

LPLT Admission Consultation Full Report - Other Comments and Consultee Status

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 a white gap in the text.
3. Some redactions have been made due to the provision of the Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 (ISS Regulations). Where this is the case, the text has been removed and replaced with [Deleted due to the requirements of the ISS Regulations]

Form Submission ID	OTHER COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS. If you have any other comments or observations to make on any aspect of the proposed new admission arrangements for any of the schools, please set these out below (if your comments relate to a specific school, please make t	Please confirm your consultee status :
1		Unknown
2		Parent of child at another local primary school
3		Parent of child at another local primary school
4		Parent of child at another local primary school
5		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
6	<p>The idea of streaming in children from feeder schools that are part of the same academy trust, but who live outside of the catchment area is particularly unfair for local children who would otherwise be admitted._x000D_</p> <p>It promotes the idea that you can rent a flat in a primary catchment area for a short period of time, subsequently move away and then stream all of your children through to 6th form at the expense of local families._x000D_</p> <p>A secondary effect is that the children who have been given preference then are needing to travel further and frequently driven into the schools area twice a day, at great cost to the environment and air quality of both the children at the school and local residents._x000D_</p> <p>If children from feeder schools live in the local area, they will still be admitted after looked after children and siblings have been offered places, should they choose to apply._x000D_</p> <p>A further issue is that the Harris chain has also recently published a similar consultation. Meaning that if both plans go ahead, in the local area we are heading towards a situation where children who live in the local area, but haven't attended a primary that has later been deemed a feeder for either Langley or Harris, are left with a severely restricted choice that they weren't aware would be the case when applying for primary school places. Aside from the restriction of parental choice this then also pushes up the need for children to travel further / more car journeys to attend secondary school._x000D_</p> <p>The arguments around curriculum alignment, are difficult to support given that KS2 & 3 are part of the National Curriculum._x000D_</p> <p>I would be interested to hear some concrete examples of how local pupils at Langley from non-trust primaries have struggled as a direct result of their respective primary schools's educational vision & mission being misaligned to Langley's?</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
7		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
8		Parent of child at another local primary school
9		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years

10	This attempt at empire building by local secondary schools has got to stop. We are fortunate to live in an area with a host of good primary schools and too few good secondary schools. Driving towards a situation where children who do have access to good schools such as Hayes or Ravensbourne have priority of access to the Langley schools over children at Balgowan or Marian avian is patently unfair and should be objected to in the strongest terms.	Parent of child at another local primary school
11		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
12		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
13		Parent of child at another local primary school
14		Parent of child at another local primary school
15		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
16		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
17		Parent of child at another local primary school
18		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
19		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
20		Parent of child at another local primary school
21		Parent of child at another local primary school
22		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
23	The sibling rule should apply regardless of the child's gender. e.g. a girl attending LPSG would count as a sibling for her younger brother wanting to go to LPSB. In your consultation document when talking about current gender unfairness relating to children of staff, you state that; _x000D_ "The Board of Trustees believe that this is necessary to avoid an unfair situation where a staff member's child does not receive priority because they are the wrong sex, for example, where they work at LPSG but their child is a boy, or where they work at LPSB and have a son who will have priority, and a daughter who will not." _x000D_ I agree with this and therefore think the same principle should apply to the sibling rule too. It seems odd to not allow a sibling place to be offered just because their sibling is the wrong gender.	Parent of child at another local primary school
24		Parent of child at another local primary school
25		Parent of child at another local primary school
26		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
27		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
28	The principle of creating a feeder school through the trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole. _x000D_ Children need to go to a school in their local community for basic safety as the area is less safe and they shouldn't be further from home than necessary. Children from Trust schools staff should not take places of children who live in the catchment.	Parent of child at another local primary school
29	As above. You would only have to live near a feeder infant/primary for the admission time and would be guaranteed 17 years of education without having to be anywhere near the school!	Parent of child at another local primary school
30		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
31		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
32		Parent of child at another local primary school
33		Parent of child at another local primary school
34		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
35		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
36		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
37		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

38		Parent of child at another local primary school
39	Hawsbrooke Lane is currently not safe, especially when picking up children from LPPS at 3.20 as the secondary schools come out and you are walking against a tide of students coming in the opposite direction. LPPS is proposing to make the schools road a car free zone during drop off and pick up times. This would make it difficult for those who live too far away to drive to the school or would put a strain on neighbouring roads with parking and traffic.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
40		Parent of child at another local primary school
41		Parent of child at another local primary school
42		Parent of child at another local primary school
43		Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of another interested organisation
44		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
45		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
46		Parent of child at another local primary school
47		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
48		Parent of child at another local primary school
49	Your consultation document proposes to allow children of staff priority, regardless of the child's sex. The reason stated is to avoid an "unfair situation" where a ".....child does not receive priority because they are the wrong sex..." I agree this makes sense._x000D_ _x000D_ This cross-school approach (between LPSG and LPSB) makes sense to me but my point is that this same principal should also apply to the sibling rule. The sibling rule should apply across the two secondary schools; so if a girl is attending LPSG, her younger brother should not be disadvantaged just because he is the wrong sex. He should be prioritised a place at LPSB under the sibling rule._x000D_ _x000D_ It seems that you are trying to address the "unfair situation due to the child's sex" for children of staff but you are not doing anything about the same situation for siblings. This seems unfair to me.	Parent of child at another local primary school
50		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
51		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
52		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
53	The concept of feeder schools is unfair in every way to pupils at non feeder schools. The only slight exception to this would be if the changes were proposed with at least 7 years notice as then parents can make an informed choice when applying for primary school places.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
54		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
55	as noted above I strongly disagree with the feeder school proposals set out, you also need to consider the impact this has on the wider issues in the community, it's already difficult to buy a house in certain catchment areas but this will increase if people then know they will get priority over both the primary and the secondary	Parent of child at another local primary school
56		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
57		Parent of child at another local primary school
58	I strongly believe that the Trusts proposals negatively impact on the children attending local schools that are not part of the LP Learning Trust. Historically schools from the compass trust have chosen Langley Park secondaries and this proposal removes the option to the vast majority of the children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
59	Please do the right thing for everyone ! No priority for minority people!	Unknown
60		Parent of child at another local primary school
61		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
62		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
63		Parent of child at another local primary school
64		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
65		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

66		Parent of child at another local primary school
67		Parent of child at another local primary school
68		Parent of child at another local primary school
69		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
70	Interested party as I have children who will go to primary and secondary school in the area.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
71		Parent of child at another local primary school
72		Parent of child at another local secondary school
73		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
74		Parent of child at another local secondary school
75		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
76		Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of a Local Authority
77		Parent of child at another local primary school
78		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
79		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
80		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
81		Parent of child at another local primary school
82		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
83		Parent of child at another local primary school
84		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
85		Unknown
86		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
87		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
88		Parent of child at another local primary school
89		Parent of child at another local primary school
90	this process would be completely unfair to our children and their access to secondary education in the borough. The naming of feeder schools will have a detrimental effect on our choices when applying for secondary school places. This sets a precedent for other secondary schools who are part of mixed phase trusts to then add their primary schools to secondary admission criteria. It will become an issue locally that people will be desperate to get their children into one of the feeder primary schools, they do not then need to stay living locally to get into the secondary schools. This seems a business decision to get numbers up in the primary schools listed within the trust. This procedure should not be allowed to proceed at the detriment of many children's educational choices.	Parent of child at another local primary school
91		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
92		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
93		Unknown
94		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
95	Can it also be considered to mix the sixth forms for some lessons? I just feel that being so close to one another & under the same trust it would be really easy & beneficial to both schools. Some children might want to study 2 subjects at A level but their 3rd preferred subject is not available in the their 6th form but is in the other (eg textiles is not available at the boys) _x000D_ Thoughts on this please	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
96	I feel a positive addition to the siblings policy would be that siblings of year 12 students who have attended LPGS or LPSB for the majority of their high school careers should be counted as siblings for school admission. I.e, a female born in June 2006 (year 12 in 2022, year 13 in 2023) with a female sibling born in July 2012 thus will be asking for admission for year 7 2023 - these should get the same sibling priority.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
97		Parent of child at another local primary school
98		Parent of child at another local primary school
99		Parent of child at another local primary school

100		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
101		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
102		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
103		Parent of child at another local primary school
104		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
105		Parent of child at another local primary school
106		Parent of child at another local primary school
107		Parent of child at another local primary school
108		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
109		Parent of child at another local primary school
110		Parent of child at another local primary school
111		Parent of child at another local primary school
112		Parent of child at another local primary school
113		Parent of child at another local primary school
114	I disagree strongly with the reasons for these changes. Schools are built to serve the local community, not other communities which may be several miles away. Destroying communities by prioritising entrance for children on anything other than distance from the school is fundamentally wrong and will result in degraded educational quality and the breakup of community values. I am a local Park Langley resident whose children attended local primary schools and secondary schools with Friends living in the local area	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
115		Parent of child at another local primary school
116		Parent of child at another local primary school
117		Parent of child at another local primary school
118		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
119		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
120		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
121		Parent of child at another local primary school
122		Parent of child at another local primary school
123		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
124	I very much hope that this is not a done deal. Something which has been cooked up by the Trust without parental backing and I do hope that parents whose children do not attend a Trust school but would likely get into Langley will be consulted too. I also hope that the other local primary schools will be allowed to have their say and outline the negative impact that this will have upon their schools (which are all very good primary schools. _x000D_ I am really saddened by this. It feels discriminatory and like an attempt to try and control who gets into the school. A move away from children towards the elmers end area to children from the west wickham area falling into potential new catchment areas.	Unknown
125		Parent of child at another local primary school
126		Parent of child at another local primary school
127	It is unfair to give spaces to the feeder schools if children are out of catchment. Priority should follow Bromley borough existing rules and fairly be allocated on siblings and distance. I am aware that some children at lp are well out of catchment for lpgs and lpbs being Shirley/ Bromley north, how is that fair they should be given priority over a child that attends a different primary school that lives near and within current catchment.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
128		Parent of child at another local primary school
129		Unknown
130		Parent of child at another local primary school
131		Parent of child at another local primary school
132		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school

133	I believe that it is unfair to the children attending schools outside the trust, to not have an equal opportunity to attend the senior schools. I would also suggest that the children attending the feeder schools are at an advantage over the other schools (not in the trust) by having such a close link with the senior schools preparing them for the leap to senior school. This was something that would happen in all the local primary schools in the past.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
134		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
135	It was previously stated that feeder schools would not happen and now it looks like that's what you want to occur. I understand the benefits for current trust pupils but what about those children who live near the Secondary School and now may not be able to attend.	Parent of child at another local primary school
136		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
137		Parent of child at another local primary school
138		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
139		Parent of child at another local primary school
140		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
141	I have just submitted a response form but made some errors. Please accept this form as my amended opinion. Many thanks	Unknown
142	People have moved into the catchment for the Langley boys and girls school and paid a premium for that, it is not right that it should not be based on feeder schools now rather than distance.	Parent of child at another local primary school
143		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Representative of a Local Authority
144		Parent of child at another local primary school
145		Parent of child at another local primary school
146		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
147		Parent of child at another local primary school
148		Parent of child at another local primary school
149		Parent of child at another local primary school
150		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
151		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
152		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
153		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
154		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
155		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
156	I attended myself. I had the best 7 years education i could ask for by attending this school. My younger sister who attends attending the proposed Feeder Schools. world not be able to have the experience I had if you implement the changes and give priority to the children I walked to school with my friends every day, socialised locally around my home and school which from My parents perspective was a major factor in moving to the area. You cannot deprive my sister this opportunity at the age of 10, when her 6 years of junior school life she has had the expectation of following me to the same school.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
157		Parent of child at another local primary school
158		Parent of child at another local primary school
159	Overall I think it is unfair to deprioritise children coming from other primary schools. Admission should be in line with other secondary schools in the borough, based on siblings first and then distance	Parent of child at another local primary school
160		Parent of child at another local primary school
161		Parent of child at another local primary school
162	This proposal is detrimental to local people and families that have moved into the surrounding areas to attend LPGS/LPBS. The change will also have a massive impact on the local environment with increased cars on the road which means increased danger to our children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
163		Parent of child at another local primary school

164		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
165		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
166	<p>My children currently go to secondary school. and the proposals will massively affect where they will be able to go to secondary school. has always sent a sizeable number of pupils to the Langley schools and to have this option almost taken away is unacceptable. Schools that enter into these trusts should not do so to the detriment of the local population. Local schools should be for local children!</p> <p>In addition to the above, have you considered the families who have moved to the catchment area in order to secure a place at the Langley schools? To be given less than 2 years notice of the proposed changes is totally unacceptable. Are you going to compensate them because chances are, the move was made with secondary schools in mind?</p> <p>If this is to take place, then the lead time needs to start from the 2020 reception intake at all the local schools so that the actual implementation will take place in 2027, therefore, decisions made on where to send children at primary can be done so with the full understanding of the catchment areas of the secondary schools in the area.</p> <p>I am not happy at all about these proposals and I think you will find that I am most definitely not the only one!!!</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
167		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
168	I'm in complete disagreement with the elitist access that this proposes for children living in the local area. I'm greatly concerned at the group you are and what you really represent.... very worrying....	Parent of child at another local primary school
169	Having grown up in the local area I now have 2 children at non Langley trust schools and have made significant life decisions based on where they will go to secondary schools. Creating feeder schools is unfair (versus the typical distance criteria) and likely to be hugely disruptive as children have to travel further to reach school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
170		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
171		Parent of child at another local primary school
172		Parent of child at another local primary school
173	I think it would have been useful to look at which primary schools currently feed into Langley and provide some stats on how future school places would be impacted for those schools not in the trust. There are examples for HD and CH but there is some hysteria around how other local children will lose out. How will the new proposals really impact them? People are making their own assumptions without the right data.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
174		Parent of child at another local primary school
175	All children should have equal access to their local secondary school, changing entry to selected feeder schools will be extremely unfair to children not attending those schools	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
176		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
177		Parent of child at another local primary school
178		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
179	Under Equality Act of 2010, all applicants compliant with school's admission requirements should be treated equally.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of a local primary school (community or VC)
180		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
181		Parent of child at another local primary school
182		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
183		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

184	<p>The proposed changes go against the historic methodology for admitting students and as such severely disrupt the plans of many families. _x000D_ _x000D_ I cannot find a strong motivation for this consultation being held, and as a result there is no measure for success other than to change the priority of intake candidates. This does not strike me as a change that benefits potential students in the main and will surely lead to a more homogenous intake pool. The issue here is that the children at the school will not get to benefit from a diversity of thinking if all of their peers are from functionally the same primary school background._x000D_ _x000D_ I would urge the board to reconsider it's plans and to continue with the status quo until there is a change of plan backed strong motivation that benefits the educational outcomes of LPSB / LPSG students.</p>	Parent of child at another local secondary school
185		Parent of child at another local primary school
186		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
187		Parent of child at another local primary school
188		Parent of child at another local primary school
189		Parent of child at another local primary school
190		Parent of child at another local primary school
191		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
192		Unknown
193		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
194		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
195		Parent of child at another local primary school
196		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
197		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
198		Parent of child at another local primary school
199		Parent of child at another local primary school
200		Unknown
201		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
202		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
203		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
204		Parent of child at another local primary school
205		Unknown
206		Parent of child at another local primary school
207		Parent of child at another local primary school
208		Parent of child at another local primary school
209	<p>Please don't make it impossible for children who aren't at one of the 'feeder' schools to attend the secondary schools. Langely park schools already have an exclusive feel about them don't push it even further. This change will also make it more difficult to get into the feeder primary schools and children in catchment areas will not get their local schools.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
210		Parent of child at another local primary school
211		Parent of child at another local primary school
212		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
213		Parent of child at another local primary school
214		Parent of child at another local primary school
215		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
216		Unknown
217		Parent of child at another local primary school
218		Parent of child at another local primary school
219	<p>Combining the schools facilities, ideas and teacher training and ensuring that all local students will have a chance to enter the school of choice is the way forward. The target is improve the standards for the benifit of the future of our children. Lets hope you succeed.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

220		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
221		Parent of child at another local primary school
222		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
223		Parent of child at another local primary school
224	Harris Academy Beckenham have recently undertaken a similar consultation, these consultations are wholly unfair. Children and parents in parts of Beckenham are being faced with the prospect of having no secondary schools to choose from with the only options to travel outside of the borough or to the other side of the borough which is quite simply ridiculous. If anything schools such as the Langley Park schools with land should be looking to invest and extend their accommodation to increase their intake.	Parent of child at another local primary school
225		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
226		Parent of child at another local primary school
227		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
228		Parent of child at another local primary school
229		Parent of child at another local primary school
230	This will have a detrimental impact on to all children attending Pickhust infants and Primary school who live in the current catchment area and who parents like myself bought a house based on catchment for both primary and secondary schooling. It is a totally unfair proposal and clearly driven by financial gain at the trust. Pitching school trust against each other is disgraceful. This is the future of children's educational prospects and makes every child currently in area at risk of having to travel out of area for secondary school places. This creates a total lack of community as local children can't attend local schools. It also puts them at great risk due to the increased distance they have to travel alone or it makes it very difficult for working parents to take them to school then go to work. Totally unacceptable and unworkable for a community who have based them selves in the area specifically for the schools and their children's education.	Parent of child at another local primary school
231	If such a trust feeder proposal is accepted, I feel it should only be fair if this is not applicable to parents who have moved into the community from 2020 and earlier and are within catchment. And that siblings of such families are given priority regardless of when they start school. Only this way is sufficient warning is given to family who will be affected when making life choices, and existing families are exempt for this distress and unfair treatment.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
232		Parent of child at another local primary school
233		Parent of child at another local primary school
234		Parent of child at another local primary school
235		Parent of child at another local primary school
236		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
237	It's just shocking and frightening to see the fact that such consultations are even happening.	Parent of child at another local primary school
238		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
239		Parent of child at another local primary school
240		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
241		Parent of child at another local primary school
242		Parent of child at another local primary school
243		Parent of child at another local primary school
244		Unknown
245		Parent of child at another local primary school
246		Parent of child at another local primary school
247		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
248		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
249		Unknown
250		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
251		Parent of child at another local primary school
252		Parent of child at another local primary school

253		Parent of child at another local primary school
254		Parent of child at another local primary school
255		Parent of child at another local primary school
256		Parent of child at another local primary school
257		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
258		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
259		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
260		Parent of child at another local primary school
261		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
262		Parent of child at another local primary school
263		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
264		Parent of child at another local primary school
265		Parent of child at another local primary school
266		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
267		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child under 2 years
268		Unknown
269		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
270		Parent of child at another local primary school
271		Parent of child at another local primary school
272		Parent of child at another local primary school
273		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
274		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
275		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
276		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
277		Parent of child at another local primary school
278	Harris is also trying to push through a similar priority for their Harris primaries as feeders. Should LPLT and the Harris schools achieve these goals then children at Balgowan and other 'non feeder' primaries will have very little choice about where they go to secondary school with the potential to have to travel long distances as well as being placed in a school that's not compatible with the child in question. This is discrimination and will further exacerbate house price rises in 'desirable feeder-school' areas.	Parent of child at another local primary school
279	The admissions priority given to children in certain schools will disadvantage other locally living children who are not attending the above named schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
280		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
281		Parent of child at another local primary school
282		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
283		Parent of child at another local primary school
284		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
285		Parent of child at another local primary school
286		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
287		Parent of child at another local primary school
288	As a life long resident of the area I believe these proposed changes would have a detrimental impact on the choice of schools for my young sons and may set a precedent that has a much greater impact at a crucial time in their academic journey.	Parent of child at another local primary school
289		Parent of child at another local primary school
290		Parent of child at another local primary school

291		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
292		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
293		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
294	You have already decided to go with this. Overall it is imbalanced and mediocre approach. A waste of time.	Parent of child at another local primary school
295		Parent of child at another local primary school
296		Parent of child at another local primary school
297		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
298		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
299		Parent of child at another local primary school
300	We moved into _____, and got a huge mortgage so we could be in the catchment area for the Langley schools, you are now trying to enforce this new admission rule, that could mean that someone who lives a lot further than us, would get a place over us, thus meaning my child would need to possibly get 2 buses to school. This I feel totally against. It's a joke.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
301		Parent of child at another local primary school
302	Admissions should be clear and fair. Residents pay a lot of money to live in the catchment areas of good schools and if they are in the catchment then they should have a fair chance of being admitted to the school of their choice.	Parent of child at another local primary school
303		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
304		Parent of child at another local primary school
305		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
306		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
307	Why are you proposing changes as all of the children who attend surrounding areas that are not in the Ipgs would be disadvantaged beside the fact that the children live near Ipgs secondary this does not make ethical sense	Parent of child at another local primary school
308		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
309		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
310		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
311		Parent of child at another local primary school
312		Parent of child at another local primary school
313		Parent of child at another local primary school
314		Parent of child at another local primary school
315		Parent of child at another local primary school
316		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
317		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
318	_____ and live in the catchment for Langley Senior Schools, both my _____ went to Langley. As I help with the care of my grandchildren it would be a relief to know that they would get priority.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
319		Parent of child at another local primary school
320	If priority is given to children from feeder schools, regardless of where they live, then it will not only disadvantage children from other schools in the catchment area, but it will also create significant extra pressure on catchment area for other nearby schools. This will be very unfair on local families and cause all sorts of practical issues for travel to school for those families who risk being pushed further away.	Parent of child at another local primary school
321	I fear if this goes ahead other schools will follow leaving less well off children in ghetto schools. I think it is a negative thing creaming off the best pupils from the best school. Only the rich will benefit from this. As a _____ I am fully aware of the importance of education for all and not the few rich who will do well wherever they go as they have the wherewithal to succeed.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
322		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
323		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
324		Parent of child at another local primary school
325		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
326		Parent of child at another local primary school

327		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
328		Parent of child at another local primary school
329		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
330		Parent of child at another local primary school
331	Other schools in our area I.E : Beckenham, their primary schools do have priority to get into their secondary schools, so why should we not have that? I think it's a brilliant idea, my mum works in a secondary school in Orpington & is also in a trust well their primary schools that are in that trust DO get priority to get into the secondary school that's in the trust	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
332		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
333		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of religious body
334		Parent of child at another local primary school
335		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
336		Parent of child at another local primary school
337		Parent of child at another local primary school
338		Unknown
339		Parent of child at another local primary school
340	Can you outline your proposal for Looked after / Previous looked after children and the definition on intake here?	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
341		Parent of child at another local primary school
342		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
343		Unknown
344		Parent of child at another local primary school
345		Parent of child at another local primary school
346		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
347	I understand why this has been suggested - the implementation plan/timing and introduction of 3 feeder schools is completely unreasonable and shows little respect or consideration for the local community	Parent of child at another local primary school
348		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
349		Parent of child at another local primary school
350		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
351		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
352		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
353		Parent of child at another local primary school
354		Parent of child at another local primary school
355		Parent of child at another local primary school
356		Parent of child at another local primary school
357	Langley Park Primary as a feeder school is a term I heard for the first time recently. I heard it from a new neighbour (recently moved in order to get a place at Langley Boys School) that Langley Park Primary School 'promised' parents that their primary school was a feeder school for the Langley Boys and Langley Girls. At the time I assumed it was nonsense and that people involved simply heard what they wanted to hear. This week I was told that the same parents have threatened legal action over the issue. I don't know if this is true or not. Yet this week your admissions consultation notice has been published. Issuing this consultation document towards the end of term, just before Christmas, the same week as a general election - I doubt that there is ever a good time to issue your proposed new admission policy but the timing this week is particularly special and it makes me wonder if your board of trustees has the right approach. It brings into question your whole attitude. We moved into our home in so we are concerned at these proposed changes, ten months before we are due to make our application. I think the issues of road use, transport, time spent commuting and local children having access to schools should take priority. I do not support your proposals to have Langley Park Primary, Hawes Down or Clare House named as feeder schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
358		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
359		Parent of child at another local primary school

360		Parent of child at another local primary school
361		Parent of child at another local primary school
362		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
363		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
364		Parent of child at another local primary school
365		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
366		Parent of child at another local primary school
367		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
368		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
369	<p>I strongly suggest you consider in the future to refrain from even proposing changes to the advantage a very few, at the expense of the majority. _x000D_ This is clearly not fair, in particular, to matters as important to the community as access.to education_x000D_ _x000D_ I would also strongly suggest you do not organise these consultations to take place during the holiday season (xmas and new year). This can be easily perceived as a deceitful attempt to avoid feedback from the community</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
370		Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
371		Parent of child at another local primary school
372		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
373		Parent of child at another local primary school
374		Parent of child at another local primary school
375		Parent of child at another local primary school
376		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
377		Parent of child at another local primary school
378		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
379		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
380		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
381		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
382		Unknown
383		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
384		Parent of child at another local primary school
385		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
386		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
387		Parent of child at another local primary school
388		Parent of child at another local primary school
389		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
390		Parent of child at another local primary school
391		Parent of child at another local primary school
392		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years

393	As a local parent with children attending a primary school outside of this school trust, I am saddened to think that my children will not get a fair chance to attend either of these secondary schools. When LPPS first opened I heard from fellow parents who were convinced to start their children at the school because they were told it would become a feeder school for the secondary school by the time their children reached that age. At the time the school said this was just a 'rumour' but it now seems to be becoming true. I wasn't able to send my children there as my oldest had already started school when it opened. I can imagine these parents are very angry at being lied to which is why I assume Option A has been put out there. And I'm guessing Option B has been put up as the other primary schools in the Trust will then feel like it's unfair for them. Secondary schools should not be allowed to be made elite like this. As the primary schools are already in a trust together, this means that they are essentially 'teaching' their students from primary age knowing they will highly likely to attend the secondary school. Secondary schools should take students from a wider local selection of local schools to make it more diverse. Plus it might make our harder for 'outsiders' to settle in an environment where most students know each other already.	Parent of child at another local primary school
394		Parent of child at another local primary school
395	Allowing some primary schools to be feeder schools would put children at other primary schools at a large disadvantage, and with secondary school places increasing in demand in the area this seems very unfair and would extremely limited the catch area.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
396		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
397		Parent of child at another local primary school
398	I strongly suggest you consider in the future to refrain from even proposing changes to the advantage a very few, at the expense of the majority. This is clearly not fair, in particular, to matters as important to the community as access to education. I would also strongly suggest you do not organise these consultations to take place during the holiday season (xmas and new year). This can be easily perceived as a deceitful attempt to avoid feedback from the community.	Parent of child at another local primary school
399	We moved to the area hoping that are would go to Langley as this would be our local school that they could walk to, introducing feeder schools would make this impossible for all local children to get a space at the school. More traffic and damage to the environment will be created for the feeder schools to go to Langley as it will not be possible for them to walk to school. Langley is our local school and it will be devastating for them to not be able to attend there	Parent of child at another local primary school
400		Parent of child at another local primary school
401		Parent of child at another local primary school
402		Parent of child at another local primary school
403		Parent of child at another local primary school
404		Unknown
405		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
406		Parent of child at another local primary school
407		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
408		Parent of child at another local primary school
409		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
410		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
411	3 years ago it was promised it would be a feeder school, we joined lpps on that basis. It is on site with lpps, the other schools are a lot further away.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
412		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
413		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
414		Parent of child at another local primary school
415		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
416		Parent of child at another local primary school
417	Please see my previous comments regarding traffic concerns in Hawkesbrook Lane.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
418		Parent of child at another local primary school

419		Parent of child at another local primary school
420		Parent of child at another local primary school
421		Parent of child at another local primary school
422		Parent of child at another local primary school
423	Please do not go down this route of named feeder schools. It's unfair on so many levels and impacts on all other primary schools in the area.	Parent of child at another local primary school
424		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
425		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
426		Parent of child at another local primary school
427		Parent of child at another local primary school
428		Unknown
429		Parent of child at another local primary school
430		Parent of child at another local primary school
431	Pickhurst junior academy to be included	Unknown
432		Parent of child at another local primary school
433		Parent of child at another local primary school
434		Parent of child at another local primary school
435		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
436		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
437		Parent of child at another local primary school
438		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
439	This is not a positive change at all. Very concerning and unfair to local residents.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
440		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
441		Parent of child at another local primary school
442		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
443	The proposals to the admissions criteria is what provoked me to complete this consultation. I understand why parents of the newly created LPPS should be 'rewarded' for supporting the new school with automatic offers into the LPSB and LPSG. I do not agree that the other primary schools, that existed long before the formation of LPLT, should gain an advantage over other schools in borough.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
444		Parent of child at another local primary school
445		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
446		Parent of child at another local primary school
447		Parent of child at another local primary school
448		Parent of child at another local primary school
449	i do not agree with the concept of feeder schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
450		Parent of child at another local primary school
451		Parent of child at another local primary school
452		Parent of child at another local primary school
453		Parent of child at another local primary school
454	I sincerely hope this is not approved. It is unnecessary and benefits only the few particularly as Clare House and Langley primary are very difficult to attend anyway. The current admission policy allows all local children the same opportunity to attend regardless of background or primary school attending. . As our closest school that should be available to everyone	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
455		Unknown
456		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
457		Parent of child at another local primary school
458		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

459		Parent of child at another local primary school
460		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
461		Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
462	Interested party to ensure fair opportunity for children in extended family, and also for own children in future	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
463		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
464	Langley park primary school is on the same campus as the secondary schools. It is unfair for the children that attend the primary school to walk past the secondary schools and have links and not to have a place.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
465		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
466		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
467	Excluding all but your own trust's primary schools will have an enormous negative effect on all of Beckenham's primary schools children not linked to that school. This proposal is selective and immoral.	Parent of child at another local primary school
468		Parent of child at another local primary school
469		Parent of child at another local primary school
470		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
471		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
472		Parent of child under 2 years, Representative of another interested organisation
473		Parent of child at another local primary school
474		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
475		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
476		Parent of child at another local primary school
477		Parent of child at another local primary school
478		Parent of child at another local primary school
479		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
480		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
481		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
482		Parent of child at another local primary school
483		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Representative of a Local Authority
484	and the ethos of local children learning and growing together is so important. Neighbouring children and families pulling together to support the schools in all ways including the Sports, Drama, Dance and Music. This gives the children an important sense of community no matter what their home situation is or their ability or disability. I truly believe that we should be using this as a successful model for the future through out the country not changing something that works so well.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
485	Allowing automatic entry from nearby feeder schools is a significant change in the admissions criteria. There are certainly local pupils who do not attend these schools and would be unfairly disadvantaged by this sudden change. Such a change requires a much longer lead-in time to allow the local population to adjust as necessary. It may mean that local families choose to relocate closer to other secondary schools to allow their children to have less travel time to school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
486		Parent of child at another local primary school
487	Don't become more and more exclusive and remote, allow children of parents who moved into the area because they had a half decent chance at getting their children into the School not to feel betrayed.	Parent of child at another local primary school
488		Parent of child at another local primary school
489		Parent of child at another local primary school
490		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
491		Unknown
492		Unknown
493		Parent of child at another local primary school
494		Parent of child at another local primary school
495		Parent of child at another local primary school

496		Parent of child at another local primary school
497		Parent of child at another local primary school
498		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
499		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
500		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
501		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
502		Parent of child at another local primary school
503		Parent of child at another local primary school
504		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
505		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
506		Parent of child at another local primary school
507		Parent of child at another local primary school
508		Parent of child at another local primary school
509		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
510		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
511		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
512		Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
513	I strongly disagree with the proposed new admission criteria. School places should be allocated by distance so that pupils can have the minimal amount of commuting to their place of study. Travelling longer distances will have a major environment impact to on extra vehicles on the road.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
514		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
515		Unknown
516		Parent of child at another local primary school
517		Unknown
518		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
519		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
520	There isn't enough local secondary schools as it is , so to start saying children who are not local get priority will mean that local children will have to travel a very long way to school and will not be priority in other schools meaning there may be some children who need to be placed out of borough, which is grossly unfair.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
521	Children attending Pickhurst Junior Academy but do not live on the Hayes side of the catchment will not be eligible for Hayes School, will have no natural feeder secondary school other than The Ravensbourne School and this will in turn impact on where children from other primary schools such Valley, St John's, Parish will go because the proximity for TRS would shrink. _x000D_ _x000D_ Families will have a vastly reduced choice within the local area. In addition there is a strong risk that families will choose or rent a property close to a feeder primary and then once the place is secure for the next 13 years for all of their children, will move further afield but still take precedence over unlucky local children and create congestion and resentment.	Parent of child at another local primary school
522		Parent of child at another local primary school
523		Parent of child at another local secondary school
524		Unknown
525		Unknown
526	It is disgraceful that this is even being suggested. Feeder schools are not the way forward in this day and age. If staff need to be close to their children all day they should transfer to a school in the catchment area for their own address or move house like many of us had to to be in the catchment for Langley.	Parent of child at another local primary school
527		Parent of child at another local primary school
528		Unknown
529		Parent of child at another local primary school
530		Parent of child at another local primary school

