance away when they already have a sibling in one of the secondary schools.	Yes	Same reason as above.		Neutral
207	No	This would greatly reduce the catchment area for the boys school and me	Yes	If year 12 students were not discounted there may be an unbalanc	No	Neutral
208	Yes		Yes			Yes I agree with closer collaboration between the 2 schools and furthermore, would like to see this extended so that the skills and facilities of both schools can be shared. I attended LPSG (why is there no consistency on whether it's LPSG or LPGS?!) including the sixth form in the mid 90s and it was a truly mixed Sixth form where we had lessons with teachers from both schools. It worked really well and I've long felt it a shame that the schools moved away from that model.
209	Yes	Both schools are within the same MAT and being unwilling to offer sibling places to girls whose brothers are at LPSB or to boys whose sisters are at LPSG is sexist – and unfairly penalises families with both girls and boys. If the sibling rule is to remain (which I hope it does), the gender of the sibling should not be taken into account	No			Neutral
210	Yes		Yes			Yes
211	Yes	I agree with the Board of Trustees' statement that 'it would be fair and reasonable to give parents who already have a child at one of the Trust's secondary schools priority for their younger children to be admitted to the schools, regardless of their younger children's gender. Langley Park Schools for Girls and Boys are already closely linked as they share the same site and are run by the same academy trust. Staff already receive sibling priority across the two schools and it is not fair and equitable that parents who live in the local area are currently not given the same right. It also makes little sense that families who are already invested in and connected with Langley Park Learning Trust and its ethos and values may need to place one child elsewhere purely due to gender. The situation of not being eligible to join an older sibling within a linked school could cause unnecessary distress to some children. Linking the admissions process is a logical and necessary step and essential to ensure fair and equal access to school provision. In fact by not linking admission to the two schools, some children will be disadvantaged purely as a result of their gender, which is wholly unacceptable. Within Bromley, the only other pair of boys/girls schools (Bullers Wood) already provide sibling priority across the two schools. It is unclear why Langley Park do not do the same, given the legislation	Yes	I agree that it is fair and reasonable to discount sibling priority for those whose older sibling joined in Year 12. This is because the sixth form provision draws from a much larger area than the secondary school. Taking Year 7 students from outside the core catchment area will result in a reduction of the 'local' catchment area as well as longer journeys to school with the resulting congestion and air pollution.		Neutral

212	Yes	This allows parents of mixed sex siblings to plan for the future properly and removes the considerable anxiety that is caused by one child gaining entry and the other child(ren) potentially being relocated at another school; and the associated logistical, environmental and safety concerns that such a scenario would bring.	Yes	In my mind it seems disingenuous for a child to gain entry 'via the back door' due to the fact that an older sibling has gained entry to year 12 despite the fact that they live outside of the usual proximity criteria for year 7 entry into the school; at the expense of other children who live more local.	Yes	<i>(related to Q4)</i> In my opinion, it is preferable for there to be continuity between children studying at a particular school and then progressing through to sixth form at the same school rather than moving elsewhere. Fewer external candidates would help to result in the school ethos, standards and culture being maintained through the sixth form rather than it being more greatly diluted. In addition, I understand from the notice that a child from LPSFB applying for a sixth form place at LPSFG (and presumably vice versa?) would be treated as an external candidate, however in my opinion this does not seem logical and may warrant further consideration; albeit I am not sure how often such a scenario would arise! We have applied for our Son to join LPSFB commencing with the 2021/22 academic year and we have a daughter who is currently in Year 4 and who we would like to start LPSFG in to start in the 2023/24 academic year. We live on the outer edge of the typical catchment area and while we understand from your notice that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact in our scenario because we live 'well within the usual LPSG geographical footprint', there is ultimately no guarantee that she will gain entry into LPSFG when we apply and the fact the catchment area may shrink in future years. Amending the sibling rule would instantly remove the anxiety we will suffer for the next two years until she has (hopefully) a place confirmed; where it is likely that she will probably get a place anyway! As mentioned previously, it is preferable for parents to have mixed sex children located in close proximity to each other during their whole school life – for safety, logistical and environmental reasons. We are concerned about the temporary <i>(related to Q4)</i> I understand that the schools will want 'the best' students as this would help them achieve better scores for A levels etc. However, I feel it is important that children that have come through either Langley school has the option to remain in the school and be supported. Again it also means that the schools are catering for the local community. I also feel it is important that a number external candidates are still able to join as for some children they require a new start and new environment for 6th form rather than staying in their current school. I feel that the above proposal are fair as they are all in line with the schools providing spaces for the local community.
213	Yes	This proposal would bring consistency to that which is already in place regarding the admission criteria that children of staff at either school have priority of a place. This proposal will still mean that children attending the schools live in the local area. This proposal will mean that families are not having to navigate the tricky scenario of having their children in two different schools that are not anywhere near each other. This proposal provides an option for families who have a child of each gender and do not have the option of a mixed secondary, due to where they live and mixed school catchments, in order to have their children attending a school near to each other. This proposal could potentially have an impact on traffic as if parents are bringing children to school in cars, although not the preferred option as walking will be better, as children are coming from the same family home there would be one car rather than two. The proposal will help to bring cohesion to the two schools as they would potentially be working with the same	Yes	The current priority means that children entering year 7 may not be from the local area as the Year 12 external admissions could come from further away and this is what the local community want to avoid.	Yes	
214	Yes	I fully agree that 'it would be fair and reasonable to give parents who already have a child at one of the Trust's secondary schools priority for their younger children to be admitted to the schools, regardless of their younger children's gender.' Langley Park Schools for Girls and Boys are closely linked. They share the same site and are run by the same trust. Staff receive sibling priority across the two schools, and it is not fair that this right is not extended to other children in the local area. It makes little sense that families who are already invested in and connected with Langley Park Learning Trust and its ethos and values may need to place one child elsewhere purely due to gender. The situation of not being eligible to join an older sibling within a linked school causes unnecessary distress to some children. Linking the admissions process is a necessary step and essential to ensure fair and equal access. By not linking admission to the two schools, some children will be disadvantaged purely because of their gender, which is wholly unacceptable. Within Bromley, the only other pair of boys/girls schools (Bullers Wood) already provide sibling priority across the two schools. Langley Park should do the same, given the legislation around gender equality issues which appears to be breached by the current system.	Neutral		Neutral	