531		Parent of child at another local primary school
532	This is completely unfair to local school children who live within the catchment area of the schools, their ‘most local’ school unless they attend Ips ch or hd. Ridiculous. live within the catchment area & have done for many years to potentially fall short of getting a place because another primary school was built on the already congested lane of both secondary schools, not to mention environmental factors, more traffic, pollution etc with pupils at Ips who may live further out as the school didn’t/doesn’t have a catchment area.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
533		Parent of child at another local primary school
534		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
535		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
536		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
537		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
538		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
539		Parent of child at another local primary school
540		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
541		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
542		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
543		Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
544		Parent of child at another local primary school
545		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
546		Parent of child at another local primary school
547		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
548	As a local family, the chance in the criteria for admission would be unfair to the local families who are not in the feeder schools, causing more travel and congestion, we want our children be able to walk to school, and enjoy their life within the local communities. The feeder schools would have a knock on effect on the community and children travelling to and from school by reducing the catchment area for the local community. The change will also put pressure on admissions on both Clare House and Hawes Down Primary schools and the communities surrounding them. I ask that you don’t change the criteria for admission, as a Secondary schools which are part of our community for which admission has worked for decades. Many thanks and best wishes,	Parent of child at another local primary school
549		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
550		Parent of child at another local primary school
551	Langley secondaries have already got a very narrow catchment area. I do not understand why you would want to limit this even further, penalising local families and reducing the level of diversity in the secondary schools. It is a very concerning trend.	Parent of child at another local primary school
552		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
553		Parent of child at another local primary school
554		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
555		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
556		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
557		Unknown
558		Parent of child at another local primary school
559	The catchment for Langley secondary schools should be relevant to the school not the primary schools catchment	Parent of child at another local primary school
560		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
561		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
562		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
563		Unknown
564	We already have a national admissions code, let’s not start an underhand change to national policy that benefits the few rather than the many.	Parent of child at another local secondary school
565		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

566		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
567		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
568		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
569		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
570		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
571		Parent of child at another local secondary school
572		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
573		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
574		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
575		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
576		Parent of child at another local primary school
577	Please do not singlehandedly dismantle the admissions system. It is very unfair on local children and cause lots of problems for other local primary schools. Bad practice!	Parent of child at another local primary school
578	As above.	Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
579		Parent of child at another local primary school
580	Children from certain schools must not have a advantage over other schools. This totally unacceptable and I am appalled to even fill out this consultation.	Parent of child at another local primary school
581	The trust is I’ll be taken on by the whole community we are seeking MP support, local business support and organising peaceful protests and pickets to help the trust understand the obscene detrimental effect this proposal has on the community	Parent of child at another local primary school
582		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
583		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
584		Parent of child at another local primary school
585		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
586		Parent of child at another local primary school
587		Unknown
588		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
589		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
590		Parent of child at another local primary school
591		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
592		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
593		Parent of child at another local primary school
594		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
595	Bromley schools are over subscribed especially secondary. If we except feeder schools before local catchment area we are putting added pressure on the surrounded secondary schools such as Hayes Secondary that is already completely gone we subscribed. If you want to go to these school move witching catchment like everyone has been doing for years. You pay a premium to live in theses area because of the schools. How is it fair for a child that lives in walking distance to the schools to have to travel to get to another school when someone who lives further away takes their place based on feeder schools. It’s doesn’t feel ethically correct or environmentally you’re possibly making two children travel bar car/bus to get to schools further away rather than giving them both their local school.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
596		Parent of child at another local primary school
597		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
598		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
599		Parent of child at another local primary school
600	I am a concerned grandparent and I sincerely hope that the issue of insufficient places, for any child, at their local secondary school will be addressed. _x000D_ The current situation is shameful and avoidable. New Primary schools have been built to accommodate the growing demand from an increasing population but you’ve done nothing about secondary schools. This problem is not going to disappear and needs to be addressed now.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

601		Parent of child at another local primary school
602	I am currently in the catchment area for both Langley boys and girls however this change could potentially mean I'm not anymore - based on a decision I made 7 years ago with regards to my choice of primary school, completely unaware of the impact of this decision. I strongly believe all school admissions should be based on your address when applying - be it for primary or secondary school. Your admission for secondary school certainly should not be based on an address you had 7 years previously. This will allow too many parents to 'play the system' whilst penalising those who genuinely live close by to the school. Consequently, this can result in additional traffic and congestion near or close by the school as far more attending children are having to commute (or moreover their parents drive them in), rather than walk, as the schools distance from home means walking is not an option.	Parent of child at another local primary school
603		Parent of child at another local primary school
604		Unknown
605		Parent of child at another local primary school
606		Parent of child at another local primary school
607		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
608	This consultation has already caused a significant amount of distress, and worry for hundreds of local families, including young primary age children, who are very much aware of discussions taking place, in the Borough. The Langley Schools currently benefit from very long standing positive community support, with many families having 2nd and third generations attending the schools. The LPLT I fear is likely to lose a great deal of this support if the proposals are granted. It will create a set of schools with little connection to the community surrounding them._x000D_ _x000D_ Many families already have an older sibling at the schools, but if the proposals are adopted , younger siblings who are too young to be admitted under the sibling rule, are likely to be schooled elsewhere. The continuity of care, through schools educating a whole family will be lost, those precious home/school relationships will be broken. School is not just about a place to be educated, its about a safe place to be, to become part of the community, to forge lifelong networks. This will all be greatly damaged if the proposals are taken forward.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
609	I really disagree with the proposals to change the admissions criteria. and the prospect of them being pushed to the back of the list for a secondary school place is incredibly worrying and stressful. We moved to the area 5 years ago so that our children would be in close vicinity of several excellent primary and secondary schools. For us to now have the real possibility of them not receiving a place at Langley Boys and Langley Girls is very concerning. Wouldn't it make more sense to keep school catchment criteria is it is. Encouraging local children to attend their local schools should be priority. It will encourage children to walk to school, there will be less car traffic as parents do not need to drive their children to school and with all of that it will be safer for pedestrians and road users! Then there is the frustrating issue of us having bought a house which we felt was future proofed to be in the catchment but now that would seem unlikely! What will happen to all of the ?? A huge number live on the doorstep of Langley Boys and Langley Girls!! Please reconsider. This proposal seems to be completely unfair.	Parent of child at another local primary school
610		Unknown
611	Pickhurst Junior Academy should remain as a priority feeder school.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
612		Parent of child at another local primary school

613	<p>These proposals to LPLT seems to have all emphasis on the automatic entrance to the secondary schools from the feeder schools. There doesn't seem to be any mention of automatic entrance between the secondary schools in relation to Sixth Form entry and sibling entry e.g. my daughter attends Langley Park School for Girls therefore my son should automatically attend Langley Park School for Boys. The secondary schools are in the same trust as the primary schools, why don't they have the same privileges?</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>These proposals are life changing for some families. People have moved house to be in the Langley catchment area. People have paid over the odds for houses just to be in the Langley catchment. What happens to these people? You could enforce your proposals to start in 10 years time to help these people although the value of their house may decrease considerably.</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>My own situation is that we are a second generation of family attending a Langley school. We live in the house that my husband grew up in. With these proposals, we are now in no catchment for a secondary school. I have no idea what we are going to do.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
614		Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
615		Parent of child at another local primary school
616	<p>This will impact admission to Langley Park Girls' secondary school. The reasons given for the change in admission from feeder schools do not stack up and if applied on a wider scale would result in fragmentation in the national school system, damage to local communities and significant environmental impact and traffic pollution. What is undertaken on a local level must also consider the context of the consequences if carried out on a broader scale. Option a) appears to have a limited impact given the already close proximity of LPSS and if the trust is intent on this change this option would seem a sensible compromise even though for the reasons I have described I do not agree with this proposal either.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
617		Unknown
618		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
619	<p>Potential greater influx of traffic affecting volume, parking, pollution and general quality of life with LangleySchool areas if catchment is abolished.</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Reducing house values within surroundings if catchment abolished.</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Long term stress and anxiety for families already within LPSG/ LPSB areas who may now not be eligible for entrance.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
620		Parent of child at another local secondary school
621		Unknown
622		Parent of child at another local primary school
623		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
624		Parent of child at another local primary school
625		Parent of child at another local primary school
626		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
627		Parent of child at another local primary school
628		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
629		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
630		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
631		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
632		Parent of child at another local primary school
633		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
634		Parent of child at another local primary school
635		Parent of child at another local primary school
636		Unknown
637		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
638		Unknown
639		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
640		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
641		Unknown
642		Parent of child at another local primary school

643		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
644		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
645		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
646		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
647		Parent of child at another local primary school
648		Parent of child at another local primary school
649		Parent of child at another local primary school
650		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
651	I have great concern as I want like all Grandparents & Parents my grandchild to go into a school that is within the catchment area & believe it is her right at this present time	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
652		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
653		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
654		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
655	We are all very concerned that our children won't be able to attend their local secondary school just because our head placed our primary school in a different trust. We have no say in this. We can't all quickly try and start moving our children to Langley trust school. None of this makes sense and makes me very upset and worried that because of this new unjust rule my daughter won't be able to go to her local school with her local friends.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
656		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
657		Parent of child at another local primary school
658	I strongly disagree with the proposal to change the admissions into Langley Park secondary schools, particularly to make the primary schools with that trust feeder schools. As I believe this will vastly limit the number of spaces available to local families living in the area which the schools are meant to serve.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
659		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
660	Objecting as a grandparent of children at other local schools.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
661		Parent of child at another local primary school
662	As a previous student at Langley (albeit many years ago), I have been saddened to see the narrow view your consultation appears to be taking as I have always held the school in such high regard; I know I am a better person for the time I spent at the school. I hope sense prevails and you continue to serve the whole community rather than your Trust's narrow view and this move towards elitism.	Parent of child at another local primary school
663		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
664		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
665		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
666		Parent of child at another local primary school
667		Parent of child at another local primary school
668		Parent of child at another local primary school
669		Parent of child at another local primary school
670	Local schools for local children please	Parent of child at another local primary school
671		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
672	I think it is entirely disingenuous of the Trustees to claim this is an open consultation with 'no preferred option' when the information section relating to the primary feeder option states "The Trust believes there are exceptional educational benefits in all three primary schools being named as feeder schools", and then gives a list of all the reasons why it should happen. This suggests there is very much a preferred option and completely contradicts the 'official' line of no preferred option.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
673	A whole negative and attempt and further social engineering of admissions in the local area.	Parent of child at another local primary school
674		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
675		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years

676	I would hope that the individual schools have some say in their future arrangements rather than the Trust making all the decisions. We are very proud of the school and its teaching and commitment and would hope that it can keep the standards it has always achieved in the past.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
677	I would just like you to explain why all of sudden you want to implement these changes. They seem very self-serving and do not help the wider community. I understand they are excellent schools and over-subscribed. If the changes are approved, then you will be restricting access, or is that the intention?	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
678		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
679		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
680		Parent of child at another local primary school
681		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
682		Parent of child at another local secondary school
683		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
684		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
685		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
686	I went to _____, as both Primary schools in question are not near my house. _____ is still close to LPGS/BS, but with preferential treatment for Oak Lodge and Clare House - Clare House being further than _____ from Langley, I probably wouldn't have got in.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
687		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
688		Parent of child at another local primary school
689		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
690		Parent of child at another local primary school
691		Parent of child under 2 years
692	Under the new proposal staff at the primary schools will get priority to the secondary places over staff at the secondary school, this seems unfair as they have already had priority for the primary places.	Unknown
693		Representative of another interested organisation
694		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
695		Parent of child at another local primary school
696		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
697		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
698		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
699		Representative of a local primary school (community or VC)
700	It should be based on distance from school. Those children will be further and they will put pressure on the area at school times with parents dropping off.	Parent of child at another local primary school
701	I am the godparent and family member of a child currently within the admission criteria but who would be adversely affected by the proposals. Their parents have planned and made huge financial decisions so that their children would be able to attend the senior school they believe would best suit their children and provide quality education.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
702		Parent of child at another local primary school
703		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
704		Parent of child at another local primary school
705		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
706		Parent of child at another local primary school
707		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

708		Unknown
709		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
710		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
711	I am a local resident, whose entire family attended the Langley Park Schools from [redacted] If the proposed feeder system had been in place then, they might well have lost out on the opportunities at LPBS/LPGS & been disadvantaged through no fault of their own. The proximity criterion is simple & fair, has worked well for a long time, & is the most environmentally-friendly due to reduction of traffic on the school run.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
712		Parent of child at another local primary school
713	The sibling rule should apply between Langley Girls and Langley Boys i.e. a boy in Langley Boys counts for a sibling girl wanting to attend Langley Girls. It should cut both ways. If you change this rule to suit the Trust's ambitions, then don't divide families and allow this sibling rule to apply.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
714		Parent of child at another local secondary school
715		Parent of child at another local primary school
716		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
717		Parent of child at another local primary school
718		Parent of child at another local primary school
719		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
720		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
721		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
722	The consultation should provide examples of the likely radius for accepting local children based on the new rules and apply these to the last 3 years intake. To show what the impact would have been if these rules were in place. It is hard to understand what the catchment radius would be without providing some assesment. Without this you are asking alot and it is unfair to make these suggested changes.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
723		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
724		Unknown
725		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
726		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
727	The proposal in its entirety should be reconsidered. In particular, the primary feeder schools being specifically those of the trust schools should not go ahead. Has the impact of this proposal on Unicorn been considered? In addition, the data with regard to pupils proximity to Langley secondaries, from current trust primaries, far exceeds the proximity and catchment figures of those pupils at local schools to the Langley campus. Despite being [redacted] who would benefit from this proposal, I see no moral reason to support it and put local children at a disadvantage.	Unknown
728	I am unsure why LAngley primary is proposed being top priority over the other two primary schools. Being in close proximity to the secondary schools does not seem to bring any further benefits outlined within the proposal. _x000D_ _x000D_ The current LA allocation system is not necessarily fair as it only considers pupils who currently succeed in getting a place at their closest school but neglects those who do not. Plain proximity should not dictate priority. Many children might meet a test of "sufficiently close", without giving such advantage to the absolutely closest. The council proximity dictates fairness, but I don't think reasonable argument would support that, although clearly convention does. This system can support unfairness and boosts houses market, often depriving people the opportunity to move within the neighbourhood. If the council could determine reasonable local distance to schools and then allocate place under lottery system this would ensure fairer system as wider community would be considered. Within the LB Bromley we already have selective secondary schools and pupils are not local with catchment areas being 15miles or none. If there are sufficient transport links within proximity of the school the distance is not an argument to be considered. Given this system does not exists and would not be likely to be considered by the local authority, what the trust can do is ensure the children can have smooth transition between primary to secondary school. This could be replicated to other trusts within Bromley and ensuring all schools will have a smooth transition.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

729	I think its absolutely ridiculous what you are opposing. Local children will not be able to go too their local school, how can you justify that? _x000D_ Potentially we will have primary schools that no one will want to attend. This will also massively effect house prices and people's lives too. I strongly object to this barbaric proposal I would of thought your main concern as a school academy is CHILDREN!!	Parent of child at another local primary school
730		Parent of child at another local primary school
731		Parent of child at another local primary school
732		Parent of child at another local primary school
733	There is already significant over subscription to the school, and significant gaps in the number of secondary places available for intake over the next 1-5 years. These changes make it far harder for families to predict entry and plan accordingly and increase the burden and travel time on children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
734		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
735		Parent of child at another local primary school
736	To introduce feeder school from primary would be unfair for children living in close proximity, and not be able to get into their nearest school especially if they live in the Bromley borough. _x000D_ Living very near the school I am an interested party.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
737	This will devastate so many local primaries if not kill some of them. Why should there be a fast track route into Langley? There’s no justifiable reason to do so. Creating a monopoly of schools is a terrible proposal that will create disadvantages to local children.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
738		Parent of child at another local primary school
739	I think this is a very ill thought out proposal that in not for the benefic of the Bromley community as a whole. _x000D_ Please ensure my details are only used for the purpose of this consulation and that you adhere to GDPR regulations.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
740		Parent of child at another local primary school
741		Parent of child at another local primary school
742		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
743	I fully disagree with the proposed changes. This will mean that children who live close to the LPSB or LPSG schools may loose their spaces to children who live further away, this is totally unfair and I do not see any logical reason to want to change the current oversubscription criteria.	Parent of child at another local primary school
744		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
745		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
746		Parent of child at another local primary school
747		Parent of child under 2 years
748		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
749	The new admissions policy seems unfair, in particular as it is being implemented at such short notice, as many people (for clarity not myself) have moved into the Langley catchment area specifically to access the secondary schools. To now change the admissions criteria so that children who have attended specific primary schools are given preference is in my view unacceptable as children from families in the historical catchment area will now need to travel further to a potentially less desirable school. In addition I do not think it is fair or necessary to offer children guaranteed schooling from 4-18 based purely on their residential proximity to a particular primary school.	Parent of child under 2 years
750		Parent of child at another local primary school
751		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
752		Parent of child at another local primary school
753		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
754		Parent of child at another local primary school
755		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
756		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
757		Parent of child at another local primary school

758		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of another interested organisation
759		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
760		Parent of child at another local primary school
761		Parent of child at another local primary school
762		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
763		Parent of child at another local primary school
764		Parent of child at another local primary school
765		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
766	I have not had time to fully respond to this consultation - WE need more time to fully understand these fundamental changes to schools	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
767		Parent of child at another local primary school
768		Parent of child at another local primary school
769		Unknown
770		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
771		Parent of child at another local primary school
772	I do not consider that there are exceptional educational benefits for the 3 primary schools being named feeder schools. Your Trust will continue to share resources/staff/training/senior support etc. regardless as to whether the primaries become feeders. You have provided insufficient evidence to support that are compelling reasons/exceptional benefits to be gained by the LPSB/LPSG adoption of 3 feeder schools. All local schools have similar educational ethos', values and you all share a country wide curriculum and standards which eases intra-school transitioning. _x000D_ The Office of the Schools Adjudicator's (OSA) opines that Public meetings are an example of good practice with regards to admissions consultations. Please host such a meeting so that views can be aired, shared and resolved.	Parent of child at another local primary school
773		Parent of child at another local primary school
774		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
775		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
776		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
777		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
778	All the schools are close to each other anyway, and local children will attend. There are plenty of good local schools - I hope this change stops people moving house, and investing more in local secondary schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
779		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
780		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
781		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
782		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
783		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
784		Parent of child at another local primary school
785		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
786		Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
787		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

788	<p>We have read the Consultation Notice, which provides a summary of the proposed changes to the admissions arrangements of LPLT's five schools, but does not set these out in full. However, reference is made within the document to a full set of admission arrangements for each school being published on that school's website throughout the consultation period (and having had a quick look, this appears to be true). The Consultation Notice also states that these details can also be accessed by clicking on the relevant school's name above, however despite downloading a copy of the consultation notice directly from the LPLT website I did not find this was the case. _x000D_</p> <p>The School Admissions Code (the Code) requires admissions authorities (here LPLT) to publish a copy of their full proposed admission arrangements, (including the proposed PAN) on their website together with details of the person within the admission authority to whom comments may be sent and the areas on which comments are not sought; _x000D_</p> <p>The position is confusing, in that LPLT appears to have published the Consultation Notice summary (together with an online feedback form) on its own website, with the full details of the arrangements for each school only appearing on the website of that school. _x000D_</p> <p>The Code requires these details to appear in full on the Trust's own website (here the Trust is the admissions authority and the Code requires full details to be published on their website). _x000D_</p> <p>So we consider LPLT not to have undertaken a compliant consultation.</p>	<p>Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy), Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy), Representative of another interested organisation</p>
789		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
790		Parent of child at another local primary school
791	<p>Local schools for local children is the ideal scenario; less travelling, less environmental impact, less congestion because more will walk to school, and more of a community feel. _x000D_</p> <p>This consultation has led to a very negative feeling generally. The timing being over the Christmas period has been received suspiciously and with regret that our local schools should choose the Christmas holiday period to consult when groups of parents and other stakeholders like local schools are on holiday. _x000D_</p> <p>This is not my first reply to the consultation. As I have gained more insight into the issues this proposal would cause should it go ahead, I have had further responses to make.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
792		Parent of child at another local primary school
793		Parent of child at another local primary school
794	The proposals are unfair and penalise children through no fault of their own just because they do not go to a particular feeder school.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
795		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
796		Unknown
797		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
798	I think it was a very unfair judgement call to make these announcements just prior to the deadline for the primary school admissions for 20/21. You have made yourselves look like you are only interested in getting the numbers up for your own primary schools. West Wickham is a very close knit community and you should be putting that first. Also, Hawes Down is part of our community and it isn't just other local schools strongly objecting. Langley Primary need to open up their doors to our local area, it might be on your campus but it feels alienated from the community because this seems very sided to suit them.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
799		Unknown
800		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
801		Parent of child at another local primary school
802		Parent of child at another local primary school

803	The timing of this consultation could have been better considered as it falls in the month before the closing date for applications to Bromley borough primary schools. This leaves prospective parents little time to consider these proposals in their decision process for selecting primary schools for their children. _x000D_ Moreover, at the open days of the primary schools within the trust which these proposals apply to, the question of feeder schools was asked and the repose given in each school was that none were currently or going to be feeder schools to the secondary schools in the Trust. In light of these proposals this information was misleading to prospective parents at best.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
804	The timing of this consultation could have been better considered as it falls in the month before the closing date for applications to Bromley borough primary schools. This leaves prospective parents little time to consider these proposals in their decision process for selecting primary schools for their children. _x000D_ Moreover, at the open days of the primary schools within the trust which these proposals apply to, the question of feeder schools was asked and the repose given in each school was that none were currently or going to be feeder schools to the secondary schools in the Trust. In light of these proposals this information was misleading to prospective parents at best.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
805		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
806		Parent of child at another local primary school
807	Whilst this consultation request has been provided to parents of the trust schools, it is not clear if it has been sent to the parents of children in all local primary schools who might be expecting their children to move onto the Langley Park secondary schools. It would not appear to be a valid consultation without actively involving these parents.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
808	I think that changing the admissions policy to include 'feeder' primary schools is very unjust, and will discriminate against children from a lower socio-economic background who live close to the school (as a higher proportion of children qualifying for Free School Meals may not be given places where they do not come from a 'feeder' school.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
809	I'd like to thank the Trust for the clear consultation paper and process. _x000D_ _x000D_ Whatever one's views are on this topic, i'm convinced that this well thought-through consultation will eventually yield benefit to our children's education.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
810		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
811		Parent of child at another local primary school
812		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
813	Timing of implementation. _x000D_ _x000D_ Parents plan schooling years in advance. My guess is that these proposals have taken substantial efforts to produce and have thought through the various arguments. However, if implemented parents will not have time to respond given that they already made decisions as to where they send their children to primary school and may have made a different decision if these options had previously been in place. _x000D_ _x000D_ I would consul that the implementation period of any changes is considered given these facts.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
814	I agree with reasons for the proposed changes. There are still spaces for other pupils outside the trust. But pupils within the trust should be given priority.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
815		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
816		Parent of child at another local primary school
817		Parent of child at another local primary school
818	The secondary school proximity catchment is already very small. The school should be providing for children in the immediate vicinity. By prioritising primary staff and trust primary children you are no longer providing for many of the children based in close proximity. It's simply unfair to children and to other primary schools who will see their popularity fall. There usbpotential to create 'no mans land' for secondary schools. Every child should have the right to attend a local school.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
819		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
820		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
821	This will directly affect my who currently attend school	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
822		Parent of child at another local primary school
823		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

824		Unknown
825		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
826		Unknown
827		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
828	I am the grandparent and carer of three children who all live locally.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
829		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
830		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
831	I am a local resident now with adult children but went through school place processes many years ago- I was also a school governor for a local primary school that will be impacted and actively involved - having read through the proposals I strongly believe the Langley secondary schools should be available for local children to attend based on proximity to the school. _x000D_ . The main reasons are to minimise traffic and travel times and enable children to build local friendships and local communities	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
832		Parent of child at another local secondary school
833		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
834		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
835		Parent of child at another local primary school
836		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
837		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
838		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
839		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
840		Unknown
841	While I have children in primary school in the Borough I am not seeking admission to the Langley Park high schools so am not affected by the proposed changes. However, I am making these comments based on what I feel is fair for local residents, and in particular the considerable unfairness that families very close to the Langley Park high schools will no doubt feel if they are unable to get places for their children because of these changes.	Parent of child at another local primary school
842		Parent of child at another local primary school
843		Parent of child at another local primary school
844		Parent of child at another local primary school
845	Option A should be approved. Option B should be rejected. This to preserve sense of community as stated in the above responses.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
846		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
847		Parent of child at another local primary school
848		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
849	who have successfully been educated at Langley . The school has received strong support from local parents in its immediate hinterland over the years and your proposals seem to be completely insensitive to the desirability of the school having any relationship with its immediately surrounding area. Local residents will now be faced with living in a no-mans land where secondary education for their children is concerned.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
850		Parent of child at another local primary school
851		Parent of child at another local primary school
852		Parent of child at another local primary school
853		Parent of child at another local primary school
854		Parent of child at another local primary school
855		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
856		Parent of child at another local primary school
857		Parent of child at another local primary school
858	Live in the affected area	Unknown
859		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
860		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
861		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

862	at one of the named schools and a neighbour of children that could miss out on receiving a place at their local secondary school.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
863		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
864		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
865		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
866		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
867		Parent of child at another local primary school
868		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
869		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
870		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
871	years and had a child who attended Langley I feel I have a right to make my opinion known.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
872		Parent of child at another local primary school
873		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
874		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
875		Unknown
876	I have many concerns about either of the above proposals A or B . If the proposals go ahead my may not be able to attend their closest secondary school due to places being taken up by Trust primary school children who live further away. My children may have to travel longer distances to access alternative secondary schools. This is negative for both the environment and their health as I may have to drive them to school rather than my preference of them walking to school. With the proposed changes the catchment areas for the two secondary schools is likely to result in the exclusion of children from some less affluent areas and it may well push up house prices around the primary and secondary schools making the schools only available to the well off. Under your proposal it is likely that people will 'game' the system. People will move to the catchment of a Trust primary school and then once they have secured a place for that child (which will also automatically mean places for any future children under the sibling rule), they can then move to a cheaper area, safely knowing that their children are guaranteed places at good schools for the duration of their school education. It is completely unfair, it goes against what was agreed when LPPS was set up and disadvantages a number of local families.	Parent of child at another local primary school
877		Parent of child at another local primary school
878		Parent of child at another local primary school
879	I believe that children should be educated as close to where they live as possible. This would reduce road congestion and pollution, and would develop and strengthen relationships within the community where they live. I live locally and can envisage increased traffic, increased travel times and local children having to travel to get to school, rather than walking there.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
880		Parent of child at another local secondary school
881		Unknown
882	children attended the Langley Park secondary schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
883	Children used to attend Langley Park very recently.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
884		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
885		Unknown
886		Unknown
887		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
888	I AM REALLY SHOCKED THAT ALTHOUGH PARENTS AND GOVERNORS WERE TOLD THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE A CHANGE IN ADMISSIONS CRITERIA DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIOD ABOUT SETTING UP THE LPLT, WE ARE NOW FACING THE POSSIBILITY OF THIS HAPPENING. I FEEL THIS IS A SERIOUS BREACH OF TRUST.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

889	<p>The last time the entry criteria was changed (to 10% via a test(but would apply to all the changes, as they would have an effect)), it cause great distress to those excluded by this change. that he should normally gained entry, didn't, which cause may problems, with us having to apply to a wide number of schools to get a place for him. Eventually, a place was provided at a , which meant him having to travel on two buses and take an hour to reach his school</p> <p>Another issue is the number of places lost, which is huge. I don't want the criteria to change from the current arrangements, as in effect you are bringing in the distance from LPSB to around 60%, or less?, than now. In effect you are forcing local children to travel to schools which could easily mean them having to travel on buses.</p> <p>There is also the issue of the children who will be able to gain entry in future, under the proposed changes. If they don't live close to LPSG, they will have to travel too, meaning children living close to the Langley secondary schools probably having to travel to schools on buses and children living away from this area, having to travel also. Given climate change and issues with the health of children (not walking enough), it seems illogical to make large numbers of children travel away from their home area for years.</p> <p>I feel that it is disingenuous to state that the LP group of schools don't have a preferred option, when by the very nature of this proposal, it seems obvious that the purpose is to increase the number of children from outside of the area. So it would be correct to say the statement is accurate, the direct of travel the proposals show, is obvious.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
890	<p>I live close to the Langley Park secondary schools, within walking distance. . It was very important to myself and my husband that they both walked to and from school (I having travelled an hour on either end of my school day to my selective school then homework to complete) to assist with their wellbeing.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
891		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
892		Parent of child under 2 years
893		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
894		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
895		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
896		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
897		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
898		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
899		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
900		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
901		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
902		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
903	<p>The secondary schools should be open to children and young adults who live local to the schools. The proposed new admissions is a disgrace and the trust should be ashamed of itself to even promote the idea. The secondary schools are local schools and MUST include potential pupils from the other local schools such as Highfield and Pickhurst.</p> <p>who said this would happen and was told the Trust have no plans to change the admissions criteria!!!!</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
904		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

905		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
906	The level of public opposition to the feeder proposal is significant, with widespread leaflet dropping in the local area, protests organised and facebook groups set up to coordinate a significant opposition on any basis possible. It has meant that those in favour have been very quiet for fear of social media "trolling". In addition as parents we have received flyers in our childrens school bags that are not balanced in their view - i dont think this is appropriate and should not be endorsed by the school. Making more official data available on catchment areas, impact of feeder schools etc would help fill the void that people are choosing to fill themselves with loose facts. As will any significant vote, the more information available the more likely that people will work actual fact. this does not seem to be the case currently.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
907		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
908	This proposal is going to provide an unfair advantage to a select population of children and of course this will suit their parents. Education should be equal not selective. When children leave school they have to deal with people at all levels in life whatever their upbringing and circumstances. Schools have a duty to provide this foundation for their pupils. We don't want to develop or encourage a cohort of "old etonians" at LPSB or LPSG. Too much of this still exists in everyday life!	Representative of another interested organisation
909	I feel that this consultation has caused a lot of bad feeling among the local community with various social media groups set up to complain and share bad feelings towards the primary schools - in particular LPPS. A lot of the comments are unfair and in fact untrue. It is my belief, , especially in the current Y2 and younger classes that the majority of the pupils live within the catchment and therefore changing LPPS to have feeder status will not have this huge, awful impact that local residents are claiming. It is also extremely disgraceful for these same people to imply that children who live outside of the catchment (bearing in mind how small it is - this could be a road outside of the catchment area) are under achievers and will not benefit the secondary schools as they are children who have parents living on benefits. I believe this could have been dealt with far easier and with far less anger if the promises made to the early parents in current Y3 and Y2 were upheld perhaps privately without such publicity.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
910	I believe there is a typo in the propose admissions proposal. It states LPGS twice rather LPBS.(criteria 5/Option B) I am not sure you can run a consultation with an error in it. Please advise me if i am incorrect? See below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looked after and previously looked after_x000D_ children_x000D_ 2. Children with siblings_x000D_ 3. Children attending LPPS_x000D_ 4. Children attending CHPS or HDPS_x000D_ 5. Children of staff at either LPSG or LPSG_x000D_ 6. All other children 	Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
911		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
912		Parent of child at another local primary school
913	Hopefully if all the above compliance restrictions are in place, then the problem of "over subscription" should not apply, and a clearer warning of criminal conviction punishment awards should send a clear message	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
914	The over-arching commentary to these changes has been negative in the most part on social media and in published pamphlets that are being distributed via the feeder schools, I have found this frustrating and also concerning in that the negative views in these pamphlets could be construed as being the view of the school when in fact they are simply the view of some parents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _x000D_ I am sure there are a lot of parents who view this positively but are not voicing this opinion for fear of back lash on social media etc.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
915		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
916		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
917		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
918		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
919		Parent of child at another local primary school

920		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
921		Representative of another interested organisation
922		Unknown
923	The comment about combined PANs for LPSB and LPGS being 460 allowing for at least 280 places available to non-Trust primary applicants is misleading because: _x000D_ (a) it does not take account of the unknown gender make-up of applications in any particular year _x000D_ (b) it does not seem to take account of priority places taken by cared for, siblings and staff children _x000D_ (c) the Trust primary schools may increase their class sizes and/or add more classes to year groups in the future thus increasing the number of children potentially having priority for admission to the Trust secondary schools.	Unknown
924	I am unhappy about this as I recently applied for my primary school. we were very undecided between as both seem excellent. We put as our first choice, however this may not have been our decision if we had known about being a feeder school to Langley . Pretty poor timing I must say!	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
925	I appreciate that making all 3 primary schools in the trust feeders to the secondary schools may make them more attractive and hence result in higher pupil numbers / funding. I also understand that work is being done to bring the primary and secondary schools closer together, share resources and ease transition from primary to secondary education etc. However, I worry that CH and HD becoming feeders would have a disproportionate impact on the catchment area of the secondary schools and affect local communities as well as resulting in increased traffic. Unfortunately past statistics from CH and HD only show pupil numbers that have transferred into the secondary schools but not those that would have liked to. I am not sure if numbers are available of pupils from those schools that applied unsuccessfully. This might provide a better view of potential pupil numbers from the primary schools in the trust (and how this might affect the catchment areas) under Option B.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
926	Please leave things as they are under present admission criteria to ensure fair access to Langley schools for ALL children.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
927		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
928		Parent of child at another local primary school
929		Parent of child at another local primary school
930		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
931	This is disgusting and I have complained to our MP. Publically funded schools should serve the LOCAL community not your Trust!	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
932		Unknown
933		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
934		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
935		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
936		Parent of child at another local primary school
937	It is extremely unfair to give priority to children living further away from the Langley secondary schools rather than local children. The children living closest to the schools should absolutely be given priority.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
938	Your oversubscription criteria appears wholly unacceptable. Category 1 and 2 are acceptable. All other categories should be considered on the home address basis. There should be no preferential placement of children attending schools within the trust.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
939		Unknown
940		Parent of child under 2 years
941		Parent of child at another local primary school
942		Parent of child at another local primary school
943		Parent of child at another local primary school
944	Langley Park quite simply should be linked to the secondary schools. _x000D_ The company should engage in a wider community, live by the same values and encourage their pupils to go through a consistent educational journey.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

945	It makes absolute sense for Langley primary pupils to have priority to the secondary school. They share everything the same including the name.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
946		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
947		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
948		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
949		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
950		Parent of child under 2 years
951		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
952		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
953		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
954	<p>Your proposals would greatly disadvantage both the children and staff at _____, recruitment of staff would be compromised and our children would miss out on the exceptional teaching available at the Langley secondary schools. Looked after children would be in danger of losing vital links with their peers from primary school, relationships that in some cases are vital. SEN children would equally be in danger of losing contact with children that they have made vital friendships with.</p> <p>As a _____ to both Langley secondary schools and thrived, I feel passionate about the children I now work with having the same advantages offered to them.</p> <p>All the children in the local area need the same opportunity to attend the Langley secondary schools.</p>	Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
955	<p>I am really concerned that local children attending other primary schools will be excluded from Langley Girls/Boys school and have to journey further afield, where previously easily walked to the schools. _x000D_ The trust should not be bias towards only their schools for admissions.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
956		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
957	<p>There are two new secondary schools in the br3 area which would be catchment for Clare House and Langley Park primary. Harris academy having outstanding ofsted. Langley Park Secondary schools boys and girls have always been our local Secondary schools with most of my neighbours children attending. It would be very unfair to change admission policy for all our local children . I have lived in local area for over fifteen years and have seen many families move into our area at great expense to be in catchment for Langley Schools. I live 0.8 miles away and Langley School and expected my child to be able to attend Langley Boys which is our nearest Secondary School.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school

958	<p>These proposed changes will have a hugely detrimental impact on children and families in the areas surrounding LPBS and LPGS for a number of reasons, including:</p> <p>1) The catchment for the LPGS and LPBS, both of which are heavily oversubscribed, will inevitably shrink by a considerably amount. Priority would be given to 180 children in the 3 named primary schools, some of whom will live further from the secondary schools than children living locally (but not attending those named primaries). This means some children who are currently in the catchment for LPSB and LPSG won't be able to attend their local schools and will have to travel much further to access alternative secondary schools;</p> <p>2) There will be a negative environmental impact of children having to be transported to school rather than walking, due to the resulting increase in distances to their secondary schools. There will also be a consequential increase in congestion (particularly around LPSB and LPSG, where there is already heavy traffic) from children travelling to schools which are further away because they are not attending their local secondary school;</p> <p>3) The catchment for other schools (both primary and secondary) in the surrounding areas will be consequentially affected, and it is likely that competition for places at other popular secondary schools (eg. Hayes) will become even fiercer;</p> <p>4) There will be a knock-on negative effect on house prices for areas that are currently in the catchment for LPSB and LPSG, but would fall outside the catchment because of the proposed admissions criteria;</p> <p>The end result of these proposed changes would be that children attending one of the 3 named primary schools (along with any siblings who would access the same primary school under the sibling rule) would have their education guaranteed from 4-18 years old. This would put children attending other primary schools in the locality at a huge disadvantage.</p> <p>The alleged "compelling" reasons cited by the LPLT for these proposed changes (which are for the sole benefit of the children in the primary schools in their trust) cannot justify the devastating impact these changes would have for so many other children and families in the local area.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
959		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
960		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
961		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
962		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
963		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
964		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
965		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
966		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
967	<p>I see nothing in the Trust's stated aims and aspirations that could not be achieved without this change to a feeder school model. I am thrilled that the chief executive is keen to run schools that he would be delighted for his own children to attend But perhaps he, and the rest of the board, would be better placed focusing on educating the children from the local area who have the greatest right to benefit from that education.</p>	Parent of child at another local secondary school, Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
968		Parent of child at another local primary school
969		Parent of child at another local primary school
970		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

971	<p>As a local resident to this area in which the schools are, I would be incredibly unhappy with the increase in traffic which would be inevitable as more people would drive their children from Hayes/ West Wickham areas. This area is already snarled with school traffic and there would be less local children walking or using public transport._x000D_</p> <p>Current public transport is already experiencing a heavy amount of school children._x000D_</p> <p>Both these issues would have significant impact on parents and residents who work or use public transport for their commute._x000D_</p> <p>More cars taking up space in a small congested traffic area._x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>This is a poorly considered, elitist, unfair and unjust proposal designed to accommodate residents of Hayes and West Wickham. These residents need to consider why they moved to an area with a lack of schools if they had children. Bromley council needs to stop accommodating those who live out of borough and provide adequate schooling local to the area for Clare house, hawes down schools._x000D_</p> <p>This should not impact local residents and children who attend Unicorn, MVPS and balgowan schools. The children who attend unicorn, MVPS and balgowan should not be at a disadvantage to getting a place in their local secondary schools._x000D_</p> <p>No support for this proposal whatsoever.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
972	<p>I realise there has been much disquiet within the local community over these proposals. Arguments put forward by those opposed to the proposals include: _x000D_</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elitism. At a time when the state school system is consolidating and looking at ways to restructure to offer better education, these proposals are to be applauded. The student population at Clare House for instance is diverse and the focus is not on academic results and competition but on the child's individual learning journey. I doubt these children, should they be in a feeder school system, will be classed as 'elitist' when they graduate. _x000D_ - Environmental factors, i.e. there will be a rise in traffic and pollution in the area from parents driving their children to school. This occurs everywhere. A possible solution to this would be provide a school bus service._x000D_ - A fall in house prices. This is highly unlikely as Beckenham is a desirable place to live and there will always be a demand for local housing, 	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
973		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
974	The proposal to take pupils from further afield will increase car driving and further impact our appalling air quality in the borough	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
975		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
976		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
977		Parent of child at another local primary school
978		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
979		Parent of child at another local primary school
980		Parent of child under 2 years
981		Parent of child under 2 years
982		Parent of child at another local primary school
983		Parent of child at another local primary school
984		Parent of child at another local primary school
985	<p>Like many families and parents in the local area, I moved close to the Langley secondary schools a few years ago to give my child access to the respected level of education they provide. This was a major life decision, affecting both finances and work arrangements, to which my family is still adjusting. The proposal that this access may now no longer be available is extremely distressing as well as defeating. Parents are faced with a hugely difficult task navigating their way through the lottery of state education, and to have the goalposts shift once a major upheaval has already been undertaken is simply exploitative and unethical and would cause considerable unrest and destabilisation in the local area.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
986		Parent of child at another local primary school
987		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
988		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
989		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
990		Unknown
991		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

992		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
993	Nexus Education Schools Trust strongly objects to the proposals submitted as the Langley Park Learning Trust, admissions consultation which will prioritise children attending Langley Park Learning Trust Primary schools ahead of children from other schools.	Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
994		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
995	It seems somewhat unfair that parents who are living within the current catchment area for Langley Secondary Schools, but who didn't have a crystal ball at the ready when choosing primary schools several years ago, may now find that their children will not be offered a place at Langley because they did not select the correct primary school. If these changes are to go ahead, they should come into effect when next year's Reception intake are due to move into Year 7, so that parents have had the opportunity to make informed decisions as to their choice of primary school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
996		Parent of child at another local secondary school
997		Parent of child at another local primary school
998		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
999		Parent of child at another local primary school
1000		Parent of child at another local primary school
1001		Unknown
1002		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1003		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1004		Parent of child at another local primary school
1005		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1006		Parent of child at another local primary school
1007		Parent of child at another local primary school
1008		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1009		Parent of child at another local primary school
1010		Parent of child at another local primary school
1011		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
1012		Parent of child at another local primary school
1013		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
1014		Parent of child at another local primary school
1015		Unknown
1016	and I think that had we tried to apply to LPGS or LPSB under these new criteria, they wouldn't have received places despite being their local secondary. A retrograde step. We're all equal only some are more equal under your criteria.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1017		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1018	Two points_x000D_ 1)It would be useful to understand further as a parent how the schools within the trust were selected, which has driven the new selection policy to which there is the major controversy._x000D_ 2)For simplicity in my view. it makes no sense giving priority to children from schools in the selected trust over other children who live closer and in the catchment area of the secondary schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1019	These are state schools and facilities of our local community. There should be an open application process for all locally residing children whose parents wish to apply._x000D_ _x000D_ Selection in the divisive way proposed smacks of moral corruption, and it will be seen that way.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1020		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1021	Do not make any changes to the current system. Keep local school for local children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1022		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1023		Unknown
1024		Parent of child at another local primary school

1025	<p>This proposed change will exclude children from other local schools, such as Unicorn, Pickhurst and Highfield, most of which live very close to the Langley Schools. _x000D_</p> <p>If this feeder school idea were to go ahead, there WILL be a lot more traffic outside the school. It&rsquo;s already dreadful, more so since the primary school and an &lsquo;accident waiting to happen&rsquo;. _x000D_</p> <p>This proposed change will make it worse and have an impact on house prices around these &lsquo;proposed feeder schools&rsquo;. _x000D_</p> <p>The Langley schools would lose their sense of &lsquo;community&rsquo; as a lot of the children and parents won&rsquo;t be as local, this will have an impact on their PTA&rsquo;s as parents won&rsquo;t want to/can&rsquo;t just &lsquo;pop in and help&rsquo;. _x000D_</p> <p>I understand this proposal has been driven by what works &lsquo;best for the trust/academy&rsquo;, which I can understand given the amount of time and great effort invested but it feels very short sighted. It feels like it&rsquo;s becoming &lsquo;an exclusive school club&rsquo; without true consideration for the extensive impact on the other local children. Any sense of community will be lost.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1026		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1027		Parent of child at another local primary school
1028		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1029	<p>I strongly oppose priority places for Langley trust primary schools. This could set a precedent for other trusts in the borough, resulting in reduced secondary choices for many children. _x000D_</p> <p>If the idea behind this is to fill the places at Langley primary school, by offering an incentive of all through education, then more consideration should be given as to why Langley primary school is not full. _x000D_</p> <p>Children living within the catchment area for LPGS & LPBS should have priority over those attending trust primary schools, as historically as been the case.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1030	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed priority secondary places for trust primary schools. _x000D_</p> <p>If all trusts do this, then choices are seriously reduced for Yr7 places. Some trusts have no secondary schools in them so these children will be disadvantaged.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1031		Parent of child at another local primary school
1032		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1033		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1034		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1035	<p>Admission based on a parent working at that specific school is reasonable for obvious convenience reasons. Admission based on working at a school within the trust, but not the actual school being attended by a pupil, would constitute nepotism or a perk - and is therefore unfair to other more eligible candidates. _x000D_</p> <p>I'm neutral on the LPPS being a feeder as it shares the same site. This shared site is the only real justification for designating any particular school as a feeder. Many parents will have already made significant life decisions on the reasonable expectation of being allocated a LPSG/B place based on proximity to the school. To be excluded by new policy because they didn't send their children to a school within the trust is alarming. The proposals clearly, perhaps suspiciously, result in an outcome in favour of one group of parents and pupils and therefore very much against another. Clarifying definitions of sibling and breaker scenarios are welcome on their own without the insidious proposals surrounding designated feeder schools.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1036		Unknown
1037		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1038		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1039		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1040		Unknown
1041		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1042		Parent of child at another local primary school
1043		Parent of child at another local primary school

1044	As you will no doubt know, this has caused major concern within the local area. An area which has a great community spirit & reputation. With this proposal you have alienated the very people that fill your schools & the future of the local children & area that we all live in. It's obvious for all to see why you have proposed this change and all it has achieved is to highlight that the Langley Park Learning Trust is an elitist group who care more about their status than caring for & educating the children within the catchment. Shame on you for even suggesting this absurdity in the first instance.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1045	I will become a parent in 2020 and my fiance and I have purposely moved into the area because of the access to good schools. and we are very concerned about possible exclusion as a result of these proposed changes.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1046		Parent of child at another local primary school
1047		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1048		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1049	Consideration should be given to the fact that if the secondary schools allow the proposals to go ahead and have feeder primary schools then it is possible that Harris Academy and E21C academy will follow your example. This would mean local children may have to travel to go to secondary school due to lack of choice based on the narrowing of the number of places able to be allocated under proximity rules. This would be a travesty as children local to the Langley schools currently have a good choice of schools catering for different types of need. This has only happened within recent times and has removed some of the anxiety of choosing a good school as there is now a good choice.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1050		Parent of child at another local primary school
1051		Parent of child at another local primary school
1052		Parent of child at another local primary school
1053	You now need to build relationships with all local primary schools as well as the local community as this consultation has caused great upset. _x000D_ What a shame that you are not thinking about how to make the two secondary schools, in particular the sixth forms, work more closely together as this would be far more beneficial to the children in the local area.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1054		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1055		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1056		Parent of child at another local primary school
1057		Parent of child at another local primary school
1058	I'd like to understand the tangible benefits to be gained from the LPLT's proposal to change the Admissions Policy? None of the school's are undersubscribed, so why the change? Who or what will advantage from this proposed change? _x000D_ Can you quantify the advantages please? _x000D_ Happy for you to do this openly to all concerned/consulted, or feel free to outline this directly? _x000D_ Thanks in advance.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1059		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1060		Parent of child at another local primary school
1061	Langley Schools should remain for local residents with no priority given to feeder schools. It should purely be on catchment fair and square followed by sibling already there. I am a parent of children who previously attended both schools and a grandparent of prospective pupils!!	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1062		Parent of child at another local primary school
1063		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1064		Parent of child at another local primary school

1065	I suspect that by far the fairest outcome for the local community is for the status quo to continue with no feeder schools. As a I can see that the advantages of a similar approach through the years with a guaranteed transfer to the associated secondary is advantageous but don't feel this ways strongly enough to balance out the disadvantage to the community as a whole.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1066		Parent of child at another local primary school
1067		Parent of child at another local primary school
1068		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1069		Unknown
1070		Parent of child at another local primary school
1071		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1072	If children who now no longer live locally but go to one of the proposed feeder schools are awarded places at LPSB or LPSG, there may be a big environmental impact with more children being driven to school rather than walking or cycling which is currently encouraged.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1073	I think if this goes through then it will have a knock on affect for other schools and children in the wider area. We could end up seeing children travelling to schools that are not their local schools. Terrible for the environment and safety of those children having to travel further than necessary. It shouldn't be about what academy chain you attend. That is not in the best interest of everyone in the community.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1074		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1075		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1076		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1077		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1078		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1079		Parent of child at another local primary school
1080		Parent of child at another local primary school
1081		Parent of child at another local primary school
1082		Parent of child at another local primary school
1083		Parent of child at another local primary school
1084		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1085		Parent of child at another local primary school
1086		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1087		Parent of child at another local primary school
1088	I strongly disagree to the proposal to create feeder schools. The impact to other local schools will be disastrous and they will be undersubscribed. A child that would usually get into a secondary school under the current policy may not under the new. They are then essentially in no mans land. Too far for their next nearest and then travelling out of borough to schools that have places. Schools that have places for children so far out of catchment have them for a reason. The Langley Trust has not explained why they want to do this and what impact they think it will cause. If anything the sibling rule should apply between the secondary schools. It seems ridiculous that a sister and brother would have to go to different schools. Many schools also take more nursery children than they can offer reception places. Similarly Linden Leas is on the same sight as HDPS but children are not guaranteed a place at HDPS. There is no reason any of these children. Should get priority over other local children. What happens if the Trust take other schools into their academy? Will these schools take up all the secondary place's eventually.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1089		Unknown
1090		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1091		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
1092		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1093		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1094		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1095		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1096		Parent of child at another local primary school
1097		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1098		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1099		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1100		Parent of child at another local primary school
1101		Parent of child at another local primary school
1102		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1103	My final say on this is simply, Langley secondary schools are local schools – children in this area go to primary schools together, they then move up to Langley secondary schools together, they all live local so they remain lifelong friends and I believe that then translates into a lovely community that is familiar with eachother and help eachother out. I love seeing the Langley secondary school kids come out their house on my road in the morning and knock for their friends who live next door to walk to school together….if this proposal goes through, that sense of local community goes with it too. Which would be the saddest part of it all	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1104		Parent of child at another local primary school
1105		Parent of child at another local primary school
1106		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1107		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1108		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1109		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1110		Parent of child at another local primary school
1111	I am concerned your Option A and Option B both include adding Langley Park primary as a feeder school. I believe you should have offered a third option where you only change the arrangements for children of staff and the other clarifications on definition. You haven't offered any explanation as to why Langley Park primary children should be prioritised over the other two; being on the same site is irrelevant to me. The catchment for LP Primary has been so big the last few years it clearly would take places for the secondary. It looks suspiciously like you want to help the primary become more popular which I think you should be doing by virtue of the education and experience offered there, not by a quick fix measure dangling places at the secondary?? If I'm wrong on the motives, please explain why being on the same site is of such import to be given automatic through places?	Parent of child at another local primary school
1112		Parent of child at another local primary school
1113		Parent of child at another local primary school
1114		Parent of child at another local primary school
1115		Parent of child at another local primary school
1116		Parent of child at another local primary school
1117		Parent of child at another local primary school
1118		Unknown
1119		Parent of child at another local primary school
1120		Parent of child at another local primary school
1121		Parent of child at another local primary school
1122	Both Options A and B will have a distorting impact on the local community. Priority will be given to children from outside the traditional catchment of Langley Park Schools and will reduce the options available to local residents and pupils. If there are concerns over the admissions policy within Bromley, then this should be taken up with the Borough Council, not changed unilaterally by the school. The fact that the Borough have rasied strong objections to these proposals highlights the problems they will cause.	Unknown
1123		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1124		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1125		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1126		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1127		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1128		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1129		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1130		Parent of child at another local primary school
1131		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

1132		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1133		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1134		Parent of child at another local primary school
1135		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1136		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1137		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1138		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above), Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1139		Parent of child at another local primary school
1140		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1141	I strongly believe that local schools should be for local children and that the proposal to give priority entry to other Trust schools is unfair and would disadvantage these children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1142		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1143		Parent of child at another local primary school
1144		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1145	Children should be able to walk to school and not rely on cars and buses. They should be able to select the secondary school most appropriate for their needs. The new proposal will divide communities and restrict the ability for children to grow friendship groups - a valuable benefit of the existing system	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1146		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1147		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1148		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1149		Unknown
1150		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1151		Parent of child at another local primary school
1152		Parent of child at another local primary school
1153		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1154		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1155		Parent of child at another local primary school
1156		Parent of child at another local primary school
1157		Parent of child at another local primary school
1158		Parent of child at another local primary school
1159		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1160		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1161		Parent of child at another local primary school
1162		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1163		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1164		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1165		Parent of child at another local primary school
1166		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1167		Parent of child at another local primary school
1168		Parent of child at another local primary school
1169		Parent of child at another local primary school
1170		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1171		Parent of child at another local primary school

1172	I think school standards should be raised so that all children will want to go to their nearest secondary school as standards would be evenly distributed locally	Representative of another interested organisation
1173		Parent of child at another local primary school
1174		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1175	Another fundamental issue to be considered and which is not mentioned anywhere, is the dramatic effect on the environment caused by the extra traffic that will be a direct result of out of area children travelling to the Langley site because they have been given priority over more local children. Climate change is a very real concern that needs addressing now.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1176		Parent of child at another local primary school
1177		Parent of child at another local primary school
1178		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1179		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1180		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1181		Parent of child at another local primary school
1182		Unknown
1183		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1184		Unknown
1185		Parent of child at another local primary school
1186		Unknown
1187		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1188		Parent of child at another local primary school
1189		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1190	If this goes ahead it will set a precedent which could result in complete chaos for the school admission system.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1191	If this goes ahead it will set an extremely dangerous precedent which could result in complete chaos for the school admission system.	Unknown
1192		Parent of child at another local primary school
1193		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1194		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1195		Parent of child at another local primary school
1196		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1197		Parent of child at another local primary school
1198		Parent of child at another local primary school
1199		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1200		Parent of child at another local primary school
1201	Disappointed at the news of this consultation. Local children being excluded based on primary school is unacceptable. Not enough secondary places. Poor regard for children who aren't within the criteria. Wickham common primary school are generally too far for all secondary schools based on postcode and this compounds issue.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1202		Parent of child at another local primary school
1203		Parent of child at another local primary school
1204		Parent of child at another local primary school
1205		Parent of child at another local primary school
1206		Parent of child at another local primary school
1207		Parent of child at another local primary school
1208		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1209		Parent of child at another local primary school
1210		Parent of child at another local primary school

1211		Parent of child at another local primary school
1212		Parent of child at another local primary school
1213		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1214		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1215		Parent of child at another local primary school
1216		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1217		Parent of child at another local primary school
1218		Parent of child at another local primary school
1219		Parent of child at another local primary school
1220		Parent of child at another local primary school
1221		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1222	<p>This proposal will give them less opportunity to be given a place. The staff of are not even included specifically on the options list of interested parties below, but would have to tick 'other'. This seems grossly unfair and should be amended. but am still very concerned about how this proposal will impact on my former pupils.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1223		Parent of child at another local primary school
1224		Parent of child at another local primary school
1225		Parent of child at another local primary school
1226		Parent of child at another local primary school
1227		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1228		Parent of child at another local primary school
1229		Parent of child at another local primary school
1230		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1231		Parent of child at another local primary school
1232		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1233		Unknown
1234	I do think its fair that children living nearby ie the 3 proposed primary schools should be given priority. It is only fair local residents should be able to attend their local schools.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1235		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1236		Parent of child at another local primary school
1237		Parent of child at another local primary school
1238	Although not directly related, I have heard of quite a few incidents of bullying at the girls school. It's a shame the schools are separate as I would like my girls to attend a mixed school as I did myself.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1239		Parent of child at another local primary school
1240		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1241		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school, Parent of child under 2 years, Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1242		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1243		Parent of child at another local primary school
1244		Unknown
1245	Drop the feeder school proposals. LPGs and LPSB should continue to take local children from Beckenham primary schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1246		Parent of child at another local primary school
1247		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1248		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1249		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1250		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1251		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1252	I believe that whilst the change for secondary school admissions would benefit some children in the feeder school it will disadvantage a greater number at non feeder schools but who were previously within the catchment areas. This is unfair will become divisive in the local community. The current admissions system is fair and unbiased and should remain so	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1253		Parent of child at another local primary school
1254	I am a grandparent who feels exceptionally strongly about taking the right away from a child who has lived all his life in the catchment area for Langley Boys only to have it taken away at the whim of others. His whole family being born (including his great grandparents and myself) and lived in the Beckenham/West Wickham area all their lives.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1255		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1256		Parent of child at another local primary school
1257	Overall I strongly feel that our children should have the basic right of attending their nearest school. It is safer, better for the environment and means that children build and maintain friendships with peers that also live locally. People have invested to live in the 'Langley Catchment' in my case buying a property even before we started a family and pinned our hopes on the promise that our children would have a fair chance at attending their nearest secondary school. It also means that when choosing a primary school people may now not consider the school that is best for their child but instead one that gets them into Langley. While beneficial to the trust as their schools will be full, other great schools in Bromley will suffer and in turn so will our children and surely its the children that should come first in all of this!	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1258		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
1259		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1260		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1261		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1262		Parent of child at another local primary school
1263	I don't think it is appropriate that Academy schools can change their entry criteria without final approval by local government/MP. The state has a duty to ensure fair access to quality education provision and it cannot be right with a known increase in child numbers in the borough and insufficient school places currently available that a trust should be able to implement a change that further reduces choice, puts pressure on other schools and will lead to increased traffic congestion and air pollution. If we want to live in thriving communities where people feel invested in local matters and energised to care about their community then this is a step in the opposite direction as it will pull families further away from their locales. Educators have a responsibility to provide opportunities to children that they themselves likely benefitted from and they have a responsibility to look at the wider societal implications rather than the narrow focus of their own trust.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1264		Parent of child at another local primary school
1265		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1266		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1267	If you have a boy and a girl the trust should take that into consideration and consider the second child as sibling.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

1268	<p>Thank you for opening the consultation with regards to the proposed changes to the proposed changes to the Langley Park School for Boys and Langley Parks School for Girls.</p> <p>I do not oppose prioritising admission for children of staff, however I do strongly oppose the proposal to name any of the primary schools as feeder schools in the admission arrangements for the Secondary Schools and urge you not to proceed with these changes which are not clear, fair or objective and will unreasonably disadvantage all local children.</p> <p>Specifically &hellip;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; The proposal is unfair to local children, including those within the LPLT Trust itself - Under both Option A and B, Langley Park Primary School children are unfairly given priority over CHPS & HDPS children. The pretext given in the proposals for this are : &#9702; LPPS is located on the same campus as the two secondary schools - Although located in the same vicinity, the schools maintain their own security and boundaries, much in the same way as Unicorn Primary School (not part of the Trust) which shares a physical border with LPBS. Location does not demonstrate greater cooperation between LPPS and the secondaries and this is not sufficient reason to prioritise LPPS children over all others. &#9702; Parents of current or future pupils at LPPS may have a higher expectation that their children will be able to transfer to one of the secondary schools - As legally required under the Schools Admissions Code, the current admissions policy for LPSB and LPSG must be clear in setting out the admissions arrangements. Priority for LPPS children is not stated under the current arrangements and therefore any expectations formed based on information outside the published policy are unreasonable and not credible. &bull; The introduction of the feeder arrangements will set a detrimental precedence for other Multi Academy Trusts and will have an adverse effect on all local school children (including those in the LPLT Trust), limiting choice for those part of a primary / secondary Multi Academy and leaving those in Trusts without Secondary Schools with almost no local Secondary School choice. Furthermore secondary schools neighbouring the LPGS and LPBS schools, such as Eden Park High and Harris Schools, are MATs with primaries and so the threat is significant and real. These changes would lead to greater manipulation, cheating and error in the Admissions process. &bull;The LPLT Trust is not only a private company but also a registered charity and therefore has a responsibility to compete fairly. Whilst the proposals are likely to lead to attracting larger numbers to Langley Primary School - which has been undersubscribed for two of the last three years - such aggressive competitive behaviour, and deviation from the Spirt of the Schools Admissions Code will be at a negative cost to the Trusts' schools, children and reputation as a whole. The proposals alone have proven to be divisive. In order to provide the highest possible standard of education and pastoral care would it not be better to continue forging effective links with business and community and work collaboratively with the local community, schools and 	Parent of child at another local primary school
1269		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1270		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1271	<p>I have additional concerns at the proposed timings to implement any changes to the admissions procedure. Year 5 children entering secondaries in 2021 will already be considering their options, but will have to do so with no understanding of how admissions will work for LP secondaries for 2021 entry. Whilst I object to the proposed designation of feeder schools for the reasons above, on any analysis it would be unfair to implement any changes in such short order. Families in the area have a reasonable expectation that at least for 2021 entry the usual admissions policy will apply. Some families take significant decisions (house sales and purchases) in order to maximise secondary opportunities. Some will already have moved to the area to enable entry to LP secondaries; if the admissions criteria change, others may wish to move elsewhere, into the "catchment" of alternative secondaries. These are changes which should be implemented with a longer lead time.</p> <p>Traffic in the area around the secondary schools is already very problematic, and notably more so since the opening of the primary school on site. Over time those traffic problems will only be exacerbated by children travelling in from wider distances if dropped by private car (and in future years by sixth formers with their own cars).</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1272		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1273	<p>Having moved to be closer, investing in our child's future by allowing them a choice to attend the Langley Park Schools, it is concerning that this could be taken from them. We couldn't be any closer to the schools, yet could still be excluded if the in take from feeder schools is high.</p>	Parent of child under 2 years
1274		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1275		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1276		Unknown

1277	langley has always been ran the same way to now turn around and say kids from say balgowan will now have no chance isn't fair.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1278	The question of access by the primary schools, including priority access, was a frequent topic during discussion about joining LPLT but it was vehemently denied that it would happen to Governors and to a Parents Consultation event. A year later it is being proposed!!!	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1279		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1280		Parent of child at another local primary school
1281		Parent of child at another local primary school
1282	I am a non-parent with an interest and concern as I have friends/colleagues who's families could be negatively affected by these decisions.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1283		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1284		Unknown
1285		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1286		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1287		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1288		Parent of child at another local primary school
1289		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1290		Parent of child at another local primary school
1291	This would have an impact on my children. We would hope for Hayes secondary school but if the restrictions go ahead the demand for hayes may increase and as we are on the border of catchment for hayes will likely mean we would not get a place.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1292		Parent of child at another local primary school
1293		Parent of child at another local primary school
1294		Unknown
1295		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1296		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1297		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1298		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1299		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1300		Parent of child at another local primary school
1301		Parent of child at another local primary school
1302		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1303		Parent of child at another local primary school
1304		Representative of a Local Authority, Representative of another interested organisation
1305		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1306		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1307		Parent of child at another local primary school
1308		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1309	I do not agree with the sibling rule _x000D_ I am fully aware that many families get a first child in then move away siblings keep automatic right to attend this is unfair on kids that live close to school it should be scrapped	Parent of child at another local primary school
1310		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1311		Parent of child at another local primary school

1312		Parent of child at another local primary school
1313		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1314		Parent of child at another local primary school
1315		Parent of child at another local primary school
1316		Parent of child at another local primary school
1317		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1318		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1319		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1320	I feel very strongly that the Langley Park Secondary Schools for Boys and Girls and equally the Langley Park Primary School should be for local children. It is good for the children socially and also good for the environment.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1321		Parent of child at another local primary school
1322		Parent of child at another local primary school
1323		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1324		Parent of child at another local primary school
1325		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1326	Places should be allocated on a provision of those who live nearest to the school. This allows children to walk to school and is far better for the environment than parents driving their children. There will be fewer car journeys thus saving on pollution. It is also safer for children to walk to their nearest secondary school. The environment is already very polluted and we do not need more pollution. The health and well being of all school pupils should be the top priority for all responsible adults involved in the welfare of children. There are also factors affecting the local community. It is easier for children and parents who live near each other to meet up for local events and other activities rather than having to travel miles for such events. Moreover, I am not convinced that public transport can cope with additional children traveling to far distant schools. I believe that the school system should stay as it is now because it works well. _x000D_ _x000D_ Moreover, there will be a problem with all academy trusts giving preference to schools within their trusts only. If an academy trust does not have a secondary school or schools within its trust, where will pupils from those schools get secondary education? Furthermore, what about children who move into the area later, where will they go to school if their parents cannot afford to pay for private education? _x000D_ _x000D_ All these issues must be taken into responsible and pertinent consideration if the matters mentioned above are to be resolved in a meaningful and inclusive manner giving full attention to the wishes of local parents whilst meeting with their expected outcomes in this situation.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1327		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1328		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1329		Parent of child at another local primary school
1330		Parent of child at another local primary school
1331		Parent of child at another local primary school
1332		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1333		Unknown
1334	Other closer primary school children should have at least as much chance to attend LPSB or LPSG. _x000D_ Equal access should be given to children living closest to the school. Schools for the local community who may be walking distance from the school to support child health, cleaner environment, smooth traffic flows, keep and create close community links and community feel within the schools for the children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1335		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1336		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

1337		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1338		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1339		Parent of child at another local primary school
1340		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1341		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1342		Parent of child at another local primary school
1343		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1344		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1345		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1346		Unknown
1347	<p>This is the case for a lot of people who have moved into the area but who are now in limbo, petrified to know where to put for their first choice of school. Do they go with their heart for a school that they feel would suit their children's nature now or place them in a school in order to guarantee them a place for a recognised secondary school. I think this would stop people moving into the area, causing a negative impact on the housing prices and market.</p> <p>. This is wrong it's simply not fair for the children who may live on the doorstep to now be worrying what's going to happen.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1348		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1349		Parent of child at another local primary school
1350		Parent of child at another local primary school
1351		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1352		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1353		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1354		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1355		Parent of child at another local primary school
1356		Parent of child at another local primary school
1357		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1358	<p>I would like to repeat my strong opposition to the proposal to establish feeder primary schools. This fundamentally goes against the principle of local schools for local children and will have far reaching impacts, well beyond the confines of the trust's schools, both on the environment and other schools within the local authority. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Should the trust decide to continue with this approach I will support a complaint to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1359		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1360		Parent of child at another local primary school
1361		Parent of child at another local primary school
1362		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1363		Parent of child at another local primary school
1364		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1365	<p>and I have worked extremely hard to purchase a property within the catchment of such a well reputable school in order to give our children the best start we can. By offering the named primary schools priority means we are now highly unlikely to be offered a place therefore limiting our choices. This process seems highly unfair to those who have financially burdened themselves in order to benefit there children.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1366		Parent of child at another local primary school
1367		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years

1368	allocation should be as normal LBB criteria eg proximity to school, preference to Clare House and Hawes Down over Unicorn school should not be given as the catchment area of those schools will result in considerable increase in vehicle traffic over Unicorn, which would mostly be within walking distance	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1369		Parent of child at another local primary school
1370		Parent of child at another local primary school
1371		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1372		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1373		Unknown
1374	On the whole, this sets a dangerous precedent for all academy trusts to set their own admissions criteria thus exacerbating an already less than ideal secondary transition for many families. This could negatively impact on the community.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1375		Parent of child at another local primary school
1376	This will clearly be an emotive subject for the local community, and it is welcomed that the consultation is taking place. As per my earlier comment though, I do think it is unfortunate that the questions posed here in the response form do not match the consultation notice i.e. no mention on the response form of proposed LPPS priority over other schools or of Option A and Option B. This will make interpretation of the results more difficult as those supporting the general principles of MAT feeder schools may not support LPPS retaining priority over others and this should not be implied.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1377		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above), Representative of another interested organisation
1378		Unknown
1379		Parent of child at another local primary school
1380	See above notes under feeder schools section.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1381	The consultation has not sufficiently emphasised in its information pack, the consequences and associated risks of the schools becoming the Authority for the administration of the new admissions process to its schools, rather than the Central School Admissions team at Bromley Council. I think it would inevitably attract concerns about the transparency of the admissions process and the risk of corruption in administering the system if this were more widely understood. I think Langley Learning Trust must provide assurances of how they will ensure that the admissions process is transparent and not open to abuse including ways in which they will need to achieve an effective dovetail with the Central Schools Admissions team in order to provide joined up Admissions process to perspective parents. These reservations would also apply to in-year transfers. _x000D_ in addition, you have asked for comments to policy changes in isolation to one another. In the few examples where you have attempted to represent a scenario of the net effect of multiple proposals being introduced, I believe this consultation misrepresents the more likely outcomes (See reference above to the introduction of 3 Feeder Schools along with proposed Children of Teachers policy). I think the school needs a second run at considering and proposing changes to its Admissions policy, rather than implementing a set of policies that have yet to be discussed with Key Stakeholders (Schools Admissions Team) despite them directly impacting the responsibilities of those teams.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1382		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1383	I would not be in favour of Option A. I believe that if feeder schools are being introduced, it is only fair that it should apply to all schools within the trust and not only LPPS.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1384		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1385		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1386	and one of my main criteria was that they should be able to walk to school and live close to their friends. All of them are still in regular contact with school friends. I too benefited from making local friends through my children.	Unknown
1387		Parent of child at another local primary school
1388		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1389	<p>I and many more people I know are very unhappy to hear that Langley girls school will be a feeder school. We strongly disagree with it.</p> <p>We would just be devastated if there wouldn't even be option of going there! It's not right that other schools that are further away get first choice into Langley!</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1390		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1391		Parent of child at another local primary school
1392		Parent of child at another local primary school
1393		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1394		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1395		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1396		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1397		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1398		Parent of child at another local primary school
1399		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1400		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1401		Parent of child at another local primary school
1402		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1403		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1404		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1405	<p>With regard to the feeder school proposal where priority is given to the three schools above, I strongly disagree with this as it will shrink the catchment areas for both LPSG and LPSB meaning that local children will not be able to go to their local school. It will also have a negative environmental impact as children from further afield will be coming into the schools. Finally, it will make other local primary schools very unattractive where they are not connected to a secondary school, which will be detrimental to those schools and will also place more pressure on the already oversubscribed Clare House and Hawes Down.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1406		Parent of child at another local primary school
1407	<p>I think it is important that the same approach is taken to all the primary schools in the Trust. To create stronger links with one primary than the others would create an imbalance which I don't believe is justified sufficiently by Langley Primary being located alongside the secondary schools. _x000D_ _x000D_ I know that the option to have feeder schools will also have a lot of opposition, and parents' responses will be influenced by the individual impact it will have. However, I feel that the proposed changes are no more or less fair than the existing criteria - the secondary schools are and will remain oversubscribed. The decision should be made on the educational benefits of the changes, which I believe to be significant.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1408		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1409		Parent of child at another local primary school
1410		Parent of child at another local primary school
1411		Parent of child at another local primary school
1412		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1413	<p>This is an unfair disadvantage to local residents and their children. Like many other residents, we specifically chose West Wickham as our choice of residences (13 years ago), with schools in mind for their children. How can it be deemed slightly fair that staff and their children who potentially reside some distance away from the Langley schools secure a place within their desired school without any factor of proximity in place. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>The affect this would have on pollution due to extra traffic congestion into the area would almost certainly have a negative impact. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Local children should be able to walk to their nearest school, not be forced to take a different form of transport purely because they cannot secure a place for your proposed reasons.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1414		Parent of child at another local primary school
1415		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1416	<p>Believe other Secondary schools in Bromley have become feeder schools._x000D_</p> <p>Beckenham has a good choice of Secondary schools offering secondary choice for residents and Langley Schools I feel will still be able to provide places for local residents even with a feeder system in place.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1417		Parent of child at another local primary school
1418		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1419	<p>I would like to strongly complain about how this consultation has been managed by the Trust. It was announced very suddenly and with the consultation period over Christmas which really looks like an attempt to avoid responses. Even if the timing was set by required procedures, the lack of information from the Trust has been breath-taking. The FAQs document is insultingly brief and does not answer many of the valid questions consultees have raised. The Trust is asking people to comment on a policy that will affect local schools for years to come but has provided minimal information to help them, and then hidden behind a stonewall defence. This has left school staff and governors to face the local community with no support whatsoever.</p> <p>we live in this community and we have faced questions every day. Parents are rightly angry that they were misled in being told &lsquo;no schools will be feeder schools and if one school becomes one, all the Trust schools will be&rsquo;. The Trust has entirely failed in its duty in handling the situation. should have been kept informed about the decision and reasons for holding the consultation so that we could communicate to parents and also form our own opinions. What is the point of having</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1420	<p>The Trust does not express a preference between Options A and B. Option A seeks to secure Langley Park Primary as a feeder for both the secondary schools and by being on the same site has a logic. However it may, because of undersubscription, have the effect of allowing children into the secondary schools who would not otherwise secure a place on grounds of distance._x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>The argument for securing feeder status to Clare House and Hawes Down (Option B) is less convincing as they are further away. The Schools Adjudicator looks carefully at feeder proposals and has emphasised that there must be meaningful links between the named schools in order to demonstrate commonality of ethos and practice - indeed the Trust has sought to demonstrate this in its consultation document. However there is a risk that by building such strong links the children from other non feeder schools coming into the schools are disadvantaged and perhaps unwittingly would give rise to a 'them and us' culture in year 7 which may take some time to overcome. I consider this could be detrimental to children from non feeder schools. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>For this reason, whilst I disagree with the feeder proposal as a whole I consider that Option A would be less divisive than Option B.</p>	Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)

1421	<p>I have read carefully all the reasons you list for why the schools within the trust should have priority. Unfortunately no balance has been considered on why they should NOT have priority.</p> <p>1) All primary schools across the borough have similar mission and values statements - these have a common theme present in the countries mission and value - and are not particular to your staff or pupils. In life we have to learn to live and work with people from different backgrounds, education, religion, ethnicity - in my opinion this first statement is utterly ridiculous.</p> <p>2) The KS2 curriculum is set out by the government and all schools in the borough are working hard to deliver it in different ways. This richness and diversity of experience brings freshness and material to the classroom. We need innovators for the future, not robots. Again this point really has not been thought through. We should be aiming for high academic transition for all.</p> <p>• 3) Point 3 - 'Staff across all five schools carry out shared learning walks every term across all five of the schools, to enable staff to share best practice across the schools and to ensure consistency of high expectations across the schools' Absolutely and this is a great reason to be in a MAT - but this doesn't mean that the experience should not be shared fairly in an undiscriminatory manner. I would hope this would continue. But then you release many of these children to share their learning in other secondary schools and you allow the usual mix of pupils in to LPB/G and you allow cross pollination of ideas.</p> <p>• 4) Point 4 - "Staff across all five schools have created, facilitated and participated in the Trust's Middle Leader programme, and this takes place in all of the Trust's schools across the course of the academic year. As part of the programme, leadership projects can be chosen that require participants to work in other schools in the Trust" Again this is a reason for being in a MAT - but it is absolutely not a reason at all that select primary schools within the borough should be feeder school one does not follow the other.</p> <p>• 5) Point 5 "Headteachers from across all five schools meet monthly to support each other, monitor progress across all five schools, and to ensure all of the schools are delivering the best education to all the pupils in the Trust's schools" - again this is great - and what a MAT is all about - but it has no relevance whatsoever that primary schools should be feeder schools. This is about staff development and support. Mentoring and headship. AN irrelevant point in regard to feeder schools.</p> <p>• 6) Point 6 - "The schools all share a School Improvement Partner, who makes recommendations for each school and for Trust wide collaboration" AGAIN part of being a MAT - has no bearing whatsoever on feeder schools - changes that will disturb the education of other children in the borough and have significant impact on the environment.</p> <p>• 7) - Point 7 "Leaders across all five schools support each other through regular school improvement visits" - again this is what a MAT is - again this point has nothing whatsoever to do with feeder schools.</p> <p>• 8) Point 8 - "Senior leaders from across all the schools meet half termly to share best practice and ensure consistency across all schools" - again this has absolutely no bearing on where pupils go for their secondary school experience / have come from. This should continue regardless of the pupils journey and whether they are fortunate enough to spend 7 years of 14 under the leadership of the Langley MAT.</p> <p>• Point 9 "Designated safeguarding leads (DSLs) from across all five schools meet half termly to share best practice and ensure consistency across all schools" - This is good practice across the nation - and has absolutely no bearing whatsoever about feeder schools. If a child in need/ at risk has to move schools then good handover would be recommended anyway.</p> <p>• Point 10 - "SENCOs from across all five schools meet half termly to share best practice and ensure consistency across all schools" - again little to do with feeder schools - this is good practice and should happen anyway.</p> <p>• Point 11 - "Leaders of disadvantaged pupils meet half termly to ensure best provision for the disadvantaged pupils"</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1422		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1423		Parent of child at another local primary school
1424		Parent of child at another local primary school
1425		Parent of child at another local primary school
1426	<p>I am a local resident and have grandchildren in Goodhart Way that will be adversely affected by your Feeder Schools proposal which I strongly oppose. _x000D_ _x000D_ I am shocked that the trust has put forward these proposals over the Christmas period. Schools are shut for 2 weeks so making communication between heads and parents more difficult. Also applications for primary school places in sept 2020 had to be in by 15th Jan so putting pressure on parents to consider changing their choices with the consultation undecided, a unfair tactical move. I witnessed first hand the turmoil and tears this massive decision caused my own family, shame on you for causing this. The trust have made no effort to gather views from the local community outside of schools it was not publicised. Thankfully there have been people who did not allow it to be kept secret.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1427		Parent of child at another local primary school
1428		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1429		Parent of child at another local primary school
1430		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1431		Parent of child at another local primary school
1432		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1433		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1434		Parent of child at another local primary school

1435		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1436		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1437		Parent of child at another local primary school
1438		Unknown
1439		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1440		Parent of child at another local primary school
1441	I am a local resident and ask that the current admissions process remain unchanged. I would like to see my neighbours children walking to school in the Langley uniforms as they have always done. Simply put children should be able to go to the nearest school its the safest greenest option it's the rational answer.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1442	This is dividing schools parents and our community. As a local resident I am witnessing this. I cannot see any benefit to the main proposal of ANY feeder school. Even our local education committee is against this saying it will cause problems. Why disrupt families like this.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1443		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1444		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1445		Unknown
1446		Parent of child at another local primary school
1447	There are quite a few children in my road who attend the Langley senior schools and this this has always been the case.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1448		Unknown
1449		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1450		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1451		Parent of child at another local primary school
1452	, I know the importance of children having the option to attend their most local Secondary school usually attending with siblings and primary school friends. I am a working parent, who did not want to drive my children to Secondary school and was happy for them to walk independently to school promoting self confidence and wellbeing, physical exercise is so important to them and to the environment by reducing the time spent in cars. Children attending the 3 proposed feeder primary schools should not be given priority over children living in closer proximity to the Secondary Schools and I actually feel that all local primary schools should have more interaction with the Secondary Schools not just the primary school who are part of the Learning Trust. All schools in the local area should interact more to maintain as high a standard as possible and an equal learning platform for our area as a whole.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1453		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1454		Parent of child at another local primary school
1455		Parent of child at another local primary school
1456		Parent of child at another local primary school
1457	The Trust has at no point demonstrated a need for feeder schools, and the disadvantages for the local population are clear to see. The proposals have been widely rejected by all authorities with an interest in them	Parent of child at another local primary school
1458		Parent of child at another local primary school
1459		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1460		Parent of child at another local primary school
1461	Allowing the students of the primary schools in this MAT a priority place at either Langley School will cause all kinds of disruption to the local community, including making a lot of houses ones that will fit into no secondary catchment. It appears that this is a business based decision, not one with the welfare of its most local students at the forefront, which is appalling.	Parent of child under 2 years, Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1462		Parent of child at another local primary school
1463		Unknown
1464		Unknown

1465		Parent of child at another local primary school
1466		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1467		Parent of child at another local primary school
1468	I do not feel that enough information has been given to the general public. As such this consultation has created a lot of negativity, a protest and a petition. This is on top of a lot of widespread misinformation of the facts.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1469		Unknown
1470		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1471		Parent of child at another local primary school
1472		Parent of child at another local primary school
1473		Parent of child at another local primary school
1474	<p>I strongly disagree with the idea of feeder schools for these two secondary schools. Both schools are heavily oversubscribed every year and the fairest way of allocating places, if you are a non-selective school, is by offering them to those applicants that live closest to the school. Local state schools should be for local children. Not only that the short timescales for these proposed changes to take place (for children applying for Secondary School in 2020 and therefore starting in September 2021) is wholly unreasonable.</p> <p>The Bromley schools admissions (and indeed most of England) operate on a distance-to-school basis. This creates a fair system where children are, on the whole, travelling to schools close to them. This avoids extra traffic and pollution and allows children to live and attend school in the same community, creating a cohesive learning/life environment. To upend this throws families into chaos.</p> <p>In my own particular case my , who is currently in year will be directly impacted by this change as we will be applying for secondary schools in September and he will be starting Secondary School in September . We currently live . These are our two nearest schools and potentially my after that, and many other children like them, will now have to travel to a school across the borough so that families who live much further away from Langley are given spaces for their children. When we moved to I made extensive enquiries to ensure that we would be in the catchment area for and to have this removed, especially in such a short time scales, is unconscionable.</p> <p>This proposed change will lead to increased travel time for many families, causing congestion at peak hours, and children having to travel across borough to schools not in their local area. By giving priority to schools within the same Trust you are essentially locking out many local families who have attended and anticipated attending the Langley schools for years. It is unfair and not something that has been requested by parents in the local community. The upset and worry this has caused parents of all the other local schools such as Pickhurst, Highfield, Oak Lodge & Unicorn should not be underestimated.</p> <p>Many secondary school age children will have to make their own way to school and it is surely preferable that they walk to school where possible, which is better for both their health and the environment. It makes no sense to prioritise children that live further away adding more traffic on the already congested roads around the school and forcing the local children to have to travel further to their school.</p> <p>To move/change the entry criteria and implement it in such a short space of time is outrageous. It is particularly not fair on those with children in year 5 in a non-feeder school locally to suddenly be told the goalposts have moved. Parents start to think about, and make preparations for, their child's secondary education much earlier than Year 5. Perhaps you could argue for the change if it were to be outlined now but implemented in 8 years time, giving parents of children yet to apply to primary school the chance to make an informed decision about which primary school to send their child to. Many parents with children at local non feeder schools may well have made a different decision when their child was 4 had they had this information then.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1475		Parent of child at another local primary school
1476		Parent of child at another local primary school
1477		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1478		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1479	One factor you do not seem to have considered is to allow siblings of children at LPGS or LPBS to attend either school. eg, the sibling of a child at LPGS given priority to attend LPBS and vice versa. That would seem appropriate to me. Also, the sibling of a child at LPBS or LPGS given priority to attend LPPS.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1480		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1481		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1482		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1483		Parent of child at another local primary school

1484		Parent of child at another local primary school
1485		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1486		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1487		Parent of child at another local primary school
1488		Parent of child at another local primary school
1489	Children who live nearer to the school should be given priority and not those in feeder schools which will make it fair. Giving feeder schools priority will rule out local children who are nearer and can walk to school. Many people have moved into the area with the view they can send their children to that local school. In addition you are then excluding faith schools as none of the feeder schools are faith. This proposal will mean local children will have to travel further for secondary schools as they will not be able to attend the local school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1490		Parent of child at another local primary school
1491		Unknown
1492		Parent of child at another local primary school
1493		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1494		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1495		Parent of child at another local primary school
1496		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1497	I very strongly oppose the proposal to give priority to a small number of primary schools in the area, as this will considerably limit the educational choice for both sexes, make the community more siloed and increase the distance many pupils will have to travel to get to school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1498	The change in admission criteria is going to have an impact on other local primary schools filling their reception places and ultimately financial implications which will impact on their learning. Local people will feel that they need to send their children to one of the primary schools within the Trust to guarantee a place at one of the secondary schools. The house prices will go up in the immediate areas of these primary schools which ultimately means that you are attracting only wealth middle class families to the schools. A lot of local children will be left without a 'good' school to go to.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1499		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1500		Parent of child at another local primary school
1501		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1502		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1503		Parent of child at another local primary school
1504		Parent of child at another local primary school
1505		Unknown
1506	I think I've mentioned as much as I can. The result of this proposal could have a huge impact on my children's ability to source a local high school. Parent Choice and control over a once largely anticipated catchment shall be no longer causing displacement. There is nothing spelt out in the proposal to connect to the proposed feeder schools document that makes me think you couldn't have had the same relationship with your most local schools. I'm feeling quite angry and upset writing this now. This shouldn't even be an option to consider!	Parent of child at another local primary school
1507		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1508		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1509		Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of a Local Authority
1510		Parent of child at another local primary school
1511		Parent of child at another local primary school
1512		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
1513	If this proceeds it has significant far reaching consequences for education and more across the borough. It appears to be proposing selection criteria similar to private schools with which I strongly disagree	Parent of child at another local primary school
1514		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1515		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1516		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

1517	<p>As a parent of children that are not able to get a place at either Langley school due to distance from the school these changes will not directly affect my children but I am looking at the wider implications of the changes. It is difficult enough to get a place in your first choice of school and anything that gives children from further away an advantage over local children should not be allowed to go ahead. If these changes are made it will have knock on effects to other primary schools making them less desirable than the feeder schools and the rules may make black hole areas in the borough where secondary places are not available in any local schools. _x000D_</p> <p>No school admission policy is without problems but I do believe it needs to be fair to all children and I do not think these changes are fair to non feeder school children.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1518		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
1519		Parent of child under 2 years
1520		Parent of child under 2 years
1521	<p>You are arbitrarily deciding to leave hundreds of children without a high school place with these proposed changes to your admissions criteria. I will set out some further arguments AGAINST your proposed changes below:</p> <p>The break up of community: a high school serves the children of the local community. Every child should have the RIGHT to attend their local state school. You are removing that right, and, by creating feeder schools, destroying the very community which you are meant to be the centre of.</p> <p>The vast expense of relocation: If you change the admissions criteria it is unlikely get a place now. Like other parents, we will have to face the heart-breaking choice to leave the home we love and move into the catchment area of another school. That will be a lifetime of financial hardship. I can guarantee that if you were to go ahead with these changes, house prices in your new catchment area (and in other schools&rsquo; catchment areas) would go through the roof, as supply meets demand. Many people will be unable to move, of course, and will therefore be left without a high school.</p> <p>You will create &lsquo;ghost schools&rsquo; with have significantly reduced intakes.You will set a precedent for other academy chains to create feeder school which would have a catastrophic impact across the borough (and the country). If you are successful, what&rsquo;s to stop other high schools from following suit and shrinking their catchment areas? It&rsquo;s quite possible that in the future there may not be ANY school to go to in the borough unless you are in a feeder school. Parents will therefore choose NOT to send their children to many of the wonderful primary schools in the borough. Numbers on the roll will plummet; teaching staff will leave; the schools will die.</p> <p>I can guarantee you will receive an avalanche of job applications from sub-standard teachers who only want to join the Langley schools in order to guarantee their child a secondary place. Instead of recruiting and retaining the best staff, you will usher in a new generation of poor teachers who only have the best interests of THEIR children at heart.</p> <p>Rights. What right do children of Hawes Down Primary or Clare House have to leapfrog over children who are closer to the school? Their parents made the decision to buy properties or stay in properties in a particular area and would, I assume, already have plans for high schools. Besides, the vast majority of Hawes Down parents live in Hayes and are firmly in the catchment area for Hayes secondary. They will therefore have two choices for local secondary schools, whereas many parents will now have have none. In what universe is this fair?</p> <p>It&rsquo;s entirely possible that we will now have to send our child a long way from her home, leading to social isolation and a greater threat of danger . Many children may even have to travel out of the borough. Certainly more unsafe. Currently, my daughter will be able to walk to Langley. If she does not have a place in 2023 then it&rsquo;s likely she will have to use multiple modes of public transport to travel to a school much further away. Her journey to school will possibly take hours rather than minutes. This keeps her further from her family, her friends, and her home.</p> <p>Finally. Who is really pulling your strings? Why this proposal? Why now? I have heard that the only reason you are consulting on</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1522		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1523		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1524		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1525		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

1526	I am a local resident living close to the Pickhurst Schools. _x000D_ I strongly believe the kids in the surrounding roads should be able to go to the local schools at all levels. _x000D_ It's easy it's safer greener and makes sense. Families are so upset by this feeder school proposal. _x000D_ I can't see educationally it will improve anything but I do expect that it may cut costs. _x000D_ Socially mixing with children from a variety of schools is beneficial for children. This select approach is not, _x000D_ Please do not introduce feeder schools it's unfair, upsetting and dividing the community and not beneficial to children.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1527	I am a local resident expressing my interest in support of family members affected and our local community.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1528		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1529	Lastly, I would just like to add that Langley Secondary Schools are local schools, and every local child that lives in this area and goes to a local primary school should have the opportunity to attend their local/nearest secondary school._x000D_ _x000D_ Children in the 'normal' Langley catchment area go to local Primary school together, they then move up and go to the Langley Secondary schools together, they forge lifelong friendships and that in turn translates into a lovely community. They turn into amazing young adults that care about each other and the wider community. I am nearly of pension age and I have loved over the years seeing the Langley Secondary School pupils knocking for their friends every morning to walk the short distance to school together. If this proposal goes through our children will miss out on this sense of 'local community' which would just be very sad and unfair.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1530	The rules for teachers say that their child would be eligible even if they DO NOT live with them. The same rules should apply to all the child should reside with them. The admissions policy should be considered in the context of the wider community and other schools. Just because there is an 'admin' arrangement with other schools should not lead to a greater advantage. There is reference to the Heads all meeting up and working together which just suggests 'more of the same' and ignores the diversity brought from pupils joining from a wider range of schools with different perspectives and talents. There is reference to 'expectations' of those at these connected schools but surely those living closest to the school should have a reasonable expectation of a place at the schools. I live 0.9 of a mile from the Langley schools which my children attended. They did not go to Clare House or Hawes Down and under the new criteria are unlikely to have got a place at the schools which would quite simply not have been fair and are not close enough to have got a place at Hayes so have limited alternatives.	Parent of child at another local secondary school
1531		Parent of child at another local primary school
1532	(and living in the LPGS catchment), I strongly disagree with the proposal to create feeder primary schools. This will have a negative impact on the remaining number of places available at LPGS and LPBS and therefore shrink the 'catchment' area. This would leave my child in no mans land with regard to a local secondary school and is completely inequitable with those children being offered a place that actually live further away but attend one of the three feeder schools in the trust. It's not acceptable to expect children to travel miles to alternative secondary schools which would be a reality if this were to be approved. This would have an impact on the mental wellbeing of those children affected, being separated from friends but also the added anxiety of earlier starts, later to return home and travel arrangements. I have no doubt, this will have a detrimental impact on many more families than it will benefit and am strongly against these new admission arrangements.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1533		Parent of child at another local primary school
1534	I believe each child should be able to walk to their nearest school	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above), Representative of religious body
1535		Parent of child at another local primary school
1536		Unknown
1537		Parent of child at another local primary school
1538		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1539		Parent of child at another local primary school
1540		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1541		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1542		Parent of child at another local primary school

1543	If these proposals go ahead, they will shrink the local catchment areas for all schools and have a very negative environmental impact.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1544		Parent of child at another local primary school
1545	Really sad that so many people adjust their lives and work to fit around apparently a good school only for the school to make it even more difficult and so blatantly elitist. What kind of society does this present for our children's future?	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1546		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1547		Unknown
1548		Parent of child at another local primary school
1549		Parent of child at another local primary school
1550		Parent of child at another local primary school
1551		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1552		Parent of child at another local primary school
1553		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1554		Unknown
1555		Parent of child at another local primary school
1556	I would just like to add that allocating places to children who live outside of the catchment area will result in increased congestion, traffic and subsequently pollution this will have a huge impact on the area, as these pupils will likely have to be ferried backwards and forwards to school by their parents. I cannot say enough how strongly I oppose these proposals. I am the they all live with their parents within a mile s of both Langley Schools, If this proposed change goes ahead it is likely that none of my Grandchildren will be allocated places at the Langley Secondary Schools, instead their places will be given to other children living further away from the two schools. How is this fair? local schools should be for local children!!	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1557	I understand the catchment for Langley Primary school is much larger than for other local primary schools which will mean children who live at a significant distance from the primary and therefore secondary schools would still have priority over children who live in much closer proximity to the secondary schools. There was mention of the important of fairness in your proposal for the tie breaker so fail too understand how this proposal would be deemed fair.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1558	This will surely badly impact on local children. Making schools less inclusive and already making children coming to secondary feel like second class students as they haven't been previously educated by the trust. Is this actually something that they need at this difficult time in their lives. Having lived in the area for over 20 years taking away the chance for my children to be educated locally in the borough I have lived in for over 35 years cannot be excepted.	Unknown
1559		Parent of child at another local primary school
1560	I feel that the consultation could have been handled better. Refusing to meet with the protest group appears cowardly. Some of the ideas raised in consolation are quite good, however proposing to make such a significant change is such a short space of time was not a good decision. This decision could potential impact many local families negatively both financially and from an education perspective. If the plans were scheduled over say a 5-10 year period, this would have given families the time needed to plan and adapt appropriately. _x000D_ Additionally these changes could see some of the local primary school outside of the trust weaken, as there could be a rush to move to a Langley primary.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1561	I do think this proposal raises questions around the decision making and transparency of the trust that is running such an important part of our community. Perhaps the trustees can reflect on the reaction to this proposal and enact changes that will give parents and the wider community a greater sense that the trust organisation is open and accountable.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1562		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1563		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1564		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
1565		Unknown
1566		Parent of child at another local primary school
1567		Parent of child at another local primary school
1568		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1569		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1570		Parent of child at another local primary school
1571		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1572		Parent of child at another local primary school
1573	The idea of giving preferential treatment to applicants from the named feeder schools would one that would provide a huge injustice to pupils coming from other schools in the local area. All pupils should be entitled to the same about of choice no matter what school they have attended. I strongly urge you not to go ahead with this unethical proposal.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1574		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1575		Parent of child at another local primary school
1576	<p>If you haven't already gathered, I'm feeling hugely disappointed in LPLT right now. This proposal is just so divisive to our community. I always thought the Langley schools were community minded, but it seems I was very wrong!_x000D_</p> <p>The fact that so many people oppose the plans shows just how little thought has been given to the community here: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups._x000D_</p> <p>This is callous timing too - just before the primary applications deadline and over the Christmas period._x000D_</p> <p>I feel the data provided in the consultation document relating to catchments and pupils transferring from proposed feeders is both incomplete and misleading. I (and most other busy parents like me) simply do not have the time to locate the proper pupil data behind these proposals, nor to carry out line by line comparisons of the trust's various documents in order to determine what other changes (eg in siblings criteria) may not have been disclosed in the main consultation page. It is not a transparent approach._x000D_</p> <p>As a final point, where on this form is the option for NO CHANGE? Its all very well the CEO saying to the local MP that it's very much an option still, but you are not allowing anyone to select it so its impossible to know whether those people who agreed with the feeder school proposals in any way may actually prefer no change at all, even if they are neutral or positive towards any of the options listed.</p>	Unknown
1577		Parent of child at another local primary school
1578	LPSG and LPSG have always been at the heart of the local community, with many important links. The surrounding areas (Eden Park, West Wickham and Park Langley) contain - in relative terms given all are in Bromley - a mixed demographic and so having good local schools provides opportunity where that might not otherwise exist. The proposals would fundamentally weaken links with the surrounding areas and would be detrimental to the local school-age population. Favouring primary schools the trust has taken over will just fuel fears that such trusts are simply out to develop commercial success at the expense of educational principles. Keep the schools local.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1579	The proposal of giving children priority from 'outer areas' would be hugely detrimental to the local area and incredibly unfair. To say that children living within walking distance of the school no longer have priority would not only change the wonderful community spirit we've lived with here for so many years but also incredibly detrimental environmentally, with the obvious onslaught of vehicles bringing children into school. benefitted greatly from having their school within walking distance and helped in building friendships that have carried on into adulthood.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1580		Parent of child at another local primary school
1581	Please don't do this! It will have a knock on effect on other local schools, and ultimately will send our children in all different directions and this will cause all sorts of practical problems, as well as emotionally for the kids.	Unknown
1582		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1583		Parent of child at another local primary school
1584		Parent of child at another local primary school
1585		Parent of child at another local primary school
1586		Parent of child at another local primary school

1587		Unknown
1588		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1589		Parent of child at another local primary school
1590		Unknown
1591		Unknown
1592		Parent of child at another local primary school
1593		Parent of child at another local primary school
1594	To whom it may concern, I strongly disagree with the suggestion proposed above. I concur with the views of the Jared Nerah (Director of Education for Bromley). Yours Sincerely	Parent of child at another local primary school
1595		Parent of child at another local primary school
1596		Parent of child at another local primary school
1597	I strongly object to the proposal that Clare House, Langley Park and Hawes Down Primary Schools become feeder schools to Langley Secondary Schools. It is a nonsense that local children should have to take transport to school when they have a school which is a 5 minute walk away.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1598		Parent of child at another local primary school
1599		Parent of child at another local primary school
1600		Parent of child at another local primary school
1601		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1602		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1603		Parent of child at another local primary school
1604		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1605		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1606		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1607		Parent of child at another local primary school
1608		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1609		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1610		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1611		Unknown
1612	I was told on open day (in October 2018) that there was absolutely no intention to set up feeder schools and in the event that changed all schools in the trust would be treated equally. In the event this turns out not to be true, due to pressure from LPPS parents who were misinformed I (and many others) would be lodging a formal complaint ourselves.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1613		Parent of child at another local primary school
1614	I have a letter dating back to the consultation process for joining the Trust which states "We have had some questions around admissions and we should make it clear that there are no plans to change the admissions criteria for any school within the Langley Park Academies trust or for Langley Park School for Boys"	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1615		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1616		Unknown
1617		Parent of child at another local primary school

1618	It seems crazy to choose feeder schools like Clare House or Hawes Down which have catchments largely outside the existing catchment area for LPGS or LPBS._x000D_ _x000D_ The proposal will have a detrimental effect on the intake for nearby schools like Hayes and could mean children from Hayes and Pickhurst having to travel to Beckenham or other fairly large distances to get any school choice at all.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1619		Parent of child at another local primary school
1620		Unknown
1621		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1622		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1623		Parent of child at another local primary school
1624	I think that these changes should be slow, adapted and thinking of generating few problems for families gradually.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1625		Parent of child at another local primary school
1626		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1627		Parent of child at another local primary school
1628		Parent of child at another local primary school
1629		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1630		Parent of child at another local primary school
1631		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1632		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of religious body
1633		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1634		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1635		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1636		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1637		Parent of child at another local primary school
1638		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1639		Parent of child at another local primary school
1640		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
1641	I find it odd that you want to unite the schools in the trust more (so that a path from primary feeder to secondary is the norm), but not link the two secondary schools together by allowing the sibling policy to extend over the two schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1642		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1643	The proposals are completely contrary to the principle of educational choice and would cause considerable prejudice and unfairness to those adversely affected.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1644		Parent of child at another local primary school
1645		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1646		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1647		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1648		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1649	It is absurd that catchment areas for Langley Park secondary schools has not been changed based on the fact that a brand new secondary school has been created a quarter of a mile_x000D_ away in Beckenham. Bromley borough residents who live in West Wickham have no other secondary school option within the local vicinity. Bromley council should be held to account for such ludicrous planning. Langley catchment should be adjusted accordingly and should be factored into their remit.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1650		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1651		Parent of child at another local primary school

1652	The Trust has at no point demonstrated a need for feeder schools, and the disadvantages for the local population are clear to see. The proposals have been widely rejected by all authorities with an interest in them	Parent of child at another local primary school
1653	I have read the consultation notice and cannot see what the supporting case for this proposal is. The "exceptional educational benefits" appear to amount to little more than pupils sharing a curriculum and teachers working together. It does not take into account the negative impact on hundreds of other pupils. I object to the structure of the consultation documents which are over complicated, multilayered and conceal the key questions among other less relevant questions. I am concerned other parents may not be able to navigate the multiple PDF files which must be downloaded and consultation form itself.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1654		Parent of child at another local primary school
1655		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1656		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1657		Parent of child at another local primary school
1658		Parent of child at another local primary school
1659		Parent of child at another local primary school
1660	I strongly oppose any Primary feeder schools to the Secondary Schools. It will create pockets of houses who are not able to send children to their local secondary which is perverse and unfair. People have made decisions based on jobs, careers, housing and education based on long and well-established principles of admissions criteria, and these proposals radically alter that in a way that will be detrimental to the community. Children will not all go to the local school but will come from a much wider geographical area which will impact both community feel as well as increased congestion on the roads at opening and closing times. I not only feel that the community will miss out but also the children who have to travel in from further away - their schooling experience will also suffer as a consequence. Finally, I would like to emphasise how much I disagree with the proposal of feeder primary schools in this instance.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1661	It's really simple local schools for local children	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1662		Parent of child at another local primary school
1663		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1664		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1665		Parent of child at another local primary school
1666		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1667		Parent of child at another local primary school
1668	Do not make any changes to the current system, your proposal will increase pollution, have negative impact on community as it will divide it, it will make kids travel from further away to our local school and will leave some areas not covered by any secondary school. STRONGLY objecting to the proposal. Make no changes to the current system!	Parent of child at another local primary school
1669		Parent of child at another local primary school
1670		Parent of child at another local primary school
1671		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1672	I can understand the benefits of all three primaries in the trust becoming feeder schools. I dont feel option A is a viable option as I think that will cause huge problems for Hawes Down which will undoubtedly become undersubscribed as their catchments overlap and unfortunately there is an ever increasing secondary black hole around Hawes Down so these parents would of course choose Langley Park Primary despite it not being there closest primary school if it was to become a feeder. I believe it should be all threer o become feeder schools or none to become feeder schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1673		Unknown
1674		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1675		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1676		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1677		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

1678		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1679		Parent of child at another local primary school
1680	In terms of creating feeder primary schools, I strongly object to excluding children from other primary schools outside Langley Park Learning Trust, many of whom live closer to the Langley Secondary schools, but would be denied a place if this policy went ahead. _x000D_ This would be seriously detrimental to the environment, the community and the well being of the children in the borough, as so many more children would be travelling further to school. _x000D_ In addition, it restricts parental choice of school and puts additional pressure on other schools in the borough.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1681		Unknown
1682		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1683		Parent of child at another local primary school
1684		Parent of child under 2 years
1685		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1686		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1687		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1688		Parent of child at another local primary school
1689		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1690	The timing of the consultation does appear to be rather calculated. Parents deciding on primary school preferences will undoubtedly want to 'hedge their bets' and put feeder schools as their first choices meaning that the trust are securing plenty of funding for their schools by having full classes. There are concerns in the community that the trust is being held to ransom by parents who had been promised feeder status of Langley Park Primary by a Head who is no longer at the school. There are also queries as to why LPSB has changed its admissions criteria when it had previously stated that it would not be as a result of joining the trust. It could be argued many of the children attending LP primary and Hawes Down would have attended Langley Secondary schools due to the home address' proximity to the school. This is not the case for Langley Park Primary as figures show that children from outside the local area and normal catchment were able to attend Langley when it first opened. The catchment area of Clare House also suggests that children will attend the secondary schools who would normally be out of catchment and therefore impacting local children. Congestion will become far worse as children are taken to school and children using public transport will be expected to have to travel and for longer impacting on their after school activities and safety. The speed at which the new criteria will come in to force means that parents of children already in schools have not had the opportunity to factor this in when they were looking at where to send their children to school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1691		Unknown
1692	The timing appears rather calculated as many parents will have been giving their preferences for primary schools and will have been swayed by this consultation. Money appears a driving factor rather than education benefits as it will ensure their reception classes are full. _x000D_ The speed at which the new criteria comes in to play has not allowed for parents of children in Year 5 to plan accordingly. Many families make a decision on their housing based on school proximity. Feeder schools are creating selective admission and this is not in the spirit of education.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1693		Unknown
1694	As a local resident and grandparent I am concerned that local children will not be able to go to their local school. Families have moved in to the area due to schools and this consultation changes the way that people will look at West Wickham and for those who already have children at the non feeder primary schools, their preference for secondary will be affected and limited.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1695	As a local resident and grandparent I am concerned that local children will not be able to go to their local school. Families have moved in to the area due to schools and this consultation changes the way that people will look at West Wickham and for those who already have children at the non feeder primary schools, their preference for secondary will be affected and limited.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1696		Parent of child at another local primary school
1697		Unknown
1698		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1699		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

1700		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
1701		Parent of child at another local primary school
1702		Parent of child at another local primary school
1703		Parent of child at another local primary school
1704		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1705		Unknown
1706		Unknown
1707		Parent of child at another local primary school
1708		Parent of child at another local primary school
1709	The 3 primary schools in the Trust are all equal and should be treated as one, not favouring one school over the other 2 with regards to admissions.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1710	<p>Displacing local children_x000D_ _x000D_ Two of the three proposed feeders are more geographically remote than five other, more local, primary schools. _x000D_ _x000D_ The feeder school currently on the same site as the high schools has a vast catchment with some children coming from more than three miles away. Fifty per cent of the current cohort come from outside the catchment area established for the Langley Park School for Boys._x000D_ _x000D_ As feeder schools take up places previously taken by local children, the catchment area for our secondary schools will shrink. The creation of these feeder schools by the Langley Park Learning Trust will leave pockets of our community without a local high school at all._x000D_ _x000D_ Where is the sense to ship our children out to schools on long journeys every day, and in turn ship in children from equally remote locations?_x000D_ _x000D_ _x000D_ _x000D_ _x000D_ _x000D_ The local community has previously been reassured that this was not something the Trust planned to do._x000D_ _x000D_ In prospectuses, public meeting minutes, at open days and parents' evenings, until December 2019, this was never an option that the Trust promoted publicly. _x000D_ _x000D_ Many families have made decisions in excess of a decade ago to settle in our community with the simple idea of getting their children a good education. Those who moved here worked hard to put down roots in the area, helping to maintain what has always been a thriving local community. Decisions were made for their children based on the 'best fit' schools available in their areas, not based on securing access to a secondary school at the age of four. _x000D_ _x000D_ This sea change, now proposed by the Langley Park Learning Trust, alters the landscape of this decision making entirely._x000D_ _x000D_ It divides a community._x000D_ _x000D_ _x000D_ _x000D_ Declining demand and budgets for our other, great, local primary schools_x000D_</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1711		Parent of child at another local primary school
1712		Parent of child at another local primary school
1713		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1714		Parent of child at another local primary school
1715		Unknown
1716		Parent of child at another local primary school
1717	I have an interest/view on this as I have friends and family in the local area that are hugely affected by this. A lot of these families moved to the area years ago in the hopes of getting their children into these secondary schools, only for it to favour more advantaged children at the last minute. This is astounding, and an attempt to only maintain upper class children of a certain background.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1718	Seems to me like Option A (Langley Park Primary School as a feeder) would be a good intermediate step forwards. Once that is judged to be a success, perhaps think about including the other / more primary schools into the feeder system.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1719		Parent of child at another local primary school
1720		Parent of child at another local primary school
1721		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1722		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1723	<p>. Establishing your own company and investing over a decade in my local community, through various means, giving up free time for consultations and relishing the community of inspiring business owners.</p> <p>These proposals will have a huge effect on the local independent shopping district of Beckenham and West Wickham. The area is hugely supported by local businesses like my Bussiness.</p> <p>This will change under these proposals, because there will be many parents of children, that will no longer have the local support of the residents network.</p> <p>Inevitably the families that do not get fair access to the secondary schools, will end up elsewhere - travelling to other areas and high streets, having a negative effect on the local economy and ethos, commitment, investment and passion of all the Bussiness community.</p> <p>It saddens me that the LPLT haven't considered the investment businesses make in the community, by not acknowledging the knock on effect in these proposals.</p> <p>We are a strong committed group of bussness owner in Beckenham and West Wickham, who are active in giving up money and time to assist the local schools. These proposals are actively turning their back on anyone who is not attending the feeder schools.</p> <p>Business owners that are already commented to positive inputs to the social, economical and charitable time - not to mention money donated through events and sponsorship. If your not in the catchment for the proposed feeders, your proposals appear to then exclude these strong local investors in the community.</p> <p>Which is shortsighted and will have a negative effect on the LPS, long term.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of another interested organisation
1724	Being a resident in the borough of bromley, I feel that residents in this borough should also have a priority to those who live in neighbouring boroughs. We should be able to get our children into a school of the borough we live in as opposed to those who don't.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1725		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1726		Unknown
1727		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1728		Parent of child at another local primary school
1729		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1730		Parent of child at another local primary school
1731		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1732	I am a concerned local resident and parent of a child that attended local schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1733		Unknown
1734		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1735		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1736		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

1737		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1738	All my Grandchildren have attended both Langley Boys and Langley Girls schools. My two youngest may now be discriminated against despite living 1 mile from the school	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1739		Parent of child at another local primary school
1740		Parent of child at another local primary school
1741		Unknown
1742		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1743	They both walked to school and did not put any pressure on the local roads by being driven to school.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1744		Parent of child under 2 years
1745	I strongly agree with the council's view that this will undermine fairness and cohesion with the schools admissions policy in Bromley borough.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1746	This is going to have a detrimental affect to the local community for various and obvious reasons. It will shrink the catchment areas dramatically and force local children who would in previous years get into the Langley secondary school to travel further afield which will have a huge environmental impact. There is no need for feeder school status and no supporting evidence to warrant this change to be necessary. It has already caused a lot of sleepless nights for parents worrying about their children's educations. Lots of young families move into the area especially to be close these sought after schools and to now find out they could lose their places to children that live further away is beyond unfair. When myself & my husband attended an open day for Langley Primary School back in 2016 we were told there were NO plans for LPPS to become a feeder school to LPBS or LPBS so we made our decision based on that to send our . LPPS is an undersubscribed primary school and I see these proposed changes as a desperate plight to fill spaces at LPPS.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1747		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1748		Parent of child under 2 years
1749	We don't want Hawes Down and Clare House to be granted feeder school status as they haven't committed to Langley as we have, and don't feel they have earned feeder school status as we have been promised at admissions level.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1750	I disagree with the proposed feeder schools. This is already dividing our community and causing stress for our children who have assumed they and their friends would be going to Langley for secondary. MPs, local counsellors, other MATs etc also disagree with these proposals. Local schools should be for local children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1751		Parent of child at another local primary school
1752		Parent of child at another local primary school
1753		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1754	Not fair! Keep local schools for local children!	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1755		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1756	Making these changes will shrink the proximity 'catchment' to a totally unfair radius. Children living closest should always get priority. Feeder schools where children live further away will skew the intake, divide the community, force local children to travel for an inconvenient length of time to schools further away, cause more to drive to Langley rather than walk or cycle thereby adding to the pollution levels and decreasing opportunities for exercise. Unfair and objectionable every way you look at it.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1757	Please don't do this to our community.	Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
1758	. If the above gets the go ahead, the children in these schools will loose out and not have the same choices as everyone else.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1759		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1760		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1761		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1762		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

1763	The Langley Park Learning Trust is independent in its decision making regarding the admission process. However, this does not absolve it of its responsibilities and duty of care to the local community. Some parents may have bought property in the these two secondary schools’ catchment area for the sole purpose of ensuring their children are admitted to these schools. Changes at such a relatively short notice is unfair in the extreme. The reasons given by the Trust for the proposed changes are not entirely robust. It is perhaps fair to give priority to LPPS, but not the other two primary schools at this time. A much longer notice should be given if these changes are to pursued to ensure that those who are already in local primary schools are not discriminated against.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1764	Admission to secondary schools should be based on home address not based on which primary school a child attends. The children at the named schools may have moved out of the local area at some point, yet under the proposals these children along with any siblings will have a guaranteed education pathway, which will have a negative and devastating impact on children living near the secondary schools, yet deprived of being able to attend a local school.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1765	<p>Copied from above- was not quite sure where to record my comments: </p> <p>I object to the naming of feeder schools due to the detrimental impact this would have for local children when choosing and applying for secondary school places. The selected three feeder primary schools will unfairly disadvantage children from more deprived areas and ethnically diverse communities.</p> <p>Data from Public Health England use national profile indicators across a range of health and wellbeing themes which can be viewed at electoral ward level (data source: fingertips.phe.org.uk). This data below shows that a number of wards currently on the edges of the Langley Boys and Girls secondary school are more ethnically diverse and deprived when compared to the wards of Clare House (Copers Cope/ also close to the edges of Kelsey & Eden Park) and Hawes Down (West Wickham/ also close to the edges of Hayes & Coney Hall):</p> <p>Percentage of the population whose ethnicity is not &lsquo;White UK&rsquo; Penge & Cator: 45.2% Shirley North: 37% Clock House: 29.7% Copers Cope: 27.9% Kelsey & Eden Park: 22.8% West Wickham: 16.2% Hayes & Coney Hall: 13.3%</p> <p>Index of Multiple Deprivation Score: Penge & Cator: 26.3% Shirley North: 17.2% Clock House: 13.5% Copers Cope: 12.2% Kelsey & Eden Park: 11.6% West Wickham: 5.8% Hayes & Coney Hall: 6.8%</p> <p>Changing the admissions policy to favour primary feeder schools located in more affluent wards could be considered &lsquo;social engineering&rsquo; potentially resulting in indirect discrimination on the grounds of race and deprivation.</p> <p>The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2018 (London Borough of Bromley/ Bromley Clinical Commissioning Group) outlines: &lsquo;&rsquo;The need for Year 7 places in secondary schools forecast to increase from 3,445 in 2016/17 to 4,025 in 2023/24. This represents a 22% increase in 7 years&rdquo;.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1766	With regard to the feeder school proposals, please refer to my detailed comments above.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1767		Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1768		Parent of child at another local primary school
1769	The changes to not give preference to other Primary schools in the group expressly goes against what was said when the Trust was created	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1770		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1771	I am a grandmother of a education and the continuing excellence where she is blooming is vital for her future	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1772	I firmly believe that this is a genuine consultation process and I sincerely hope that trustees consider the wishes of the whole community when making their decision. What I assume is pressure from a small number of parents at one or two schools should not be allowed to dictate important strategic decisions for the whole community and MAT. Any pressure from a small number of parents may be better dealt with on an individual basis via the appeals process as part of the secondary school applications for each child. _x000D_ Whilst I understand financial and funding pressures schools face, the longer term implications of the admissions proposals should be considered.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1773		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1774	In summary, the proposals make sense. If the government remains committed to the 'academisation' of the schools system it logically follows that individual academy trusts should have greater control and autonomy over their own specific admissions criteria. The decision to proceed with the proposals should not be overly influenced by an increasingly irrelevant LEA or those residents in Park Langley with opposing vested and emotional points of view. The logic of primary schools within a trust acting as feeder schools to secondary schools in the same trust makes logical and pragmatic sense for the benefit, wellbeing and transition of children within the Trust.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1775		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1776		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1777	I feel that a child needs to live in the area to be accepted in the local school, before children from other boroughs attend.	Unknown
1778	Children should be in the catchment area to be accepted into schools. _x000D_ My grandchildren could lose a position to another children out of the area. This is not fair or safe for them to travel further away.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1779		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1780		Parent of child at another local primary school
1781		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1782		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1783		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1784	Have a climate crisis. who will be affected. Children should go to school as close to home as possible, especially with the	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1785		Parent of child at another local primary school
1786		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1787		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1788		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1789		Parent of child at another local primary school
1790		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1791		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1792		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1793		Parent of child at another local primary school
1794		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1795		Parent of child at another local primary school
1796		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1797	I understand that Harris wish to apply these criteria to their feeder school. If this is approved then you cannot deny the opportunity for our children to receive the same priorities.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1798		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1799		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1800		Parent of child at another local primary school
1801	Deeply opposed and have not been able to ascertain any real reasons for them.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school

1802	<p>The proposals will shrink local school catchments and will actively deprive parents/children of choice. _x000D_ It will mean that many children will be unable to attend any of their local and/or closest schools as the proposal will shrink the catchment of other local schools. _x000D_ Non LPLT primary schools will suffer detriment as a result as the likely outcome is that numbers of applicants will drop as parents will be forced to consider feeder primary schools to ensure their child is not left without any reasonable secondary options. _x000D_ The proposal is discriminatory, in particular with regard to poorer children who are less likely to be able to attend a LPLT 'feeder' primary schools. This is counter to the Department for Education policy to address social mobility. _x000D_ The proposal is divisive for the local community as a whole and overwhelmingly it does not have the support of local citizens, our local MP, local councillors, the LA, other local MATS, teachers' unions, Langley Park Residents Association and local environmental groups. _x000D_ The consultation itself has been lacking in persuasion or transparency as to the purpose of the proposal and any benefit it will bring for local families. _x000D_ The proposal leaves children vulnerable and safety is a risk for children having to travel further distances. There will be an environmental impact on greater use of cars and vehicles to enable children to get to and from school safely.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1803		Parent of child under 2 years
1804		Unknown
1805	<p>I am the great aunt of twins who started reception year at Oak Lodge Primary School in September 2019. _x000D_ The proposed 'feeder' schools will severely limit the chances of the twins attending their parents preferred choice of secondary school Langley Park School for Girls (LPSG). _x000D_ There are also wider issues. The importance of the LPSG to the community of West Wickham. The policy of the proposed 'feeder' schools discriminates against the poorer children of the community. The potential environmental damage due to more children travelling to school by car also the safety issue due to more children travelling further distances. _x000D_ None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore is neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1806	<p>1) . When I looked around schools before applying for her reception place, Langley Park Primary was about to launch and was on the temporary Hawes Down site. I looked around and was impressed. Many prospective parents at the time asked if by attending Langley Primary one would be guaranteed a place at Langley Park Senior Boys/Girls and we were all told categorically no. This answer swayed my choice so I am dumbfounded to hear speculation that it is Langley Primary parents who are pushing for feeder status more than Hawes Down and Clare House because they were 'promised' priority admissions to the Langley senior schools. 2) I strongly disagree with the proposals that Langley Park Primary pupils be given priority above Hawes Down and Clare House. All school within the Trust should be treated equally. 3) What happens if the Trust grows? The Trust needs to consider this fully. 4) The proposals in my opinion have a business objective behind them. Ultimately, if Hawes Down, Clare House and Langley Primary are awarded feeder school status and have priority entry to the Langley senior schools, uptake of reception places is likely to increase and full classes, means more money for the schools. However this does not sit well with all schools driving their standards up, continually striving to improve etc and healthily compete for children. If the Trust's primary schools are performing well, they should have no worries filling their places. 5) Non-trust children may find themselves unable to attend their local senior school which is unfair. 6) The community is up in arms about this and if it goes ahead, community support for schools within the trust may diminish (eg less fundraising support) 7) The proposals could lead to a negative impact on the environment. Current admission by proximity means all children can walk to school. This would not be the case if the proposals go ahead.</p> <p>Please can I add that if after this consultation that the Trust insists on feeder schools, the change is phased in. i.e. at the very earliest, children who will be applying for reception places in 2021 are affected and from then on. It is unfair to make this change AFTER families have already selected their primary school.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1807		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1808	<p>22nd January 2020</p> <p>TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN</p> <p>LANGLEY PARK LEARNING TRUST CONSULTATION RESPONSE</p> <p>I write both in my capacity as the</p> <p>Langley Secondary Schools have been the preferred option for many of our pupils in the past years with some parents even choosing them over the Bromley &super-selective& schools. This is, I believe, for several reasons, most notably that the local reputation of both schools has always gone before them, indeed my own talk to parents of our older pupils includes the line, &if you are in Langley catchment, you are extremely fortunate.& and thoroughly embraced the whole school experience,</p> <p>. I do not believe he could have had a better education and therefore it is from personal experience that I wholeheartedly and actively promote both Langley schools to parents at</p> <p>The other main reason I understand many of our parents are wanting their children to attend Langley schools over other options is the proximity to where they live. We are at pains to teach our children in all our schools about saving our planet and are aware as never before of our carbon footprints. How do we reconcile this with making children travel significant distances for school each day whilst potentially denying them access to a school within easy walking distance? Distance is another aspect I get parents to consider when looking at secondary schools. Everyone involved in education and work with young people, must be aware of the increasing problem of wellbeing and mental health. The stress and safety issues involved with making our young people incur needless journeys seems unfair as well as being costly to families, both in terms of time commitment and financial considerations. The Langley Park Learning Trust website makes fascinating reading. Many claims are made, including the bold statement that the trust consists of &Five exceptional schools&. I wonder what evidence is available to back this claim and indeed would argue that it is an unsubstantiated one at best. The Langley secondary schools are surrounded and currently &fed& by many other schools who would also consider themselves exceptional.</p> <p>There is also much emphasis placed on the shared ethos, vision, mission and values between the five Trust schools. Opportunities are also cited whereby the Trust&s primary pupils are being prepared for their transition to secondary. There are aspects of this that concern me. It suggests that the Trust pupils are being channeled in a particular direction, down a set course, how then do the pupils coming from other non-trust schools fit in to this &master plan&? Will they always be playing catchup or actually be left feeling second class?</p> <p>I firmly believe that having children join the Langley secondary schools from as wide a range of feeder schools as possible must be a strength. Each child brings a uniqueness, different skills and their own primary school experience. Surely this can only add to the diversity, breadth and &colour&, the inclusivity that we all celebrate in each of our school communities. Hopefully, none of us involved in education wishes to produce a set of clones, something that the Langley Trust shared vision seems to be nodding towards. I sincerely hope not.</p> <p>Every school wishes to recruit and retain the highest calibre of teaching staff. However, I fail to see how promising places to the</p>	Representative of another interested organisation
1809		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1810	there are more primary schools than secondary schools and the choice of really good secondary schools are less. i think admission by vicinity is a fair and practical way of addressing this problem.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1811		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1812		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1813	<p>I do hope that the Langley Park Learning Trust will reconsider these current proposals. As they stand they are grossly unfair and will almost certainly damage the community and alter the balance of education, housing and traffic useage. It is damaging to all the schools - not just those in the Langley Trust (particularly the secondary ones) but also with all the primary schools in the area. I passionately believe in excellent state education and the principles of equality and fairness. All schools should be good and children should attend their nearest school. A strict catchment area for a school is perhaps the best way to achieve this rather than feeder schools or other criteria that could damage the balance of education in the area. In addition in these more environmentally aware times, schools should be making the most of being catchment area led rather than using other factors - such as feeder schools - to determine intake. This is the best way to minimise traffic, encourage walking to school and be part of a cohesive, fair community. If the Trust adopts the new proposals, it would open itself up for accusations of hypocrisy and inequity.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

1814	<p>&#9679; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role in the community. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. _x000D_</p> <p>Grandparent concerned about fair access for local children.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1815	I am an interested party as I have	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1816	This does not appear to have been carefully thought out._x000D_ The potential increase in traffic is a bad result given the need to reduce carbon emissions	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1817		Unknown
1818		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1819		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1820		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1821	I strongly disagree with this recommendation as it will adversely affect the diversity of the students attending both secondary schools. It will exacerbate an already difficult situation where people want to buy or rent property in this popular area and effectively exclude certain children from attending due to economics. The school ethos has always been not to cherry pick students via entrance exams but this would be far more damaging. My children both benefitted enormously from attending the Langley secondary school, but both felt they gained even more in the sixth form when students attended from further afield. I believe that it will not only be a great injustice to the local community but a huge loss of talent which currently helps sustain the reputations of both schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1822		Parent of child at another local primary school
1823		Parent of child at another local primary school
1824		Parent of child at another local primary school
1825		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1826	Proposed changes giving an unfair advantage to preferred primary schools_x000D_ Making a difficult situation faced by parents, even more complicated -ensuring good secondary education for their children_x000D_ If this proposed changed were to happen it would mean children that are currently in the catchment area having to travel further to school or being driven -impacting on the environment	Parent of child at another local primary school
1827		Parent of child at another local primary school
1828		Parent of child at another local primary school
1829		Parent of child at another local primary school
1830		Parent of child at another local primary school

1831	Reducing the catchment area for Langley Girls and Boys will significantly reduce the choice of schools for parents. There are very few good states schools in the Shortlands area putting further stress on parents to secure a good school place for their kids. More children will attend the school who live too far away to walk adding more pollution to the area, plus more traffic. Children will not be local degrading the local community further. There is nothing to stop the trust from expanding further reducing the places for local kids more. In my view this is a tactic for the trust to secure government funding, to continue paying their Executives high salaries by bribing parents to send their child to the feeder school with guaranteed entry to Langley. The feeder schools are clearly not rated high enough for them to attract a full school roll without this golden ticket of free Langley Entry. I whole heartedly oppose this proposal.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1832		Parent of child at another local primary school
1833		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1834		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1835		Parent of child at another local secondary school
1836		Parent of child at another local primary school
1837	My children benefitted from fair access. They attended a catholic school and benefited from attending Langley. This change is unjust and unfair	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1838		Parent of child at another local primary school
1839	This proposal goes against what the best interest for local children. Obviously the government has no regard for supporting children attending a school in their local area if they are even considering this a feasible. It is a back door way of keeping pupil numbers high in average primary schools, bribing parents to send their kids there. Keeping the trusts over paid executive in a comfortable salary.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1840		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1841		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1842		Parent of child at another local primary school
1843		Unknown
1844		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1845		Parent of child at another local primary school
1846		Parent of child at another local primary school
1847	I am a relative of a family which is impacted by these proposals.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1848		Parent of child at another local primary school
1849		Parent of child at another local primary school
1850		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1851		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1852		Parent of child at another local primary school
1853		Unknown
1854		Parent of child at another local primary school
1855		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1856		Parent of child at another local primary school
1857	I urge the Trust to stand by its promises to parents of LPPS for feeder school status when the school was being established.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1858		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

1859	<p>&#9679; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice</p> <p>&#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend &#8203;any&#8203; local school</p> <p>&#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility</p> <p>&#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school</p> <p>&#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances</p> <p>&#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own.</p> <p>&#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role in the community.</p> <p>&#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups.</p> <p>&#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>&#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
1860		Parent of child at another local primary school
1861		Parent of child at another local primary school
1862	<p>I have significant concerns about the proposal of naming feeder schools within the LPLT. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The catchment areas for both secondary schools would shrink. This will mean that local children will not be able to attend their local secondary school and potentially must travel much further distances to access a school. - For some children this shift may create areas where they are not in the catchment area for any school &ndash; what has been referred to as a &ldquo;no-man&rsquo;s land&rdquo; - and will therefore have NO choice in what school they go to. - There are safety, traffic and environmental impacts of children having to travel further to school &ndash; none of which are explained or even mentioned within the consultation. These need to be impact assessed before such a change can be agreed. - This has a huge impact on other non-trust primaries who are likely to see a reduction in applications due to no fault of their own. - The trust wants to be a play a positive role within the community, with the schools being the &ldquo;choice for the community&rdquo; (taken from the LPBS website). The divisive nature of this policy goes directly against this and will have a negative impact on the whole community. - The introduction of the named feeder schools, in particular Clare House and Hawes down will discriminate against poorer children. This is evident by the fact non-trust primaries have higher proportions of pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) than the feeder schools. Further looking at the indices of multiple deprivation those areas which are more deprived are on the outer edges of the current catchment areas, so the knock-on effect of introducing feeders and consequently shrinking the catchment means that those poorer families are no longer able to send their children to LPSB or LPSG. - The DfE want to improve social mobility through education and their overarching ambition is that &ldquo;no community is left behind&rdquo;. The introducing of such an unfair, discriminatory and divisive policy goes against that very ambition. - The consultation is lacking any real detail to explain the benefits of feeders other than that of just being within a MAT. It is also misleading and the statement &ldquo;there would still be 280 places available for children who attend other local primary schools&rdquo; is inaccurate as it doesn&rsquo;t consider the number of siblings. Using the data from the local authority on number of places allocated based on proximity (so taking into account SEN and siblings) the actual figure could be as low as 168 places across the two secondaries if all children in the feeders took up a place at LPSB and LPSG (but given they are guaranteed a place &ndash; there is no reason to think they would not). - At present I have seen not one person or organisation in favour of this change. The local MP, local councillors, London Borough of Bromley, other local MATs, teacher unions, and local environmental groups all oppose this change. 	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

1863	<p>Impact on the area's catchment area which is already, particularly for West Wickham, a challenging situation and would be adversely affected by the shrinkage as a result of a feeder system put in place._x000D_</p> <p>Negative impact on non feeder schools with a possible reduction in primary applications as perceived as less favourable due to non feeder status. For some of these schools, they are actually located closer to Langley than Hawes Down or Clare House._x000D_</p> <p>At odds with a community role. Many children would be traveling further to Langley as a result of the feeder status and more local children missing out being able to attend their nearest secondary provision._x000D_</p> <p>Considerable local opposition. Interestingly, another school which has held feeder status for some time is now consulting to return to a proximity of home address process to reinstate a community feel amongst other reasons. The grass isn't always greener!_x000D_</p> <p>Lack of persuasive argument to favour the change makes it difficult to back the proposal when weighed up against of the reasons to keep the application criteria as it stands at present.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1864		Parent of child at another local primary school
1865		Parent of child at another local primary school
1866		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1867	<p>There are a number of reasons why the feeder school and all five schools staff have priority for their children:_x000D_</p> <p>Impact on the community's catchment area, a likely situation of local children to the school losing out on a space to children who live further away (2 of the 3 feeder schools are not as local to Langley as other primary schools in the area but not within the same Trust)._x000D_</p> <p>Impact on the primary applications to non feeder primaries in the area as possibly seen as less favourable without the feeder promise both at Reception entry but also losing children in older years to LPP with parents 'bagging' the existing smaller class size spots in order to benefit from the feeder status._x000D_</p> <p>Strong local opposition. It has been promising to see how the community has pulled together in a positive and constructive way to voice their concerns over the proposal.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1868		Parent of child at another local primary school
1869		Parent of child at another local primary school
1870		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1871		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1872		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1873	<p>This policy seems very unfair on schools like Unicorn primary, for example, which is only meters away from the Langley secondary schools - these children will suddenly have lose the choice of even applying for a place at the Langley secondary schools. _x000D_</p> <p>- Hayes secondary school for example has a tiny catchment area, less than 1 mile - only very local children can apply. The new rule will mean that children living close to the Langley secondaries will lose the right to apply to these schools simply because they don't attend the feeder school. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The consequence of changing the admission policy could impact on the environmental due to more children travelling by car to school_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; There is a safety issue due to more children travelling further distances to get to school_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; There would be a negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop_x000D_ due to no fault of their own._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role in the community._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; Many people have indicated that they oppose the plans: local MP, local councillors, Bromley council, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo;_x000D_ unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The consultation document seems misleading and incomplete and_x000D_ does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined_x000D_ figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The reasons given in the consultation document are not persuasive of the need_x000D_ to change policy. _x000D_ The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is neither_x000D_ transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1874		Parent of child at another local primary school
1875		Parent of child at another local primary school
1876	is affected in the above	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1877	LOCAL secondary schools for LOCAL children where walking to school is safe, environmentally friendly and healthy.	Representative of another interested organisation
1878	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice_x000D_ 2. The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school_x000D_ 3. None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need_x000D_ to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither_x000D_ transparent or reasonable. 	Parent of child at another local primary school
1879	I completely disagree with the primary feeder schools. A year and a half ago we moved to a out new home which we are with catchment area of secondary school. How ever if these feeder schools go ahead and we can not get into one of them this could potentially move home yet again to be closed to secondary school. This is wrong and very worrying.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1880	In response to the below question on consultee status,	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1881	I am currently looking to buy a house in the area and have been put off due to this consultation. I originally planned to buy in the hope that my future children will attend one of the Langley secondary schools but I am now waiting to hear the outcome of this consultation before progressing. I feel sorry for those who have already moved in to the area in the hope that their child will attend the secondary schools and could be denied that opportunity because of these unfair proposals to prioritise children from certain primary schools. If this does go ahead, I would think the fair thing to do is to implement this 11 years from now as that means that parents of children currently in the area would still be able to benefit from the current system and those who don't have children can seriously consider moving out of the area or closer to the feeder schools.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1882		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1883		Parent of child at another local primary school

1884		Parent of child at another local primary school
1885	There seems to be a seed change in giving priority to certain primary 'feeder' schools linked to secondary schools. This will surely disadvantage children at primary schools that do not have this arrangement. This could be the primary schools' choice or that, due to catchment, there is no natural follow-on secondary school. Either way this will put parents off choosing these schools at primary entrance creating over subscription at primary feeder schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1886		Unknown
1887	Totally disagree.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1888	Changes could really impact any children who are in non trust schools. This would presumably have a big environmental impact of more children travelling to school from further away by car rather than prioritising local residents who can walk. _x000D_ _x000D_ I am filling this in as having gone to LPGS myself I wouldn't have got in based on the new criteria. Lots of friends and family would have been in the catchment and now may not be eligible and also I am very concerned about environmental issues	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1889		Parent of child at another local primary school
1890		Parent of child at another local primary school
1891	I am commenting as a long-standing & concerned resident. As a non-parent, I have had no personal relationship with any of the schools affected, but I have an interest in the implications of such proposals on the area and on the interests of local children.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1892		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1893	I'm a friend of a family	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1894		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1895	Reduced catchments for LPB/GS and all surrounding schools limits choice and in some cases access over a wide geographical area. _x000D_ The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility _x000D_ Children at two of the feeder schools and some already attending the LPPS are more likely to travel by car resulting in environmental impacts and more congestion around the school site, increasing risk for others _x000D_ Children at two of the feeder schools and some already attending the LPPS are more likely to travelling long distances with added risk _x000D_ Primary schools and secondary schools should each be chosen on their own merit and as necessary for the child not as an 14 year choice, chosen before a child's learning styles and needs are even understood. _x000D_ All authorities I have seen (MPs, Councillors, Bromley Admissions) are all opposed to these changes.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1896	These changes are not for the good of the community and would have a detrimental impact on the children. The changes would have a negative impact on choice, fairness, environment and wellbeing. If the no mans land of schools for children is increased in the Bromley area, this has a very negative impact on children. Transitioning to a secondary school is already a stressful time for children and this would be exasperated. Not knowing the school they are going, going to a school with no friends, with a long commute, this is not something that should be increasing in probability but rather reduced. In this era these impacts are not acceptable. These are not private schools, but state schools and need to be run for the good of the many and not a ringfenced few.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1897		Parent of child at another local primary school
1898		Parent of child at another local primary school
1899		Parent of child at another local primary school
1900		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1901		Unknown
1902		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

1903	The new admissions policy is disappointing as it reinforces the notion that the Langley park trust schools are only interested in the residents of the local demographic who are wealthy, middles class, and pro dominantly white able to live in the locality. It is an affluent area, with no council estates nearby. Therefore it is discriminatory of people who are not as financial stable, lacks diversity and consequently prevents social climbing. Very disappointing to see your policy being more exclusive when as a society we should be more inclusive.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1904	I believe strongly in local children going to local schools and NOT feeder schools which may not be in the local vicinity, I feel children should be able to walk to school, thus reducing emissions and helping the environment. I feel local children take pride in the local area more and I would like my children's peers to be local to reduce travelling. We have purchased our home in the expensive area on Beckenham in order to be local to the langley schools and feeder schools remove our option to send our children and also have a knock on effect on housing prices.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1905	We have moved to Park Langley for the secondary schools. However our child is currently not in a school that could be a feeder. I believe why should we pay extra for a house for a school that we may now not get into. Please review and think of the people that have moved to the area just for the secondary schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1906		Parent of child at another local primary school
1907		Parent of child at another local primary school
1908		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1909		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1910		Parent of child at another local primary school
1911		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1912		Unknown
1913		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1914		Parent of child at another local primary school
1915	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental impact of children travelling by car to school would be enormous. There are already huge problems in Hawksbrook Lane, and this would be made much worse with more children living too far away to walk to school. In addition to this children living close but who don't secure a place will have to travel to other schools, this is a disastrous environmental policy! Local schools should be for local children. • None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. ALL schools follow a National Curriculum and ALL schools are judged by Ofsted on the same criteria, there is absolutely no reason why children from other primary schools cannot make a smooth transition to secondary school and have great success there, and to suggest otherwise is grossly unfair! The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. • The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility • The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. • The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community. • The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. • The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. • Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice • The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local schools. 	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

1916		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1917	<p>1. primarily because of the excellent education provided at Langley schools and knowing that we would be safely within the catchment area. This means house prices are at a premium because of that.</p> <p>2. It is our intention for the children to be able to walk to their local secondary school. The proposal will shrink the catchment area of the Langley secondary schools and also other secondary schools which would ultimately give us no local secondary school to attend and thereby having to drive to another school further away. The impact on other residential areas will be felt. With more cars on the road this negatively effects the environment and safety of children on their way to schools.</p> <p>3. By naming your 3 primary schools feeder status will mean that children and their siblings are guaranteed a place from the age of 5 to school leaving age. This means parents can move further away once their first child is in one of the schools and driving in thereby creating traffic and environmental problems in our local area. This will have impact on the places available to other children who live more locally too.</p> <p>4. The proposal doesn't give a clear benefit of why the changes are needed. Those who attend HDPS, LPPS and CHPS and chose to live close to the secondary schools should have no issues getting a place with the current admission criteria.</p> <p>5. The comments regarding the benefits to the schools working together can still continue regardless of changes to the criteria.</p> <p>6. The only thing I can see from the proposal that benefits the school/trust is that it is using the proposal to retain staff. It makes the primary schools more desirable than others that are not part of the trust which will only add pressure to those schools and negatively effect other great schools like unicorn primary, oak lodge and pickhurst infants and academy to name a few. The proposal DOES NOT take into account the effect on the local community for which it serves.</p> <p>7. Another Trust (Riddlesdown Collegiate) is reversing its decision for a similar action made due to all the foreseeable points mentioned above. This is something to consider and learn from.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1918		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

1919	<p>1. (before having children) primarily because of the excellent education provided at Langley schools and knowing that we would be safely within the catchment area. This means house prices are at a premium because of that. many people are in the same situation.</p> <p>2. It is our intention for the children to be able to walk to their local secondary school. not only is it good for their health in terms of walking but also increased congestion due to extra cars driving children to further secondary schools will impact on my son health due to his asthma.</p> <p>3. The proposal will shrink the catchment area of the Langley secondary schools and also other secondary schools which would ultimately give us no local secondary school to attend and thereby having to drive to another school further away. The impact on other residential areas will be felt. With more cars on the road this negatively effects the environment and safety of children on their way to schools.</p> <p>4. By naming your 3 primary schools feeder status will mean that children and their siblings are guaranteed a place from the age of 5 to school leaving age. This means parents can move further away once their first child is in one of the schools and driving in thereby creating traffic and environmental problems in our local area. This will have impact on the places available to other children who live more locally too.</p> <p>5. The proposal doesn't give a clear benefit of why the changes are needed. Those who attend HDPS, LPPS and CHPS and chose to live close to the secondary schools should have no issues getting a place with the current admission criteria.</p> <p>6. The comments regarding the benefits to the schools working together can still continue regardless of changes to the criteria.</p> <p>7. The only thing I can see from the proposal that benefits the school/trust is that it is using the proposal to retain staff. It makes the primary schools more desirable than others that are not part of the trust which will only add pressure to those schools and negatively effect other great schools like unicorn primary, oak lodge and pickhurst infants and academy to name a few. The proposal DOES NOT take into account the effect on the local community for which it serves.</p> <p>8. Another Trust (Riddlesdown Collegiate) is reversing its decision for a similar action made due to all the foreseeable points mentioned above. This is something to consider and learn from.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1920		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1921		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1922	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of choice_x000D_ &bull; Non trust children may find themselves outside catchment for any secondary school_x000D_ &bull; More children will need to travel further having an impact on their quality of life_x000D_ &bull; More children travelling further, particularly if taken by car, will increase traffic and have a detrimental effect on the environment_x000D_ &bull; Children are less safe if they travel further distances to school_x000D_ &bull; Non-trust schools may see applications decrease and this could have a significant effect on those schools in terms of funding and quality_x000D_ &bull; The policy is divisive and not in line with the trust's own policy of playing a positive role in the community_x000D_ &bull; The plan is also opposed by the local MP, local councillors, London Borough of Bromley, to her local MAT's, teachers Unions, local residents's associations and environmental groups_x000D_ &bull; The consultation document is incomplete and misleading as it does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_ &bull; None of the reasons given in the consultation document is persuasive of the need to change the policy. The reason for naming feeder schools is not transparent or reasonable 	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years

1923	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of choice_x000D_ &bull; Non trust children may find themselves outside catchment for any secondary school_x000D_ &bull; More children will need to travel further having an impact on their quality of life_x000D_ &bull; More children travelling further, particularly if taken by car, will increase traffic and have a detrimental effect on the environment_x000D_ &bull; Children are less safe if they travel further distances to school_x000D_ &bull; Non-trust schools may see applications decrease and this could have a significant effect on those schools in terms of funding and quality_x000D_ &bull; The policy is divisive and not in line with the trust&rsquo;s own policy of playing a positive role in the community_x000D_ &bull; The plan is also opposed by the local MP, local councillors, London Borough of Bromley, to her local MAT&rsquo;s, teachers Unions, local residents&rsquo; associations and environmental groups_x000D_ &bull; The consultation document is incomplete and misleading as it does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_ &bull; None of the reasons given in the consultation document is persuasive of the need to change the policy. The reason for naming feeder schools is not transparent or reasonable. 	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1924		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1925		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1926		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1927	I believe this is an unfair and unjust system where local children living within walking distance will miss out on the opportunity to experience the Langley trust education and more importantly miss out on their nearest school. It will also be open for manipulation and abuse of the system where people will move in temporary to guarantee their child's education from 4-18. The proposals will bring more unnecessary pollution and traffic to the area as well as forcing local children to travel further away. Other good local primary schools will also suffer if they will not have the availability to apply for the Langley secondary schools. I don’t see how the Langley trust can benefit from narrowing the criteria to attend. I really hope this doesn’t happen as this will set a terrible precedent for future education and other schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1928		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
1929	I consider the proposed changes to be clear and fair. There will be an adjustment period but in the long term I feel it will be very positive for all the schools and pupils involved.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1930		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1931		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1932		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1933		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

1934	<p>These shrinking catchments that will result from any changes to the admissions criteria based on feeder schools will deprive many local parents of any choice in which secondary school their child attends. I know my sister, and many other families, have intentionally bought properties within the current catchment for Langley secondary schools, spending huge sums of money to give their children the best (and fairest) chance at securing a place.</p> <p>The knock-on effect of smaller catchment areas will mean that in some parts of West Wickham, many children will be outside of the catchment for ANY local school. This is simply not acceptable. There will be local children travelling further to school which will divide the community. No longer will children go to school with their neighbours. It will also mean that children need to travel to a school further away either by car or public transport, and this will have a significant impact on the environment. It is ludicrous that children who live much closer to Langley Park may be denied a place, when children from other schools (as far away as Clare House!!) will get a place.</p> <p>The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility. and if these proposals were in place at the time, I would not have met a single person in my group of 8 friends who were each from different schools but all lived locally. Nor would I have gained a place at Langley Park despite living close-by. I mixed with a wide range of people from all backgrounds, ethnicities and classes. It would be very sad to see Langley become 'elitest' which I am sad to say, is behind these proposals, in my opinion.</p> <p>The proposals would have a negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. My sister chose the primary school that was the best 'fit' for her children and felt right for them, as well as being within walking distance of her home. Parents should not be forced to send their children to their less preferred feeder school simply to secure them a place at a Langley Park secondary school.</p> <p>The policy seems very divisive, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community.</p> <p>These proposals are wildly unpopular and for multiple, very legitimate reasons. They are opposed by local MP, Bob Stewart, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups.</p> <p>The consultation has also been misleading due to the incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. They are utter drivel. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. If schools need to be working together then perhaps Langley Park secondary schools should working closely with ALL of the local primary schools that send</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1935		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1936	Grandparent to a child who would want to attend Langley park secondary school because of living in the area.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1937		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1938	I am an interested party as I live close to another local Primary school which I feel will be adversely affected by the Feeder school priority and this could adversely affect my ability to sell my house.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1939		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1940	You have put forward Option A and Option B - Why is there no option to keep things exactly as they are.? It is my understanding that this consultation was driven by parents of Langley Park primary school who were "promised " by the previous Head Mistress (who's tenure was short) that LPPS would be the primary feeder school for LPBS & LPGS , one could suggest that this was said to get "kids in the door" as it is a brand new school. if this is true , then the parents of LPPS have every right to feel aggrieved that this is not the case , but this of course should not give them any priority over HDPS & CHPS. Whilst your consultation paper has LPPS Listed above and separately from HDPS & CHPS (All 3 should be listed together) , which I suspect has rattled a few parents , I would hope that the trust looks at this in a fair and reasonable manor " If its not broke why try to fix it"	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1941		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1942		Parent of child at another local primary school
1943	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents & children a choice of going to Langley girls or boys. _x000D_ &bull; Children from areas further away will get offered a place automatically by attending the proposed feeder schools. This is completely unfair. _x000D_ &bull; Traffic congestion will build up with children travelling from further areas which in turn affects the environment. 	Parent of child at another local primary school
1944		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1945		Parent of child at another local primary school

1946		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1947		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1948		Parent of child at another local primary school
1949		Parent of child at another local primary school
1950	<p>Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice at all, resulting in many non-Trust children finding themselves unable to attend any local school.</p> <p>The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school along with safety issues due to more children travelling further distances.</p> <p>Non-Trust primary schools, will see a drop in applications due to no fault of their own, which will affect overall funding of school and current pupils.</p> <p>This is being opposed by: the local MP, local councillors, Bromley Council, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers & unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups.</p> <p>The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of & feeder schools is therefore neither transparent nor reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1951	<p>The timing of consultation has been unacceptable. With the consultation being over a busy holiday period and within the primary school application process seems to be very clever timing. It should have been done completely away from the open application process as this would have influence parents views on which school to apply for.</p> <p>Apart from a few parents of children who attend to proposed feeder schools, this has been opposed by the majority including other school trusts, London Borough of Bromley, local environmental groups and the local MP. I'm not sure there can be a justification can be made for implementing the proposal with so many against it.</p> <p>The figures for available places given in the consultation notice do not take into account places given to siblings. This would reduce these figures significantly and therefore are misleading.</p> <p>Many people have planned their future by moving to the area for their children to attend a good local primary school and knowing they would also be in the 'catchment' for the Langley Schools. This proposal is unfair on these people to change the rules with one years notice.</p> <p>As a final point, and to bring my point above to attention again, i am concerned of discriminating against families of children of different sexes attending non-LPLT schools. Attending a LPLT primary schools ensures all your children attend LPSB or LPSG (as the sibling occurs at primary school level) but this is not the case for children attending non-LPLT primary schools as the sibling rule is not applicable between the two schools. This would be extremely unfair and discriminating to local families.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1952		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1953		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1954		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1955		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1956		Parent of child at another local primary school
1957		Unknown
1958		Parent of child at another local primary school
1959		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1960		Parent of child at another local primary school
1961		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1962		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1963		Unknown

1964		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
1965	Proposed policies are divisive - not a positive effect on the community;_x000D_ Shrinking catchments will mean no choice of school for local children;_x000D_ Negative effect on non-Trust primaries - applications may drop;_x000D_ Safety concern for local children having to travel longer distances to school;_x000D_ Negative impact on local house prices - many paid higher house prices to be in the Langley catchment - if either option goes ahead, prices are these houses are likely to decrease;_x000D_ Environmental impact of more children having to be driven to school	Parent of child at another local primary school
1966		Unknown
1967		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1968	Admission should be worked out solely on distance as this is the only fair way in which to ensure local children go to local schools. away from Langley and are not in the catchment for any other secondary schools, I feel that if this change goes through it will give my grandchildren no secondary school option without having to either travel several miles to another area altogether. Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice at all, resulting in many non-Trust children finding themselves unable to attend any local school.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1969	The reasons given by the trust to make these changes can all be carried out as part of being a well led trust by the senior leaders, therefore there is no reason that stands out as something that can only be achieved by changes the admissions criteria. Both options A and B would remove the element of choice. will no longer have the choice of attending a single sex school locally. As a result therefore impacts on environments potentially from additional car journey distance of long distances at night would cause concern. The policy is divisive in its nature and goes against the ethos shared from the trust regarding its role in the local community.	Unknown
1970	Admission should be worked out solely on distance as this is the only fair way in which to ensure local children go to local schools. away from Langley and are not in the catchment for any other secondary schools, I feel that if this change goes through it will give my grandchildren no secondary school option without having to either travel several miles to another area altogether. Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice at all, resulting in many non-Trust children finding themselves unable to attend any local school.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1971		Parent of child at another local primary school
1972	Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice at all, resulting in many non-Trust children finding themselves unable to attend any local school._x000D_ The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school along with safety issues due to more children travelling further distances._x000D_ Non-Trust primary schools, will see a drop in applications due to no fault of their own, which will affect overall funding of school and current pupils._x000D_ This is being opposed by: the local MP, local councillors, Bromley Council, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers & unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups._x000D_ The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_ None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of &feeder schools is therefore neither transparent nor reasonable.	Parent of child at another local primary school
1973		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1974		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1975		Unknown

1976	Im in favor of CHPS being a feeder school for LPSB & LPSC because I think it will make a big difference to our kids school and social life to go to a school that most of their friends and peers will go. Additionally I think that this change will result to happier kids, with better grades, easier and shorten adaptation time and over all good performances (both academically but socially too)!	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1977	There will be huge environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school and_x000D_ there is a big safety issue due to the fact more children will have to travel further distances.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1978	Local resident concerned by the amount of traffic locally and the already congested routes into the secondary schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
1979		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
1980		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1981		Unknown
1982	<p>Bringing children in from further afield will increase congestion. In a world where the environmental impact of our decisions is constantly questioned, it is rather disturbing that LPLT should wish to introduce such measures where children living locally may need to start travelling by transport to schools further out in the borough in order to enable children further away to travel by transport to your schools.</p> <p>I already get cars parking up my road due to lack of adequate parking. I can already envisage more safety concerns as visibility of children crossing the roads will decrease due to the parking. Due to the current small catchments, many children can currently walk which is how it should remain. This promotes well being and positive mental health, as well as physical health. It is also great from an independence perspective.</p> <p>I note that Bob Stewart the local MP is not in favour, nor is Bromley Council, nor are the other local school Trusts. Enough said.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1983		Parent of child at another local primary school
1984		Parent of child at another local primary school
1985		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
1986		Parent of child at another local primary school
1987		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1988		Parent of child at another local primary school
1989		Parent of child at another local primary school
1990		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
1991		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1992		Parent of child at another local primary school
1993		Parent of child at another local primary school

1994	<p>I believe this will shrink catchments and therefore will deprive many local parents of any choice for secondary schools. _x000D_ _x000D_</p> <p>There will be a knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools which will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any&#8203; local school. _x000D_ _x000D_</p> <p>This policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the _x000D_ Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility. _x000D_ _x000D_</p> <p>There will be more environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school. In addition, this will cause a safety issue due to more children travelling further distances. _x000D_</p> <p>There will be a negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. _x000D_</p> <p>I feel this policy divides the community, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role within it. _x000D_</p> <p>This new policy is opposed by such a huge amount of people, surely you can see the negative impact it has had already. It has been opposed by the local MP, local councillors, the _x000D_ London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. This must be noted. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which _x000D_ does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
1995		Unknown
1996		Parent of child at another local primary school
1997	We strongly feel that the proposed changes completely go against the ethos of inclusivity that we should be embracing in our schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
1998	<p>I strongly object to the feeder school proposal for the following reasons: _x000D_</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - important to allow local children to access local schools _x000D_ - environmental impact due to increased traffic _x000D_ - financially damaging to families that have moved close but now will not be in the catchment area _x000D_ - discriminates against children in other schools _x000D_ - discriminates against poorer children _x000D_ - waste of children's time commuting 	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
1999	<p>Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice &#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any&#8203; local school &#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility &#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school &#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances &#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. &#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role in the community. &#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. &#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. &#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2000		Parent of child at another local primary school
2001		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2002		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2003	Friend of current parent of children attending/wanting to attend schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2004		Parent of child at another local primary school

2005		Parent of child at another local primary school
2006		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2007	N/a	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2008		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2009	<p>Parents will be tempted to send their children elsewhere for secondary school security, denying our school of funds and forcing families to travel away from their local school. I really worry about the greater impact this will have on existing primary schools, traffic congestion (and the air quality implications) and the community as a whole. The strength of feeling around this very strong.</p> <p>With a child in year 5 we are currently discussing our secondary school options. Moving to the Langley Catchment area was something we have been seriously contemplating. To think we could have taken the plunge, sold our home, uprooted our children, only to find that we were denied a place due to this proposal would have been heart breaking. I really hope that families are not faced with that devastating news.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2010		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2011	<p>The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility</p> <p>The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school as well as The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances</p> <p>The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2012		Unknown
2013		Parent of child at another local primary school
2014	I am a local resident who's children when to both schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2015		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2016		Unknown
2017		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school, Parent of child under 2 years
2018		Parent of child at another local primary school
2019		Parent of child at another local primary school
2020		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2021		Unknown
2022		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2023		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2024	<p>This proposal signals a change in policy which could have far reaching effects, not only on students within the local area, but the implications of this policy change could impact upon other schools choosing to go down a similar route and education provision within this area of Bromley changing irreparably. I feel the proposal is contrary to many of the Department of Education's policies and discriminates against locals and those from poorer backgrounds. The opposition from locals has been swift and vocal, the trust may choose to ignore this at their peril. At a time when school funding is being squeezed, you don't want to alienate potential parents who would invest both their time and money within a school; those that live closest often give most for PTAs and fundraising. I hope the trust will think long and hard about these changes, and realise they would be detrimental to the local area, along with themselves, if they choose to move forward with them.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shinking cathcment will reduce choice for local children - Local primary schools will be effected if they are non trust schools by becoming less desirable to potential students. - There will be environmental damage as more children will have to travel by car - both these locally communitng out of area and children from trust schools communitng in the opposite direction to the schools. 	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years

2026	All above is based on 2 form entry allowing spaces for children outside the trust. _x000D_ What guarantees are in place to protect external children if the primary schools increase their intake ?	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2027		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2028		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2029	I am not at all happy with how this consultation form is worded as it does not provide a clear option for "no change" and I feel pressured to agree with one of the options provided.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2030		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2031		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2032		Parent of child at another local primary school
2033		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2034		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2035	Let's have common sense - local schools should be for local children. Please consider the impact on the local roads (already very congested) and transport systems as well as the environmental impact of giving priority to children of the feeder schools over those who live nearer to LPSB/LPSG.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2036		Parent of child at another local primary school
2037		Parent of child at another local primary school
2038		Parent of child at another local primary school
2039		Parent of child at another local primary school
2040		Parent of child at another local primary school
2041	This would result in increased traffic and pollution in the conservation area with and would also limit future residents of our house who are not at one of the proposed feeder schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2042		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2043		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2044	I believe there are so many things wrong with this idea of having feeder primaries. Smaller catchment areas, discrimination against the less well-off, resentment within the community, environmental damage from traffic pollution, negative effect on non feeder primaries. And more than anything the reasons you put forward do not add up. I'm sure your Trust has shared aspirations but surely we all have those same aspirations along with all the other primaries. Maybe working together makes more sense and making the local community better overall.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2045		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2046		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2047		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2048		Parent of child at another local primary school
2049		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2050		Parent of child at another local primary school
2051	Smaller catchment areas will deprive many local parents of any choice with the result that they will not have access to a local school It makes no sense in this period of concern about climate change to 'bus' children for miles each day Do not understand the need for the change of policy	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2052		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2053		Parent of child at another local primary school
2054		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2055	Policy discriminates against poorer children Restricted choice for local parents	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2056		Parent of child at another local primary school

2057		Parent of child at another local primary school
2058		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2059	It is unfair for those parents who have spent lots of money to one into the catchment area of Langley Secondary schools, to then risk not getting a place because of the new proposed feeder primary schools. It is handpicking your students which does not support equal rights for all.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2060	I believe a local child should be able to attend their local school for a few reasons, those being.. it's safer and easier for them to get to their school, they are in their local area where they know other people attending the same school e.g. neighbourhood friends/primary school friends etc, the environmental impact of the child having to get picked up/dropped off by car because their journey to school isn't walkable/is too far and takes too long to commute by public transport and the potential cost/time it might take a child to commute to a school that isn't their local one.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2061		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2062		Parent of child at another local primary school
2063	<p>The plans to prioritise any of the schools based on trust rather than proximity would have a detrimental effect on the local children and the wider community. At a time when we must reduce carbon emissions and make roads safer for people to walk, this proposal would mean local children would be forced to attend schools that are not within walking distance and would have to travel by car or bus. This would also have a health and safety impact as children alone travel for longer each day. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>There will be negative impacts for the wider community as fewer local children will result in fewer community activities. Community support is vital for mental health, resilience and wellbeing. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Poorer children will be at a disadvantage in terms of social mobility and therefore the proposal discriminates against them. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>The proposal takes away choice for many many parents and children and is objected by many different community groups as well as parents. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>None of the reasons stated are reasonable given the negative impact such a policy would have.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2064	With all the current concerns about the climate It makes no sense to transport children from afar with the consequence that I will have in turn to 'bus' my kids to school	Parent of child at another local primary school
2065		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2066		Unknown

2067	<p>Fundamentally, the proposal to identify the primary schools within the Trust as feeder schools is unfair. The arguments put forward in favour of the proposals do not justify the negative impact that prioritising children from primary schools within the Trust will have on the wider community, not just on people living within the catchment areas for LPSB and LPSG, but for the wider area and the borough.</p> <p>Prioritising children from primary schools within the Trust will shrink the catchment areas for the secondary schools which will reduce choice for local children. This seems particularly unfair for children who have already begun their school journey, and whose parents have chosen primary schools based on information available to them at the time (which did not include an understanding that their choice might impact on the secondary school choices they might have in the future). This includes parents at a number of schools locally: Pickhurst Infant Academy and Pickhurst Academy, Highfields Primary School, Unicorn Primary School, Oak Lodge Primary School, Marian Vian School, is a non-exhaustive list.</p> <p>Moreover, it is likely that this change will also have the affect of pushing children into other local secondary schools, putting additional pressure on those school places and shrinking other secondary school catchment areas. This creates a ripple effect for the community and has the potential to create a 'no man's land' for children in West Wickham where they may find themselves outside the catchment areas for any local secondary schools. This is supported by data in the letter from the Council's Director for Education.</p> <p>Again, this seems very unfair for those of us who moved to the area, making long-term and significant financial decisions, specifically because of the excellent choice of schools. The impact of the proposal has the potential to have financial consequences for individuals but also economic impacts for the wider community.</p> <p>Data also suggests that the policy has the potential to discriminate against poorer children in the community which is not only immoral, but also against DfE policy to tackle social mobility and create opportunities for all children.</p> <p>By removing the option of local school places, the consequence will be longer commutes to secondary schools for children. This is concerning on two levels. Firstly, longer and more complicated journeys are not as safe for children, both in terms of their physical and mental wellbeing. Secondly, there are negative environmental impacts arising from children having to travel further, as they are more likely to need to use less sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>I mentioned earlier in the form that I was concerned that this policy was about creating demand for places at primary schools within the Trust. Conversely, this is also likely to affect (reduce) demand for some of the exceptional primary schools in the area, not because of their primary offer, but because parents will feel it may restrict their choice when it comes to applying for a secondary school for their child.</p> <p>I hope that the Trust will consider the weight of opposition in relation to the proposal to create feeder schools. Our local MP and Councillors are concerned about the effect that the policy will have on the communities they serve. The Council has published</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2068		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2069	If you are allowing teachers children from the girls school priority for the boys school and vice versa you should also do the same for siblings.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2070		Parent of child at another local primary school
2071		Parent of child at another local primary school
2072		Unknown
2073		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2074		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2075		Parent of child at another local primary school
2076	I feel it's best to keep the current catchment area rather than changing to feeder schools. The change will impact on the children that live near the schools and go to one of the non feeder schools. There are no local secondary schools where the children from the other primary schools can go to. This will not only cause problems with where the children will go, it will also impact on the children's journey with having to travel much further out of the area to attend any other secondary school. This is really unfair.	Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
2077		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2078	By giving priority to feeder schools it greatly decreases children from other schools, who are currently in the catchment for the Langley schools from gaining a place. This means my own children may have to travel further to go to another school. I believe this to be a safety issue. I would not be comfortable with allowing my children to travel and would have to drive them to school everyday. Not only will this impact my own ability to get to work on time, but is bad for the environment and would increase traffic.	Parent of child at another local primary school

2079	<p>I do not believe there are exceptional educational benefits in any of the primary schools being feeder schools.</p> <p>Other Bromley primary schools are no doubt of a similar view and standard to the three named schools so the reasons listed (e.g. secondary PE staff delivering primary school lessons and primary school pupils using secondary school sports facilities) would not give a significant advantage to pupils from the proposed feeder schools.</p> <p>Part of the experience of moving from primary to secondary school is dealing with new challenges and reducing these by using feeder schools would result in pupils being in an educational bubble from the age of 5 to 18 making them less able to adapt to the outside world on leaving school.</p> <p>The figures given in the analysis of admissions data in Sept 2019 are of very limited use as they will change substantially should the feeder school proposal be adopted.</p> <p>The consultation document does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>As previously pointed out, the effect of small catchments at other secondary schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school.</p> <p>Adopting the proposal would result in more children travelling further distances. This would have a negative impact on their safety. Many would probably travel by car resulting in unnecessary environmental damage and atmospheric pollution.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2080		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2081		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2082		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2083	<p>I think it would be a good idea to delay the change to admissions so people have more time to accept that the trusts are working together, interlinked and have feeder schools. _x000D_ All three primary schools should have equal priority as feeder schools. Therefore option B needs to be amended with all three primary schools at the same level. Langley Park Primary should not get priority over Clare House and Hawes Down.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2084	<p>as well as a local resident with primary school aged children, I sincerely hope that the Trustees listen to the overwhelming feeling amongst the community against the proposals to make the three primary schools feeder schools within the admission arrangements. I would also like to be clear that I have previously objected to similar proposals by another secondary school in Beckenham as I think the idea is completely wrong and unfair for local children.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2085		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2086		Parent of child at another local primary school
2087		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2088	<p>Supportive of proposals in principle as long as would not lead to pupils of trust schools having lower priority in terms of admissions to other secondary schools in the area.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2089		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2090		Parent of child at another local primary school

2091	<p>I do not believe there are exceptional educational benefits in any of the primary schools being feeder schools.</p> <p>Other Bromley primary schools are no doubt of a similar view and standard to the three named schools so the reasons listed (e.g. secondary PE staff delivering primary school lessons and primary school pupils using secondary school sports facilities) would not give a significant advantage to pupils from the proposed feeder schools.</p> <p>Part of the experience of moving from primary to secondary school is dealing with new challenges and reducing these by using feeder schools would result in pupils being in an educational bubble from the age of 5 to 18 making them less able to adapt to the outside world on leaving school.</p> <p>The figures given in the analysis of admissions data in Sept 2019 are of very limited use as they will change substantially should the feeder school proposal be adopted.</p> <p>The consultation document does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>As previously pointed out, the effect of small catchments at other secondary schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school.</p> <p>Adopting the proposal would result in more children travelling further distances. This would have a negative impact on their safety. Many would probably travel by car resulting in unnecessary environmental damage and atmospheric pollution.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2092	<p>I note that feelings are running high on this. Would it be possible to consider introducing this in a few years time 4 or 5? then people will have time to make decisions if they are impacted by this change? I think it would be brilliant if there would be continuity for the children and see many benefits in this. I applaud the efforts in putting this forward.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2093		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2094		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2095		Parent of child at another local primary school
2096	<p>As a parent I had already experienced the Greenwich Judgement and Grant Maintained Schools. I have worked in the education field and I hoped that the advent of Academies (e.g. pooling of resources, attraction of better funding, control of allocation of funding) would further improve and enhance my grandchildren's education. I understand we have to off-set the DfE lack of funding and planning for provision of an adequate number of school places but this consultation sets out a divisive, protectionist, non transparent, inequitable and grossly unfair set of policies which would result in a MAT that is too large with less accountability to the local families it should be providing education.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2097		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2098		Parent of child at another local primary school
2099		Parent of child at another local primary school
2100		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2101	Under these proposals the number of available places for local children would shrink significantly. It would limit the choices available to local children and impact negatively upon the community. The intake of the local primary schools not in the Trust would be severely affected also. If the Trust still maintains its plays a positive role in the area, but this proposal if going completely against that. The proposal to offer places to the children of staff would see places at the Secondary schools going to children who were commuting up to 5miles, 10 miles and even further afield. The impact upon the environment cannot be overlooked either. Not only with the pupils going to Langely from further afield, but these children who live closer to the school, now not being able to attend their local Secondary, having to travel further themselves. Lastly, none of the reasons outlined as a benefit to becoming a feeder school are any different to those a school inherits from already belonging to a Trust and thus there is no need to this change in policy.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2102	This is a wholly unwelcome proposal by the Langley Park Learning Trust. It goes against the principle of local schools for local children that live in the surrounding areas. It also restricts the choice for parents, many that have built up a family and network for many years with the view of sending their kids to high performing local schools in all stages of their learning.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2103		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2104	This has been a very divisive issue that has caused a lot of bad feeling in the local community. No warning was given and disappointingly this does not appear to have been well publicised. It appears that it was deliberately timed in order to try and sneak under the radar during both a holiday and election period. What is being proposed goes against a core principle of local secondary school education for local children and appears to seek to prioritise children from trust schools (which also happen to cover more affluent areas). It is not fair or equitable to prioritise such children based on a financial trust set up rather than where they live / currently go to school. _x000D_ It is noted that there are schools seeking to exit such arrangements (Riddlesdown) and that others have had similar requests declined (Harris). _x000D_ I truly hope that this consultation is genuine and not (as is widely believed) an attempt to silence a small minority of parents at one of your primary schools who may or may not have been given assurances over this matter. In reality, if the performance of the new Langley Park Primary School meets expectations it will have such a small catchment that makes your option A of this primary school being the only feeder pointless. _x000D_ I trust that this consultation is genuine and you have not already pre-determined an outcome. I therefore hope that you heed the results and the responses provided from the local community, the local MP, the local council, other local multi academy trusts amongst others.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2105	I believe it is deeply unfair for this consultation is even taking place. It has caused a lot of divisions within the community. _x000D_ _x000D_ It is vital that if Langley Park Primary are given feeder status then all of the primary schools in the MAT should be given feeder status as well. Otherwise there will be a two-tier system within the MAT.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2106		Unknown
2107	This proposal is outrageous and is discriminatory to children who live locally in the West Wickham area. It is restricting access to these local pupils in preference for pupils in the the Beckenham area. The original justification for this Langley Education trust was to save money by sharing resources and bulk purchasing power. It is has now quickly moved on to a type of preferential selection with a complete disregard on the impact on local families, many of whom have lived in the West Wickham area for a long period of time and Langley Park schools are their only nearby Secondary School choice.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2108		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2109		Parent of child at another local primary school
2110		Parent of child at another local primary school
2111		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

2112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice &bull; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school &bull; The policy discriminates again poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility. &bull; The environment damage due to more children travelling by car to school &bull; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances &bull; The negative effect on non-trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own &bull; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing positive role in the community &bull; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the L.B.Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts, teachers&rsquo; union, Langley Residents Association, local schools and local environmentalist groups &bull; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children &bull; None of the reasons given in the consultation for naming of &lsquo;feeder schools&rsquo; is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. 	Parent of child at another local primary school
2113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice_x000D_ &bull; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school_x000D_ &bull; The policy discriminates again poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility. _x000D_ &bull; The environment damage due to more children travelling by car to school_x000D_ &bull; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances_x000D_ &bull; The negative effect on non-trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own_x000D_ &bull; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing positive role in the community_x000D_ &bull; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the L.B.Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts, teachers&rsquo; union, Langley Residents Association, local schools and local environmentalist groups_x000D_ &bull; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children_x000D_ &bull; None of the reasons given in the consultation for naming of &lsquo;feeder schools&rsquo; is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. 	Parent of child at another local primary school
2114		Parent of child at another local primary school
2115		Parent of child at another local primary school
2116		Parent of child at another local primary school
2117	I am part of the local community and strongly disagree with these proposals. School places should be equal to all regardless of which school they attend. where is the equality and diversity in these proposals. disgusting.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2118		Parent of child at another local primary school
2119	I think this is a self serving move by the trust and is not in the best interests of local children.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2120		Parent of child at another local primary school
2121		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

2122	<p>I strongly believe that there will be a negative effect on non-Trust Primary schools such as Unicorn Primary who may see a drop in admissions due to the proposal of making Langley Primary, Claire House or Hawes Down feeder schools. This would be no fault of their own, and may change the way parents select primary schools moving forwards. This could mean that parents criteria for choice of primary school is based on securing a place at the secondary school which goes against my belief of supporting your local school, and adds to all the additional problems of children not walking to school, added congestion as well as pollution.</p> <p>_x000D_ _x000D_ In addition to this, I do feel that this proposal has created a lot of negative feeling in the local community and goes against one of the Trust's aims of playing a positive role in the local community. The whole principal of the primary feeder schools lacks any sound educational reason, which is why there has been such a huge objection, by not only non Trust primary schools, but also by a lot of the Langley Trust's primary school parents.I strongly believe that there will be a negative effect on non-Trust Primary schools such as Unicorn Primary who may see a drop in admissions due to the proposal of making Langley Primary, Claire House or Hawes Down feeder schools. This would be no fault of their own, and may change the way parents select primary schools moving forwards. This could mean that parents criteria for choice of primary school is based on securing a place at the secondary school which goes against my belief of supporting your local school, and adds to all the additional problems of children not walking to school, added congestion as well as pollution and the environmental impact._x000D_ _x000D_ In addition to this, I do feel that this proposal has created a lot of negative feeling in the local community and goes against one of the Trust's aims of playing a positive role in the local community. The whole principal of the primary feeder schools lacks any sound educational reason, which is why there has been such a huge objection, by not only non Trust primary schools, but also by a lot of the Langley Trust's primary school parents.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2123	<p>we would like to apply for a place a Langley secondary in the future, and feel disadvantaged by the potential catchment area being narrowed due to the proposals.</p> <p>and firmly believe in families supporting their local schools. This choice may be taken away if preference is given to children living further afield. I do not want my grandson to have to travel further to a different school as we purchased the house believing we would be in the catchment area of the school. All 3 of my children attended Langley schools and that is why we chose to purchase a house near.</p> <p>Other issues that may be detrimental to the community include: There may well be a negative effect on non Trust primary schools who could see a drop in their own admissions due to this proposal. Parents may choose Langley, Clare House or Hawes Down Primaries, in preference over other local primaries, in order to secure the secondary phase of education for their child. It goes against one of the Trust's aims of being a positive role in the local community. The proposal appears divisive, whereby they seek to 'select' children to attend the school, rather than serving local families. A change to secondary education is a change for all 11 year olds. It is an opportunity to make new friends, and start a new phase of education. Change is good and should be welcomed. It is not necessary for Langley secondaries to prepare primary age children within their Trust for secondary education. It appears very much like 'hot housing' children and excluding other children from the schools because they have not been taught in a certain way in primary school, or even attained a certain standard in KS2 Assessments.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2124		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2125		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2126	<p>Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice._x000D_ The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2127		Parent of child at another local primary school
2128	<p>I have found the proposals for new admissions criteria very unsettling and upsetting. We have lived in West Wickham for 12 years believing there would be provision to educate our children locally. If the proposals go ahead I have no idea where my daughter would go for her secondary education.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2129	Please see above.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

2130		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2131	<p>Reduced catchment areas will reduce the already limited choice for many parents._x000D_ The knock-on effect of reduced catchments at other schools will mean that many_x000D_ non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school._x000D_ The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the_x000D_ Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility._x000D_ Increased environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school._x000D_ Increased pressure on local public transport._x000D_ The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances._x000D_ The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop_x000D_ due to no fault of their own._x000D_ The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a_x000D_ positive role in the community._x000D_ The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the_x000D_ London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo;_x000D_ unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups._x000D_ The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which_x000D_ does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined_x000D_ figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_ None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need_x000D_ to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither_x000D_ transparent or reasonable</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2132		Unknown
2133		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2134		Parent of child at another local primary school
2135	<p>I feel very strongly that these proposed changes shouldn't go ahead and I summarize some of my reasons for this:-_x000D_ The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school, this is unfair._x000D_ Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice, this creates a concern for us parents who only want whats best for their children._x000D_ The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school, as well as the safety issues due to children having to travel further distances to attend school._x000D_ The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. This subsequently could effect my daughters school as she attends Oak Lodge Primary School._x000D_ The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo;unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. Surely if so many people are against this proposal, there will be a more negative effect on the community and only a few will actually gain if this does go ahead._x000D_ None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. Based on this I really do not feel this should go ahead, as I am truly concerned for my daughters future secondary school choices. Having moved home recently, it would be a substantial cost on us as a family if we were to have to move again to secure her a place in a reputable secondary school, as I'm not sure how comfortable I would feel her travelling alone to a secondary school which is a significant distance away.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2136		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2137		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2138		Parent of child at another local primary school
2139		Unknown

2140	<p>With respect to all of the above comments I have made, I would challenge the Park Langely Learning Trust to try to provide any kind of viable justification for such an elitest proposal, but as the Trust deemed it unnecessary to meet with and discuss such a selection process with local concerned parents, I can only assume that they have no demonstrable justification._x000D_ _x000D_ Extract LPLT Admissions Consultation - FAQs & Answers_x000D_ '....In view of this very high number, it is not possible for the Trust to schedule meetings with groups of parents and there is no obligation on the Trust to do so....'_x000D_ The above quote clearly shows the Trusts attitude towards concerned parents, and indeed statutory consultees._x000D_ _x000D_ State schools are publicly funded, and have always, and should always endeavour to create opportunity for all. The criteria of geographical proximity has always been the established system for school catchments, I can see no evidence of these core values in the trusts current proposals._x000D_ _x000D_ Should the proposals go ahead, public funding should be withdrawn from the Foundations schools and I would suggest they re-establish and an independent school federation as their core values and mission is elitest and has no place in the publicly funded comprehensive state school system.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2141		Parent of child at another local primary school
2142		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2143		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2144	<p>As prospective parents, we were led to believe that there was a strong possibility of LPPS becoming a feeder school to the Langley Secondary Schools in the future and of course, it was a big selling point of the school for us. We would love to see these changes agreed and for the admission criteria to be changed to reflect the feeder school status - as parents of a 'Trust educated primary school child', we want to see the best outcome for him in the future and by LPPS becoming a feeder school, it really would give him the best life chances for the future and crate a holistic approach to his education within the Trust.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2145		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2146		Parent of child at another local primary school
2147		Parent of child at another local primary school
2148		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2149		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2150	<p>The change in admission criteria will not have any impact on my children - However, this change is fundamental - local schools for local children was the main rule so far. Now catchment areas will be redrawn based on some arbitrary membership of a school trust. LPLT will set a precedent and other trusts will follow. At the end schools will be ringfenced by trusts, independent of their location and local communities will suffer. School children will have less friends nearby as their classmates are coming from further afield. Any selective criteria, like academic ability, sport, drama, music, would have been fairer than this arbitrary school trust grouping. I also disagree with the short notice before these changes are implemented. Planning children's school careers, moving house, catchment area property prices, etc are all factors that cover many years or even decades whereas this fundamental change will take effect after only one year. As you can read between the lines, I do not believe that this is an open consultation but a tickbox exercise where the outcome has already been decided. Someone instrumental in pushing for these changes will gain from them, maybe via school access, maybe via an increase in property prices, maybe some other way but gain they will.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2151		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2152		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2153		Unknown
2154		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2155		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2156		Parent of child at another local primary school

2157		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2158		Parent of child at another local primary school
2159	<p>I am concerned as a local parent with children, that I had planned would go to both the girls and boys secondary schools, that the places available to them would be limited and therefore significantly narrow our chances of getting into those schools. _x000D_ We purchased our house with a long term plan that involved these secondary school choices and I'm sure we are not the only family that has done that. It may mean families have to move out of the area their children have grown up in, away from friends and family and this could have an impact on the Eden Park community. If the feeder schools go ahead this will potentially put pressure on the house market and cause prices to rise in a wider area as well as putting immense pressure on house prices in the immediate area to ensure a place at the schools as the catchment and places offered would be so small. This would therefore create an 'elite' group as only certain families could afford to buy close enough to get their children into that school. The schools could potentially then have themselves with a narrow demographic of students and I am unsure how this would be of any benefit to the students (as it would not be reflective of life outside the school) as it would create unequal opportunities and a 'superior' feel for the students as you could only get in if you can afford the houses near enough to get a space. This is not the 'equal' world we are trying to teach our children today is it? _x000D_ Another concern is that children will be travelling further to get to school - either to the boys or girls schools or to other schools further afield as the local children have not been able to get a place at them they then have to travel. This means an impact on the environment which we have to consider carefully these days. It would mean more cars taking the children to school, more traffic on the surrounding roads, adding to the problems already seen around the schools at pick up and drop off times. Children would have to use more public transport costing more money to the families, as walking may not be an option, if the children come from further away. I am also concerned that if this is the case the safeguarding and safety of the children may be at risk if they have further to travel, they might be the last one on the bus or train after all their friends have got off or gone home leaving them vulnerable. _x000D_ I see no valid reason or justification to change what has been working well for years, providing good education to the local community and fulfilling the expectations of the children at primary schools that already are familiar with your facilities and the schools and already have the expectation that that is where they will go as all the year 6 children before them have gone there. Managing that alone will be devastating to some if the feeder schools go ahead.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2160		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2161		Unknown
2162	<p>I strongly oppose these proposed changes, as I feel that this would have such a negative effect on the local community. It will significantly shrink the catchment area and will deprive many local parents of any choice. The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school. The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. For example, Oak Lodge may see their numbers drop as parents decide to go with one of these proposed feeder schools and this could subsequently effect my daughters school if the numbers start to drop. The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school as well as the safety issues due to more children travelling further to school. The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility. The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community. The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. So clearly there is a united front here that many are opposing this and especially those that attend Oak Lodge Primary School. As a final note, using your own figures, 90 out of 220 places would be prioritized to Trust primaries at LPSB. That is almost half. So half the children who would normally be expecting to attend LPSB will be affected. This is not a decision to take lightly and I strongly oppose it, as I feel it will be my daughter that will miss out due to where we live. Having moved home recently, it would be huge cost to us as a family to have to move home to secure her a place in a reputable secondary school.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school

2163	<p>Hypocrisy at its best: on one hand proposing to change admission criteria that would result in children having longer journeys to school (many will be done by car) and on the other hand wanting to make Hawksbrook Lane a "School Street" to limit the negative effect of cars used for the school run ... or is the "School Street" initiative in anticipation of the extra car journeys that the change in admission criteria will bring?_x000D_</p> <p>Plus closing off Hawksbrook Lane from the Eden Park side will only lead to more cars in the surrounding areas, especially on the Park Langley side. Since the opening of Park Langley Primary School the traffic situation in Wickham Way and connected streets has degraded significantly during drop-off and pick-up times and this would then get far worse._x000D_</p> <p>There is also the property premium for being in a catchment area. Normally that doesn't matter too much as the premium is there when buying but also later when selling. This redrawing of catchment areas, however, will lead to people who have made their decisions on existing rules lose out and others will, undeservingly, receive a windfall. I expect a very strong correlation between the address of a consultee and their opinion on the proposed changes.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2164	<p>&#9679; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many_x000D_ non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend &#8203;any&#8203; local school_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the_x000D_ Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances_x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop_x000D_ due to no fault of their own._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a_x000D_ positive role in the community._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the_x000D_ London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo;_x000D_ unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which_x000D_ does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined_x000D_ figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need_x000D_ to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2165		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2166	<p>The policy of feeder primary schools clearly discriminates against children living in the local community who are attending other non trust Primary schools. _x000D_ _x000D_ The original stated purpose for creating the Langley Park Learning Trust was "to create financial cost savings via shared resources and economies of scale" and the "sharing of best practice in teaching expertise and teacher training". The Langley Park Learning Trust has however quickly moved on from these original and admirable goals to implementing a type of "social engineering" via a new selective admissions process which is clearly discriminatory to local children living in West Wickham. How can it be right to give priority access to children living further away in Beckenham (Clare House) instead of children living much closer to the secondary school in West Wickham? If there is a shortage of secondary school places in Beckenham then the government should fund and build a new secondary school in Beckenham instead of forcing local communities to compete with each other in this divisive way. _x000D_ _x000D_ The new feeder school policy will also risk the safety of local children attending non trust primary schools, who will be forced to attend other secondary schools much further away, forcing children to walk longer distances and or use public transport to attend school when they actually live within walking distance to Langley Park secondary school._x000D_ _x000D_ If the siblings of the children from the feeder schools are to also be given automatic access, then this will restrict the catchment area even more for our local West Wickham children. _x000D_ _x000D_ Once the principle of feeder schools is established, what is to stop the Langley Park Learning Trust from expanding its network of feeder schools and further restricting the local catchment area in the future?_x000D_ _x000D_ Finally this feeder school policy is very selfish as it totally ignores the negative effect on non-trust primary schools, who may see their applications drop due to no fault of their own.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2167	<p>This is wrong on so many levels. A local secondary school should cater for its local children. There is no imperial evidence to back your claims around values. Also what is the issue with these primary school children going to their local secondary schools. This is gaming the system and is completely wrong._x000D_ _x000D_ These trust agreements need to be reviewed, as it is not clear why these school have come together other than, I assume, due to personal relationship within the management level. Especially as they are using it as a tool to undermine other trusts and disadvantage other children. It is still not clear what the true rationale regarding these proposals are. I feel this needs to be independently investigated beyond what the trust is stating.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2168	Thank you for such a clear consultation paper.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2169		Parent of child at another local primary school
2170	I believe in fairness cream	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2171		Parent of child at another local primary school
2172		Parent of child at another local primary school
2173		Parent of child at another local primary school
2174		Parent of child at another local primary school
2175		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2176		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2177		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2178		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2179		Parent of child at another local primary school
2180		Parent of child at another local primary school
2181		Unknown
2182		Parent of child at another local primary school
2183		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2184		Parent of child at another local primary school
2185		Parent of child at another local primary school

2186		Parent of child at another local primary school
2187		Parent of child at another local primary school
2188		Unknown
2189		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2190		Parent of child at another local primary school
2191		Parent of child at another local primary school
2192		Unknown
2193		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2194	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposal to name any of the primary schools in the Langley Park Learning Trust as a feeder school. My objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shrinking choice. LPSG and LPSB catchments will shrink as children from feeders take places they would not have been eligible for previously. Local secondary provision is already plagued by 'black holes'; this simply moves them around and may even make it worse. • Knock-on effect. Many local children attend primary schools in academies with no secondary option; this proposal leaves them scrabbling for places further afield. Where these places are available, there is a further knock-on effect on other catchments, distorting and shrinking them. There is no guarantee that other local schools will not also decide to name their Trust's schools as feeders; where does that leave the 'left-over' primaries? • Less funding for non-LPLT primary schools. These would be negatively affected as parents applying for reception places begin to choose feeder schools over those from other academies. Some local schools are already struggling to fill classes due to the over-provision caused by LPPS, meaning a reduction in funding (followed by the inevitable reduction in facilities and a negative impact on primary education). • Reduction of choice at primary school stage. Primary schools should, where possible, be chosen on the basis of the best fit for the child, not whether they may or may not need a particular secondary school place 6 years later. • Flawed reasoning. Your proposal lists a number of benefits to naming your Trust primaries as feeders. These include: 'curriculum consistency', 'highly effective academic transition of the Trust's pupils from the its primary schools to its secondary schools', shared values and a number of shared resources. All of these can be maintained under current admissions arrangements. However, as you point out that there will be up to 280 places for non-academy pupils across LPSG and LPSB, it is inconsistent to state that your proposal will smooth the transition to secondary. Presumably you already work with many non-Trust local primary schools; are you proposing to discontinue this to the detriment of what you claim will be the majority of your students? Your proposals are required to be transparent and reasonable; these seem neither. • Travel. While many children in London travel long distances - and indeed choose to do so - it seems insane to implement an admissions policy that forces children to travel further afield. Children who would once have lived too far from LP secondary schools will now be travelling 'in', while children who would once have walked to LP secondary schools travel 'out', with all the safety and environmental issues caused by additional traffic and local transport pressures. • Community and local opposition. The manner in which this consultation was produced - just before Christmas, just before a general election, and not long before the application deadline for 2020 reception places (given that LPPS is currently undersubscribed) - was extremely disappointing. This has unsurprisingly been a hugely divisive issue in the area - hardly the positive role the Trust aims to play. Local Multi-Academy Trusts, private schools, Bromley Council and residents' associations have all opposed the proposals. 	Parent of child at another local primary school
2195		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2196		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

2197	<p>Overall this consultation has been handled badly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should have been more widely publicised by the Trust. • If 'no change' is really an option that the Trust is considering then it should have been listed as an actual option. • The consultation has made no attempt whatsoever to address any negative outcome of the proposed changes, making it feel even more like 'no change' is not something on the cards for the Trust. • As mentioned above, the 'benefits' are purely benefits that are realised as being part of a Trust &ndash; there is nothing additional by creating feeder schools. • The FAQs that were published very late in the consultation period, which lacked any sort of empathy and failed to address a number of pertinent questions that have arisen. • The timing has been poor, falling over Christmas when people are pre-occupied with festive organisation, and over the primary school application deadline, leaving those applying unsure whether to change their preferences, potentially leading to a negative impact on other local primary schools who may see applications drop. Whether intentional or not, this was a poor lack of judgement. <p>Regarding the 'benefits' outlined by the Trust these are all good for setting foundations for children but not needed for dictating a complete educational route. The secondary schools can do other things to develop any local children. A simple example - students from the secondary schools can volunteer in whichever school they have transitioned from, being a Trust school is not a requirement and doesn't give any benefit. The taster days that the consultation mentions could be opened up to other local schools too. This also raises the question of whether any children transitioning to the secondary schools from other local primary schools will be at a disadvantage and whether that would count as constructive discrimination. Also, if children from Trust primary schools attend a different secondary school, how will they cope if everything is so geared to the feeder approach?</p> <p>I am pleased to see that so many people oppose the proposed plans. For example other Multi Academy Trusts, Bromley Council, Environmental groups, Park Langley Residents Association, and members of the public through the petition that over 3.5k people signed.</p> <p>The case of Riddlesdown Collegiate trying to change their admissions policy back from feeder schools should suggest to the Trust that feeder schools are a bad idea. They like the Langley secondary schools are oversubscribed and they have found that a very small number of places were able to be offered to children who live close to the school but did not meet any of the earlier criteria. They site that changing back away from feeder schools would allow them to better serve their local community and bring benefits such as more students being able to walk to school and consequently less congestion in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The consultation proposes to bring these changes into effect in 2021. This is short notice given that anyone already in the primary school system has made choices based on goalpost that the Trust is trying to change. At open days for primary schools within the Trust where the question of feeder schools has been asked, the response has been that the primary schools will not become</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2198		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2199		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2200		Parent of child at another local secondary school
2201		Parent of child at another local primary school
2202		Parent of child at another local primary school
2203		Parent of child at another local primary school
2204		Parent of child at another local primary school
2205		Unknown
2206		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2207		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2208		Parent of child at another local primary school

2209	<p>In my view, the proposal to create feeder schools into both secondary schools displaces the standard proximity criteria, significantly reduced the number of places available to students from non feeder schools and is inherently unfair. It will deprive many local parents and more importantly the children of any choice in their selection of secondary school. _x000D_</p> <p>Furthermore, the reduced number of places will have wider social and economic impact in the community. For example: _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend, what is their nearest local school and they may ultimately find themselves without any local secondary school option _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; There is of course the environmental impact of more children travelling by car to school due to distance _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The policy will have a negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; the consultation documents do not provide any credible and persuasive reasons for the need to change policy at this time. Therefore the current system should remain.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2210		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2211		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2212		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2213		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
2214		Unknown
2215		Parent of child at another local primary school
2216		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2217		Parent of child at another local primary school
2218		Parent of child at another local primary school
2219		Parent of child at another local primary school
2220		Parent of child at another local primary school
2221		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2222		Parent of child at another local primary school
2223		Unknown
2224		Parent of child at another local primary school
2225		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2226		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2227		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2228	The proposals will have a detrimental effect on school places available for children and deny hundreds of children the chance to attend their local/nearest school.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2229		Parent of child at another local primary school
2230		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2231		Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2232		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2233		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2234	Admission process should be fair to all children in the area.	Parent of child at another local primary school

2235		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
2236		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2237	<p>I think these proposals have the potential to negatively impact the local community in many ways. _x000D_</p> <p>1. Reducing the choice for parents seeking a good education for their child and a healthy commute whereby they are not travelling for long periods of time to school._x000D_</p> <p>2. Effect on potential overloading of already stretched public transport network for those children that would live further away from the school. Also the potential increase in carbon footprints of parents driving their child to school if they live further away._x000D_</p> <p>3. Discriminating against children whose parents cannot afford to live within catchments of the feeders schools whose average property price is higher than those locally._x000D_</p> <p>4. Adverse effect on other local primary schools that are closer to the secondary schools by proximity. By taking those children from within the trust first you will be reducing spaces for those who attend local schools. This may then reduce parents choice of not only which secondary school they get into but may affect their choice of primary school in order to get into the secondary they would like. This could lower the number of applications to schools outside of the trust even if they are better academically or more importantly if they suit their child better._x000D_</p> <p>5. It is not clear why the need for feeder schools exists. The main factor of being within the same trust does not seem transparent._x000D_</p> <p>6. The plans are opposed by many sections of the community, local authorities and local government whom are best placed to ensure educational policies are not detrimental to the majority.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2238		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2239		Parent of child at another local primary school
2240		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2241		Parent of child at another local primary school
2242	<p>I live in the local area. , so I am familiar with the school and its ethos. The proposed changes will have a profound adverse effect on the demographics and cohesion of the area, since what is suggested will impose a kind of social apartheid. Effectively this is a naked attempt to create a kind of gated community, keeping out the riff-raff that are not so fortunate as to attend one of the feeder schools.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2243		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2244		Parent of child at another local primary school
2245		Parent of child at another local primary school
2246		Parent of child at another local primary school
2247		Parent of child at another local primary school
2248		Parent of child at another local primary school
2249		Unknown
2250	<p>Personally I am not directly affected as . However I do strongly believe in fairness, and in local children being able to go to their local school. The new policy will mean children living further away will get priority over children living closer, with out any possible benefit or just reason why this should be so. The figures themselves provided admit that potentially up to 180 local children could be affected, this could be increased even further if the complexities of these children having siblings at other primary schools then also get priority (admittedly, some of these children may live within the catchment anyway, but not necessarily).</p> <p>Having first hand experience of how schools work / operate with in a trust, I have seen the arguments both for and against many times, and ultimately, it is the local children and families who are compromised at the expense of the academies putting their own interests first, above those of what is actually good for the children.</p> <p>All children should have the right to attend their local community school, whether primary or secondary. Sadly we know this has been difficult enough to achieve in the past, but with the new primaries and a secondary recently opened in the area, as well as the admirable, successful turnaround in a couple of other local secondaries, this should now be achievable for many more families. The introduction of feeder schools is a big backward step to where we were before, and this is a dangerous precedent to set.</p>	Parent of child at another local secondary school

2251	The Trust can achieve what it would like by being in a Multi Academy Trust rather than breaching the School Admissions Code in several places with its proposal regarding feeder schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2252	I loved my time there but under the new proposal, I wouldn't have had the chance to attend. I am completely against the new proposals and think it would have a huge impact on our community. It would be very sad.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2253		Parent of child at another local primary school
2254		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2255		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2256		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2257	I also think that this is a bad idea from an environmental point of view. Your children should be able to go to school in the area they live.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2258		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2259		Parent of child at another local primary school
2260		Parent of child at another local primary school
2261	<p>These new proposals by Langley Park Learning Trust have caused a huge amount of stress, anxiety and anguish within the local community. It is OUTRAGEOUS that this consultation has happened so soon after the formation of the trust in its current form, a trust which has not proven its worth to the local community. Many many parents are incredibly upset and unsettled by these proposals. It personally has upset me and my wife, we planned 8 years ahead in terms of moving house to be located close to our schools of preference. Indeed, many 2nd and 3rd generation locals would have planned even further ahead than we did. Another huge downside is the additional traffic and pollution due to the additional travel from pupils who are currently over a mile outside the current catchment/proximity area. Why would you do this to the air the children breath? Have you even completed an environmental assessment to the impact on the local area John Budden? No.</p> <p>John Budden should be ashamed of causing so much upheaval and upset in his local community. He has caused real pain to parents, and wasted many good people's time who have had to respond to this frivolous consultation. Indeed, a march by parents was organised against these proposals, and I suggest you don't wait until 2 March to publish results, you should end this now rather than cause ANOTHER 6 WEEKS OF STRESS FOR 100s IF NOT 1000s of parents. John, you should ask yourself, are you doing this in the best interests of the community, or is there another motive?</p> <p>I suggest you prove your trust is for real over a period of years, then come back once the Reception pupils who started in the trust have completed a full education within the trust.</p> <p>If you go ahead with these proposals this will drag on as there will be a serious backlash from the local community, which will continue for many many months and cause a lot more pain and suffering for the local community.</p> <p>You will certainly have my agreement to proposals if you come back in 2023; which is 5 years after the trust formation; that seems pretty reasonable, whereas current proposals are unreasonable and therefore break the Schools Admission Code Section 1, paragraph 1.15.</p> <p>And you thought Brexit was controversial? Thanks for reading, have a great day!</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2262		Parent of child at another local primary school
2263	<p>This consultation has been badly written, badly advertised and badly timed. It doesn't look like children are at the heart at this consultation at all, it sounds purely money driven. There is no benefits for the children, in terms of education or making their lives better.</p> <p>Changing the admission policy to have feeder primary schools is going to be detrimental to children, families and the community spirit.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2264		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2265	As above - elitism, undemocratic, generally scandalous and legal advice will be sought if the proposal is carried out	Parent of child at another local primary school

2266	I'm not a parent, but I am a part of the local community who has empathy for others. I have an interest in education, and barriers which are put in place which make it difficult for children and families. It doesn't seem right that children who live right next door to the secondary schools are lowest down in the list of oversubscription criteria, just because for some reason they didn't attend one of the 3 proposed feeder schools. It is likely to mean that children will have to make long complicated journeys to school, when they could instead walk to school. Also, this will make it harder for such children out of school hours, as they are less likely to be able to be with their friends, and be a full part of the school community that is a long way away from where they live	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2267	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> &bull; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice_x000D_ &bull; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school_x000D_ &bull; The policy discriminates again poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility. _x000D_ &bull; The environment damage due to more children travelling by car to school_x000D_ &bull; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances_x000D_ &bull; The negative effect on non-trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own_x000D_ &bull; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing positive role in the community_x000D_ &bull; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the L.B.Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts, teachers&rsquo; union, Langley Residents Association, local schools and local environmentalist groups_x000D_ &bull; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children_x000D_ &bull; None of the reasons given in the consultation for naming of &lsquo;feeder schools&rsquo; is therefore neither transparent or reasonable. 	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2268		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2269		Parent of child at another local primary school
2270		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2271		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2272		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2273		Parent of child at another local primary school
2274		Unknown
2275		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2276		Parent of child at another local primary school
2277		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2278		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2279		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2280		Parent of child at another local primary school
2281	The Trust, CEO and Chair should keep to their words and promises. Honour should still have a value in the present date. Langley Park Primary School is NOT a feeder school and should not become one.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2282		Parent of child at another local primary school
2283	I think it's morally wrong to give priority to CH and HDPS over more local schools, like Unicorn for example. Many people from CH move to the Langley Park area to get into the Langley secondary schools. I feel an uncomfortable precedent will be set. Where will kids from non- Trust primary schools go who live close to the Langley schools? I would be furious if I had moved to be in the catchment for the Langley Secondary schools and my children didn't go to a primary within the trust.	Unknown
2284		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2285		Parent of child at another local primary school
2286		Unknown
2287		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2288		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2289		Parent of child under 2 years
2290	<p>I believe every child should have an opportunity to attend their local school where if possible they can walk or cycle saving the environment and reduce travelling time.</p> <p>I do not want children from this primary school or other local primary schools (outside of the Trust) to be at a disadvantage in getting a place at their local secondary school.</p> <p>Secondly, a child will make friendships at their school. If they are not local friends then potentially this would cause more environmental damage in travelling to see them outside of school hours. Also it is not conducive to building a local community.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2291	<p>I think that local children should have the opportunity to attend their local school. The distance of the pupil's residence from school should be the main criteria. This is beneficial to the local community and environmental issues.</p> <p>Also it would be unfair to pupils living further away (children of parents working at the school) having to travel further distances to school. This will impact how tired they are and be a strain on their social life (school friends living miles away).</p> <p>I am a local resident whose children used to attend both schools.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2292	Concerns changes can reduce catchment and community. Should children come in from further afield then there are also potential environmental/pollution and road safety concerns.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2293		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2294		Parent of child at another local primary school
2295		Parent of child under 2 years
2296		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2297		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2298		Unknown
2299		Parent of child at another local primary school
2300		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2301		Parent of child at another local primary school
2302	<p>I believe that shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice including myself. The negative effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school which is totally absurd! If a child lives within walking distance of a school then they should be able to attend that school!</p> <p>Climate change is a serious issue affecting all of us. If children who live further away travel to the Langley secondary schools by car or bus then the environmental damage will be noticeable. Also, there is the added safety issue due to more children travelling further distances in the area.</p> <p>The nature of the proposed policy is divisive, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community!</p> <p>Please take heed to the opposition. So many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups.</p> <p>The nature of the consultation document itself is misleading and incomplete, as it does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2303		Parent of child at another local primary school

2304	Interesting that Riddlesdown College in Croydon has, after 15 years, reverted to the local catchment system based on proximity rather than the feeder school system they have been using due to the negative impact this has on local residents. Perhaps LPLT should consult with this trust on their reasons for changing back to what is the current system in Bromley before going ahead with this ridiculous and unfair proposal.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2305		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2306		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
2307		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2308		Parent of child at another local primary school
2309		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2310	I am a local resident of Eden Park and Parklangley over 70 years. I am concerned about the effects of this proposal on the local community, friends and, potentially, relatives and have supported free, fair state education for my own son and all local children.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2311		Parent of child at another local primary school
2312		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2313		Parent of child at another local primary school
2314	There is nothing mentioned about the sibling admissions of current students? I would very much like to know if I will be able to have both my sons educated in the same school which would be my choice. For my children to be given the same opportunities with their education is very important.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2315		Parent of child at another local primary school
2316		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2317		Parent of child at another local primary school
2318		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2319		Parent of child at another local primary school
2320		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
2321		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2322		Parent of child at another local primary school
2323	My comments, like those of most others who will have responded to this consultation, are primarily based around proposed changes to feeder school arrangements. The case made for change is weak and unconvincing, and is not supported with sufficient evidence. It is not, in my professional view, adequately pedagogically grounded. It creates major concerns over fundamental issues including proximity, child safety, community and the environment. In the event that an attempt is made to roll out either part of this proposal, I will, as an educational researcher, offer my support to Bromley Council to oppose and halt it. I may also use it as an example in my academic work.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2324		Parent of child at another local primary school
2325		Parent of child at another local primary school
2326		Parent of child at another local primary school

2327	<p>1. This consultation has not been run with a sufficient degree of transparency or in proper consultation with those who will be directly affected by it.</p> <p>The Trust has given no indication as to why these admission criteria are being reviewed at this time.</p> <p>It has not answered the most frequently asked questions in its frequently asked questions.</p> <p>The Trust has operated as if it were in governmental purdah rather than being open and honest about its reasons for consulting.</p> <p>2. The Trust has framed the consultation in an extremely unhelpful manner.</p> <p>The trust has proposed two options for change but failed to make clear that there are actually three outcomes.</p> <p>By offering Option A and Option B, the Trust suggests that no change to the admissions process is not an available outcome. It is not sufficient to say that no change to the admissions policy is an outcome as a footnote. It should be clearly defined as Option C.</p> <p>The options are poorly framed at best, disingenuous and misleading at worst.</p> <p>3. This consultation has caused huge division and distrust both in the community at large and in the school community itself.</p> <p>Speculation and rumour have abounded, notably that the consultation is a foregone conclusion and that the Trust is being threatened with legal action by a small group of parents who were promised feeder status by the ex-head of Langley Primary School.</p> <p>The Trust has failed to deal decisively with such divisive rumours, done little to reassure, placate or respond to such accusations and has refused to hold public meetings or respond in writing. This is not the way to run a consultation process. A consultation is a conversation, not a listening exercise.</p> <p>The Trust has failed in operating a transparent consultation process from start to finish, even scheduling the consultation period over the Christmas period, an action that has led to suggestions that the Trust hoped that concerned parties would not be aware of or engage with the process because it runs over a national holiday period.</p> <p>4. &lsquo;The trustees have stated clearly that the purpose of this consultation is to hear the view of the local community and that they are set in no particular course.&rsquo;</p> <p>Freedom of information requests have revealed that legal action against the trust are already at an advanced stage.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2328		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2329		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2330	The trust has portrayed itself as a positive influence on the local community but the proposals regarding priority of admission to the secondary schools is divisive and unfair to local children.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2331		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2332	Please consider whether parents of one child, who attends one of the Trust's secondary schools, would qualify for a sibling place for a child of the opposite gender at the corresponding secondary school. For parents with children of both genders this would be reassuring and remain within the broad spirit of the sibling preference principles given the two secondary schools are adjacent to one another.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2333		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2334		Parent of child at another local primary school
2335		Parent of child at another local primary school

2336	<p>I can't help but feel that the consultation has been badly handled. The consultation document makes it seem like the only choice is between option A and B when in reality there is an option C, which is to keep the admission arrangements as they are. It is underhand to not present "no change" to the community as an option._x000D_ _x000D_ Following on from this the response form and questions do not make it explicitly clear that LPPS is placed at a higher priority than CHPS and HDPS when it comes to admission. _x000D_ _x000D_ Ultimately it is my opinion that this whole exercise is about money. There are more primary places in the borough than primary children and you are attempting to fill the places at LPPS and HDPS by dangling a lure of admission to your well thought of secondary schools. This will see the funding cut from other local primaries and is ultimately an abuse of your assets.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2337		Unknown
2338		Unknown
2339		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2340	<p>I think it is unfair that children who go to Clare House and Hawes Down schools should have admission priority over children who live closer to the Langley Park schools.</p> <p>may be denied this opportunity as a result of these proposals. It seems absurd and very disruptive to the local community to give admission priority to children who are likely to live further away from the Langley Park secondary schools. It will also have a knock on effect for other local secondary schools.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2341	<p>I feel cheated by the consultation.</p> <p>We were disappointed with the school and the staff and when the head confirmed it wasn't a feeder into the secondary schools we put Unicorn down as our first choice. Had we known the school might become a feeder we would have held our nose and put LPPS down as our first choice. Having made this decision such a short time ago I really feel cheated that you are changing the goalposts. Is it not possible to make the decision now but only apply it from the 2020 reception intake onwards? Ultimately though I think my reaction outlined above is why you are making this change. You haven't listed any compelling reasons or educational benefits in the documents so it can only be an attempt to fill up your primary schools and guarantee them maximum funding.</p> <p>Another reason why I feel cheated is LPSB said in a letter dated the 19th October 2017 when they joined the trust, that there would be no change to the schools admission policy.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2342	<p>We all walked to school from roads on top of the Langley schools. Children from Hawes Down and Clare House are not local and Langley Primary has always offered to all applicants so they come from miles away. There is no direct bus service from Hawes Down and Clare House &ndash; these children will be driven to school. This bad for the environment and cause diversive impact on the local community. It should be local schools for the most local children &ndash; why encourage a huge movement of children from great distances to the detriment of families living on top of the schools attending the nearest primary schools? The Langley secondary schools are always oversubscribed &ndash; the proposed changes are wrong.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2343		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2344		Parent of child at another local primary school
2345		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2346		Parent of child at another local primary school
2347		Parent of child at another local primary school

2348	<p>Unicorn school shares a boundary with the senior schools, but in the new arrangement these children will be 6th priority for senior school.... yet admission to Unicorn is strictly by distance from the school.</p> <p>By giving priority to Hawesdown & Clare House, both of which are high achieving & in &lsquo;good&rsquo; areas, the senior schools are effectively selecting their pupils ... those who are most likely to do well. The comprehensive form of education is meant to accept children without selection.</p> <p>If the senior schools change their admissions criteria, the Dept. Of Education needs to be aware that the schools plan to become selective .</p> <p>This is grossly unfair</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2349		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2350		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2351		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2352		Parent of child at another local primary school
2353	<p>&#9679; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many _x000D_ non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend &#8203;any&#8203; local school _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the _x000D_ Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop _x000D_ due to no fault of their own. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a _x000D_ positive role in the community. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the _x000D_ London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; _x000D_ unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which _x000D_ does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined _x000D_ figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. _x000D_</p> <p>&#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need _x000D_ to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither _x000D_ transparent or reasonable.</p>	Unknown
2354	<p>Your policy will create exactly as many losers as winners. A local child will have to lose out on their preferred option, for another to be granted their place. _x000D_</p> <p>For one extra minute of travel a pupil wastes a full school day of time each year*. If their journey is just half an hour further, that pupil will lose the equivalent of a full school year during their time at secondary. Your laudable vision of a "rich, extra-curricular education" requires time to implement. _x000D_</p> <p>Your mission is to "provide an excellent education for every child". Yet your plan is to create a system where pupils from within the Trust have an advantage, making those from non-Trust primary schools feel like second class citizens. _x000D_</p> <p>You have it within you to create a plan where all pupils, regardless of their former school, will have an equal opportunity to succeed. And where "working together" with your "wider community" does not mean forcing local children to go to a school they can not walk to. _x000D_</p> <p>(*195 school days, 1 minute each way, assuming 6.5 hours per school day.)</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2355		Unknown

2356	<p>I remain opposed to the changes, in particular because there appears to be no real educational benefit of the changes. The educational benefits listed appear to be collaboration and sharing of facilities and best practice between schools within the trust. These can surely continue regardless of a change to use a feeder school model.</p> <p>but a number of negative impacts, including the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> &#9679; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice &#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school &#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility &#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school &#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances &#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. &#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role in the community. &#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. &#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. 	Parent of child at another local primary school
2357	Live close to school and had child there. Not happy about excluding children if they live in the catchment area. Every local resident should be treated equally. So if people move out of the catchment area their children should not be admitted based on the feeder school they come from.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2358		Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of another interested organisation
2359		Parent of child at another local primary school
2360		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2361	<p>I think that by having feeder schools you are limiting the type of child that would attend Langley Boy&rsquo;s school.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">It would</p> <p>be disappointing if this went ahead and I think this would have huge impact on the current reputation Langley Boys school has.</p>	Unknown
2362		Parent of child at another local primary school
2363		Parent of child at another local primary school
2364	to the LPGS and BS. I cannot see why other children in my locality should now have their opportunities restricted.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2365		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2366	I have deep concerns of the implications of this consultation. However, as a realist (and having spoken to senior representatives in Ofsted) I am also aware that MAT's can now seemingly adopt new rules with little challenge. The evident best outcome would be for both MATS to unite and work together for the betterment of all the children, the local residents and the tax payers. We shall see.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2367		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

2368	<p>This response form is overly long and complicated and designed to confuse and distract from the key issue. _x000D_ NO FEEDER SCHOOLS _x000D_ NO ELETISM_x000D_ SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCTION FAIR TO ALL CHILDREN IN THE AREA. _x000D_ It would also seem that under the umbrella of this there are lots of details being railroaded through - why redefine definitions of siblings and home address - something in this process appears to have unseen motives, and i would like to see full transparency on the meetings that gave rise to these proposals and consultation. In particular i find the follow statement objectionable "it is not possible for the Trust to schedule meetings with groups of parents and there is no obligation on the Trust to do so".</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2369		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2370		Parent of child at another local primary school
2371	<p>so continuing to be educated through the Langley schools would be beneficial.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2372		Unknown
2373	<p>We are not amongst the statutory consultees, however, have been involved in education throughout our working lives and live just the fairway distance away from the Secondary schools, amongst many present and hopefully future Langley Park pupils. We feel very strongly that schools should work and support the local community, as the Langley Park schools has always done in the past. _x000D_ Have tried to paste my electronic signature below, but it won't accept it and I don't know any other way of doing it. This has not been a problem before.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2374		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2375		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school, Parent of child under 2 years
2376	<p>I believe it is in the trusts best interest to be allowed to continue working and investing in the students that they have already spent 7 years educating and shaping to uphold the same values and beliefs. These are all local children who just want to learn.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2377	<p>LPSB and LPSG are very popular local schools, with a catchment area of just over a mile. In my understanding this catchment area is already shrinking as new homes are built and the population density rises around the schools.</p> <p>Having attended open days at both Langley Park schools, the relevant Langley Park school is a clear first choice for all of my children. This is on the grounds of location, academic achievement, facilities and values.</p> <p>None of my children attend the schools which are identified as receiving preferential treatment in the proposed admissions policy. , an outstanding rated school a few minutes' walk away. We have no need to drive to school and we save considerable time and effort by attending the nearest school. It was a factor in buying our house. We have no plans to move house now we are established in this neighbourhood. Indeed we could not afford the costs of moving or buying a more expensive house in the sought after Langley Park area. Other parents of and similar schools will be in exactly the same position.</p> <p>My central objection to the proposal is that the Trust's interest in creating conformity between schools is being placed above the traditional criterion of admitting children by proximity. Are I and my neighbours meant to move house, or send our children to a primary school a long way from our home, in order to secure preferential treatment when applying to our choice of secondary school? It is perverse for children who are within the catchment area to find themselves ousted due to preference being given to primary school children who are outside the catchment area. The cost of this decision to my family could be that, despite being just within the catchment area for our preferred schools, our children are forced to travel further for an inferior education. This proposal serves the interests of the Trust at the expense of the local community.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2378		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years

2379	The carbon footprint would be compromised if children for whom Langley is the nearest school have to go elsewhere while those living further away have a place. I am a local resident	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2380	I have lived in the local area since I was born and attended My wife and I decided to settle in the area and raise a family, buying our house in West Wickham with the knowledge of good local schools that we hope our children will have a fair opportunity to attend. We feel that the proposals will unfairly disadvantage them and may mean that they don't have a fair and equal opportunity to attend their preferred local school. We are also concerned that our house price will be impacted as we (like many others) bought our house largely on the basis of the possibility for our children to attend the schools included in the proposals. Future demand for houses will clearly be impacted if the proposals are put into place.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
2381		Parent of child at another local primary school
2382		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2383		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2384		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2385		Parent of child at another local primary school
2386	. Being able to stay within the campus will be important to me in terms of travel and providing after school care in particular	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2387		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2388		Parent of child at another local primary school
2389		Parent of child at another local secondary school
2390		Parent of child at another local primary school
2391		Parent of child at another local primary school
2392		Parent of child at another local primary school
2393		Parent of child at another local primary school
2394	Our Children deserve to have equal opportunities to attend these schools. We moved to the area so our children could go to Langley Park Boys and Girls schools. This is an unfair system that will divide our community, be bad for the environment and make local parents lives a lot harder when their kids can attend their local school.	Parent of child under 2 years
2395	As a concerned member of the local community I would also point out the affect it would have on travelling to the environment and socially on the local community this admissions policy would have. Please keep it based on proximity and not feeders schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2396		Parent of child at another local primary school
2397	On environmental grounds, this is a shocking and irresponsible proposal. We should be encouraging all children to WALK not drive to their local school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2398	I am a member of the local community.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2399	While the proposed changes would not affect me directly currently, they may well do in years to come and the changes would currently affects a number of my friends with young children who would normally fall within the catchment area for Langley Park School for Girls and Langley Park School for Boys but these proposed changes would mean that this is no longer the case and would cause countless issues with travel, pollution, potentialt tenstion within the community to name just a few. The proposed changes seem to be absolutely unfounded and make no sense whatsoever._x000D_ It is sad to think this could happen.	Unknown
2400	The whole arrangement seems extremely unfair both on children and families who are in the catchment areas of the Langley schools currently but will be pushed out by these changes in favour of children who live further away and live outside of west Wickham - those children may have other school options that the now excluded children in west Wickham will not have. It will result in longer journey times for children from feeder schools coming from outside the local area; more car journeys in an already congested part of west Wickham; and a splintered school community, as well as forcing people who live in west Wickham at least in part for the schools to consider moving away.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2401		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2402		Representative of another interested organisation

2403	<p>These proposals are ill-advised and will have a negative impact on local children, the quality of education, and the community._x000D_ _x000D_ Shrinking &lsquo;catchment areas&rsquo; will deprive many local parents of any choice, while the knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school. The policy will also discriminate against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility._x000D_ _x000D_ The policy will force more children (both at the two secondary schools, and those forced to attend a school elsewhere) to travel to school by car, which will increase carbon emissions. More cars on the roads around schools will impact on child safety. The feeder schools policy will also have a negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own. This in turn highlights divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a positive role in the community._x000D_ _x000D_ The nature of the consultation itself has drawn criticism. The figures given in support of the proposals are incomplete, and no wider impact study appears to have been conducted. Crucially, none of the reasons given for the change are persuasive of the need to change policy. These flaws, together with the unfortunate timing of the consultation, has created the impression that the consultation is not genuine, but is instead a paper exercise designed to rubber-stamp a decision that has already been made. The Trust should have commissioned and published impact assessments before consulting, and been honest with the community about the apparent legal action against the Trust by LPP parents who were angry that promises regarding feeder school status had not been kept._x000D_ _x000D_ There is widespread opposition to the plans. The local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups are all opposed to any change. 3,500 people in the local community signed a petition against the proposals.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2404		Parent of child at another local primary school
2405		Parent of child at another local primary school
2406		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2407		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2408		Parent of child at another local primary school
2409	Please keep focussed on equal opportunities - including children who have been at faith schools and those who may have chosen a specific primary because it was best for their special need or disability. Excluding children from faith or children who have gone to a primary which can best cater for its disability is not in line with equal opportunities	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2410		Parent of child at another local primary school
2411		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2412		Parent of child at another local primary school
2413		Parent of child at another local primary school
2414		Parent of child at another local primary school
2415		Unknown
2416		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2417	BY you making the catchment smaller, this will parents with less choices or none at all.The policy itself is very discriminatory which is against the policy of the Department of Education to tackle social mobility. This policy is also very divisive. The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself. Lots of people has oppose this policy and finally The negative effect on non -Trust Primary Schools whose applications may drop due to th divisive nature of your policy and to no fault of their own.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2418	Concerned member of the community	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)

2419	<p>- Shrinking the catchment area may deprive local children of attending local schools_x000D_ - Unnecessary environmental impact, children should have the option to walk to school not be forced into either being driven to school or take public transport to a school outside their local area._x000D_ - If children are being forced to attend schools outside their local area, safety concerns arise as they may be travelling longer distances by themselves._x000D_ - Primary schools not in the trust may also see less applications as schools within the trust are suddenly giving preference to secondary schools._x000D_ - Taking into account the amount of anger this has caused in the local community I am shocked this hasn't just been completely abandoned. It is a proposal without any merit and negatively impacts the local community in which these schools reside.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2420		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2421		Parent of child at another local primary school
2422	<p>In the documents supplied there is no transparency or clear reason for the need for Clare House, Hawes Down or Langley Primary to become feeder schools. What this does demonstrate is the Trust has no regard for the children of the non Trust schools. If this consultation is approved this would put local children at a disadvantage over the feeder school/s for accessing local education. This will also contribute to social segregation, something which I was under the impression that the Trust schools work hard at ensuring this does not occur by embedding in into their curriculum to ensure all pupils understand the meaning of equality and diversity, and that everyone should be treated fairly. _x000D_ It is clear form the information available on the gov.uk website that children attending the proposed feeder school live further away in comparison to the local non-feeder schools (Pickhurst, Oak Lodge, Highfields). Should the proposal for feeder schools be agreed as these pupils live further away, this will increase the number of parents driving to LPBS / LPGS. It goes without saying that this will create increased congestion around the roads to the Langley secondary site, which at peak times is already an issue. It will also have a negative impact on the environment with increased pollution which is high local and national government agendas. _x000D_ This proposal is unfair, unjust and divides the local community.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2423		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2424	These changes will shrink catchment ares and prioritise students that live further away from the secondaries therefore is an extremely unfair system.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2425		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2426	<p>Applying for secondary school is stressful enough. These proposals make it even harder for parents within the surrounding area of both secondary schools for their child to go to either LPSB/LPSG, and will mean children at other primary schools will possibly be excluded from being able to attend a Langley secondary school._x000D_ 2 of the primary feeder schools are over a mile away from the secondary schools when walking, where are the children at Marian Vine Primary/Oak Lodge Primary and Balgowan Primary supposed to go?_x000D_ I strongly disagree with the proposal/s for entry to either of Langley Park secondary schools.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2427		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
2428		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2429	I would implore the LPT to consider the local community and Bromley council's views . You have some very good schools (both primary and secondary) in Bromley borough. THis decision could Alter that over time.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2430		Parent of child at another local primary school
2431		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2432	PLEASE NOTE, MY SUBMISSION SUDDENLY DISAPPEARED: COMPUTER SEEMS TO HAVE SENT IT OFF BEFORE I HAD QUITE FINISHED INCLUDING ENTERING MY ADDRESS. If you received that first one please delete and ignore, this one is the correct one with the same text: I am not wanting to have my views counted more than anyone else's!	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2433	I submit my response an interested person drawn from the local community.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2434		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

2435	<p>I am not often moved to comment on matters such as those proposed in the LPLT Consultation On Admissions December 2019 Document and I have no vested interest as a parent of children either approaching primary school age, primary school transfer nor have I ever had children through any of the LPLT Schools. I strongly believe however that secondary schools should be there to meet the needs of the local community in which they reside. This has been the case at LPSB for many years and this has been the foundation for its success and reputation in the local community and beyond.</p> <p>As the former I cannot see any major educational benefits accruing to either of the trust secondary schools despite the rhetoric outlined as &lsquo;exceptional educational benefits&rsquo; in the Consultation Notice (p5-7). Many of these things already happen, with a variety of partners both primary and secondary, have done so for many years in different guises and under different banners, with different degrees of success - and they did not require an alliance which is singularly placed to upset the local population and harm the reputation of the secondary schools.</p> <p>I also think that the volume of documentation provided in the consultation serves to make responses difficult and I would hope that this in turn has not contributed to a lack of feedback on the consultation</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2436		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2437	<p>This will enhance the educational experience because formed social relationships will facilitate easy adjustment in the new school and the children will thus perform better socially and academically.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2438		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2439		Parent of child at another local primary school
2440		Parent of child at another local primary school
2441		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2442		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2443		Parent of child at another local secondary school
2444		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2445		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2446	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sets a very dangerous precedent for feeder schools_x000D_ 2. Almost all stakeholder bodies appear to disagree with the plan - including Bromley Council and other multi Academy Trusts_x000D_ 3. Reduces choice and opportunity for local children_x000D_ 4. Will be incredibly devicive to the local community_x000D_ 5. Is unfair on all families who made school choices up to 5 or so years ago with no knowledge of this plan_x000D_ 6.The reason for the plan is very unclear and incomplete_x000D_ 7. Will create shrinking and disjointed catchment areas which will increase travel and safety of children 	Parent of child at another local primary school
2447		Parent of child at another local primary school
2448	there appear to be lack or no collaboration with other schools, so I struggle to see the educational benefit in this proposal.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2449		Parent of child at another local primary school
2450		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2451	I believe any feeder system disrupts the philosophy of equal opportunity to state education for our children and I fundamentally disagree with it, despite the potential benefits for pupils at my children’s school.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2452		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

2453	<p>Shrinking catchments deprives choice for parents and children in the local community. This increases stress and anxiety in what is already a stressful process Both options result in Non trust children having less or no choice to attend a local school Negative impact on the environment and road traffic congestion Negative impact to all non trust primary schools due to reduced applications out of the schools control If feeder schools are to form part of secondary admissions this should be applied across all primary/secondary schools in the borough to allow fair access to secondary education for all children. These proposals provide minimal benefits but create significant disadvantages to the local community. I am deeply concerned and dissatisfied that the consultation has been most widely advertised via social media. All local residents should have clearly been made aware of the consultation to have the opportunity to respond. I understand there are local councillors, MP, the Bromley borough, residents association, environment groups, and other multi Academy trusts oppose this and I hope their views are given enhanced attention.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">We regarded the schools so highly we have very recently strived financially to move into the area to allow our children to attend these schools. The proposals are likely to negatively affect us along with others as stated in my comments and is personally causing us increased level of stress, anxiety and uncertainty about our children's future education.</p>	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2454		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2455	These arrangements seem to be encouraging exclusivity and refer to one school in particular -Clare House which is not regarded as a 'local primary school' having preferred admission status. I also understand that this primary school is an above-average sized primary school. If the proposals were implemented for all of the 3 feeder schools then it would definitely lead to a shrinking existing catchment area to the 2 senior schools which would be most unfortunate. Where do the other local primary school children then go? - what about the effect of long journeys to school for the young children and also the safety and environmental aspects?	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2456	Seems bizarr	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2457		Unknown
2458		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2459	With local feelings running high and some parents already talking about legal challenges it is obvious the Trust needs to think very carefully about the effect on finances which will impact all schools and pupils.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2460		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2461		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2462		Parent of child at another local primary school
2463		Parent of child at another local primary school
2464		Parent of child at another local primary school
2465		Parent of child at another local primary school
2466		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2467		Parent of child at another local primary school
2468		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2469		Parent of child at another local primary school
2470		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2471		Parent of child at another local primary school
2472		Parent of child at another local primary school

2473	<p>In my opinion this is a proposal from the LPLT , which is made without due consideration to the local community, education options for local pupils , local environment and long standing relationships with non trust Primary Schools. _x000D_</p> <p>As pupils transition for primary education to secondary ,they should have the opportunity to do so at a local school to where they currently reside, with the smoothest transition possible. A pupils opportunity to access the Langley Secondary schools should not be enabled because their parents choose to work within the LPLT, if they reside outside of the traditional catchment proximity. They should attend a school local to where they reside enjoying the benefits that this approach provides including local friends from their local community, shorter travelling time to schools . _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>The LPLT has a responsibility to deliver its services in a way that benefits the local community and demonstrates a basic value to protect the environment. It should not be "blind-sided" away from these principles , just to give an advantage and "perk" to the schools, pupils and staff who operating and participate and work within its trust. This is simply inward facing, irresponsible and I suspect contradictory to the core values they portray to hold within the schools themselves.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2474		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2475		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2476	<p>The Trust agreed to consult on the admissions, [Section deleted due to the requirements of the ISS Regulations]. Now, because of the attempt to include the 2 other primary schools in the Trust (Hawes Down and Clare House) with feeder status, has naturally sparked outrage within the local community. The campaign against the idea has jeopardised LPPS pupils' chance of success. There is also lots of inaccurate information circulating regarding LPPS and this is unfair to the families of pupils at the school, especially those of us who had faith in the school to begin with, and the tenacity to continue to support the school, despite many of the 'teething' problems which presented as it developed.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2477	<p>All schools in the trust should be treated equally. Either all in or out of the feeder school status on equal terms (no priority to any one of the trust schools). _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Additionally there has been no requirement to change from the status quo in the community. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>There is a severe loss of trust and confidence in the management of the Langley park learning trust and a lack of transparency to the motive of this and has caused unnecessary stress in the community, I really hope you idiots know what you are doing.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2478		Parent of child at another local primary school
2479	As a local resident traffic issues that will result from this proposed change affect me as well as my citizens concern for fairness	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2480		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

2481	<p>The reasons set out in the consultation notice to justify this proposed change to the admissions policy are unconvincing. The suggested benefits would be massively outweighed by the negative impacts that the change would have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local families will be deprived of choice and some children will be unable to attend a school local to them. - children will be travelling further to get to school - both those children from Trust primaries who live further away from the school (and would not have received a place under the current proximity criteria) and those from non-Trust primaries (who would have had a place under the current proximity criteria but would find themselves outside of a smaller catchment area if the feeder school proposals were introduced). This will have environmental consequences with more children being driven to school as they live too far away to walk, increasing pollution and congestion. It will have social consequences as children may not be attending schools with other children that live locally to them. There are also potential safety concerns with children having to travel further to school. - there may be a knock-on effect for catchment areas of other local schools, further exacerbating the problem and meaning that some children may find they are no longer in the catchment for any school. - the policy is socially divisive. All families living in the local area should have equal access to the local schools. Families should not be disadvantaged by having not attended one of the Trust primaries. (Particularly when they will have had no warning that their choice of primary school could be disadvantageous). The divisive nature of this policy could have consequences for the Trust's reputation within the local community and its aim to have a positive role within the community could be compromised. <p>The suggested benefit of having a similar ethos across all Trust schools and the ease of transition is not sufficient for such a seismic change to the status quo. The current system is transparent and easy to understand and treats local families fairly. The children who live closest to the school get priority, which is as it should be.</p> <p>The secondary schools have an obligation to all of their pupils to ensure their transition is as smooth as possible and co-operates with all local primaries as a result, not just those within the Trust. Emphasising the difference between Trust primaries and non-Trust primaries is counterproductive and will serve to make that transition harder and create divisions within the school.</p> <p>The consultation notice gives a misleading impression as to the number of places available to local children attending non-Trust primary schools, as it fails to account for the number of sibling places which would also receive priority and further reduce the number of available places. The 2019 admission figures show that 93 places across the two schools went to siblings. Rather than the 280 places available, as suggested in the consultation notice, there would actually be nearer 190 places, less than half of the total PAN.</p> <p>There would be a detrimental impact on other non-Trust primary schools in the vicinity who will not be feeder schools. Parents are likely to prefer those schools which would guarantee entry into the secondary schools. This could lead to some very good schools being undersubscribed.</p> <p>In any event, it would be unfair to change the admissions policy with immediate effect - if changes are to be made to the admissions policy (which is opposed for the reasons set out in this response), so that the choice of primary school becomes more important, changes should only take effect from a time when parents applying to primary school are aware of the feeder school</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2482	I strongly believe that if feeders are introduced the ALL trust primary schools should receive this status - one feeder school should NOT be given priority over another	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2483		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2484	<p>The introduction of a feeder school system to a state school is unfair to local children and frankly feels elitist. We are in the catchment for Langley Park (a reason why we located to Beckenham) and these proposals are likely to rule LP out as a school for our . There are few good choices for secondary schools and this limits options further.</p> <p>What thought has been given to the potential expansion of feeder schools and therefore the knock on effect of increased numbers coming through feeder schools into LP, thus limiting places for non-feeder school applicants further in the future?</p> <p>I can see offering members of staff priority entry for their children would be of benefit in terms of retention however, I assume the staff across all LP schools is a significant number and thus places would be reduced further by this proposal. In addition if they live out of area it disadvantages local children.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school

2485	<p>I strongly object, and believe it's wholly unfair, to introduction of a feeder school admissions policy which would give children attending Langley Park Learning Trust primary schools priority admission access over other local children for a variety of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local children should have equal access to local schools. - As publicly funded schools, parents in the local area who have contributed to those schools should have equal access to them. These are not privates schools &ndash; you cannot take public funding and then exclude a large proportion of the local families who have contributed to that funding. - Surely all local schools should work together and not just those in a Trust. What happens to children who get a space, who didn't come from a feeder school, how will they make the transmission into the secondary school &ndash; they'd surely be at a disadvantage. - I believe this proposal would significantly decrease the number of spaces available to children in the local community and further shrink the catchment areas of other local secondary schools. They will become over-subscribed as children who would ordinarily have gone to the Langley schools would have to go to other local secondary schools leaving a large number of children being pushed further out. <p>I do hope the proposal is reconsidered and made fairly for the local community. Access to schools should be fair and this proposal simply isn't.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2486	<p>, so have first hand experience of what an utterly phenomenal school it is. I completely understand why everyone would want the opportunity to send their children to these schools. My first concern about the proposals is why there needs to be feeder schools at all.</p> <p>If these feeder schools got the 'go ahead', what effect would this have on the children who did not attend schools from the MAT who miraculously manage to get in? My child was successful at securing a place BECAUSE WE LIVE LOCALLY to the school site. walks to school and home again daily, and even sometimes at weekends to attend music/sports events. We moved to this area before he was born knowing the reputation of the school, and have not been disappointed.</p> <p>Another concern about these changes are the environmental effect they will have. More children will have to travel from further away to get to school and back daily. as a knock on effect, may then have to travel further away in another direction to attend (who knows where?) because their local secondary will not accommodate them. Increased congestion around the schools is bad enough; but I also have concerns about the extra hours our children will have to waste travelling. Their days are long and demanding enough without these extra pressures, which could have a detrimental impact on their mental health.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2487		Parent of child at another local primary school
2488		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2489	Concerned member of the community	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2490	Quite simply this is an unfair proposal - local schools should be for local children! We already have to play the postcode lottery to get our children into good schools. Don't make this even harder for us and make our children suffer. From the arguments and paperwork I have read/seen I cannot see how this proposal is in the best interests of the majority of local children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2491		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

2492	<p>I think it's absolutely outrageous that this has been proposed. We moved into this area for the excellent local schools and having one son decided that LPBS would be an excellent choice for him to go to. Despite living 0.75 miles away with the proposal of the children at the feeder schools having priority would mean that there would be a high possibility of him not getting a place. Clare House is a far distance away from the Langley Schools, many of the children who attend wouldn't normally be considered for a place at the Langley Schools as they are not in the catchment area. The Clare House children would take up places meant for local children and this is just quite simply not fair.</p> <p>The same is possibly true in many cases for Hawes Downe Primary School</p> <p>If this went ahead traffic would increase as many of the children would not be in a position to walk to school so potentially the possibility of a lift to school in the family car would increase.</p> <p>More traffic= more pollution= more illness= more strain on the NHS</p> <p>The shrinking catchment area means that our CHOICE for a local school would be taken away.</p> <p>would have to travel some distance to attend another school which would leave tired and give less time to complete course work.</p> <p>This decision would have an impact on the non feeder schools as suddenly people would feel that they would have to attend the feeder schools in order to be guaranteed a place at the Langley schools. School applications would drop and places would then be given to children who are not local meaning yet more traffic and movement of young children.</p> <p>We paid a premium to buy our house in this area due to the Langley Schools. If the catchment area changes and shrinks house prices could suffer and decrease impacting on many families in our local community</p> <p>All the catchments for all the other local secondary schools will be impacted and will shrink leaving areas whereby children are not in any catchment for any local secondary school.</p> <p>So many people oppose these plans so it can't just be me who thinks its a dangerous and completely unfair proposal. For as long as I can remember you went to your local school. Schools are there to serve the local children. PLEASE LET'S KEEP IT THIS WAY!</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2493		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2494		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2495		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above), Representative of another interested organisation
2496		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2497		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school, Parent of child under 2 years
2498		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2499	<p>and they were some of the best years where I found the best friends. It would be a shame for this to go ahead to stop people that live close to attend Langley.</p> <p>I plan to move back to the area in a few years and start a family and would want my children to have a fair opportunity to go to Langley. I also have friends children and godchildren that live in the area that would look to go to Langley whom currently live in the catchment area but might not attend one of the chosen primary's.</p>	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2500		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2501	<p>It would appear to me that this whole consultation is a sham, issued at an incredibly ill advised time of year with no care of the impact it would have on parents or their children during the Christmas 2019 period. The proposal has been put together with very little merit and thought and has not been backed up in any way; the statistics offered are clearly wrong and I have zero confidence that the trust has done its homework properly. Fundamentally the proposal of feeder schools is plain and simply wrong and unnecessary, acting in such a selfish manner will have wide and significant impacts for the trust, the schools and the local area. As educators the primary focus of the trust should be the well-being and development of the children under your umbrella, pushing away children from the local community that see the Langley Schools as their next natural step will leave a life long scar on them - please leave the politics and the economics aside and think about the impact these actions will have on children at a particularly vulnerable time of their lives.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2502	This is lacks explanation and clarity. There appears to be a lack of explanation for the proposals for change.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2503		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2504		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2505		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2506	Reduced places will deprive local children of choice of school. I believe this will also have a detrimental effect on other local school catchments, which in turn could lead to some local children being out of the catchment for all schools in the area._x000D_ I disagree with the proposed plans for environmental reasons - more children travelling by car to school than walking._x000D_ Effect will have on house prices due to catchment and local community in general whereby those children attending local schools are not part of the local community.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2507		Parent of child at another local primary school
2508	I am an interested party as I am an ex-pupil of LPSG and benefitted hugely from having an education at my local school. There has always been a strong sense of community in the local area and I feel that these proposed changes may disrupt this. I now have godchildren who live locally and are hoping to go to these schools in a few years that may well be removed from the catchment area if it shrinks. I also still have family living locally and so they will be affected by changes to house prices and the general effects it will have on the community.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2509	-Reduced places for local children_x000D_ -Safety of children - children travelling further distances_x000D_ -Could lead to some local children not getting into an local school due to impact on all catchments._x000D_ -Environmental factors - children travelling further to school - increase car usage_x000D_ -Impact on local house prices_x000D_ -Wider community impact	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2510	[Section deleted due to the requirements of the ISS Regulations] From a response to an FOI request to the London Borough of Bromley, the objection they have raised regarding how far children from LPPS live from the secondary schools is outdated. It was mileage recorded on National Offer Day and there has been a lot of movement in LPPS with children transferring in and out of the school which renders this information void. By including Hawes Down and Claire House Primary School in this consultation, the Trust has divided the community and caused bad feeling. Furthermore, quotes from apparent responses to the consultation from Bromley Council, Bob Stewart MP, Mark Brock Councillor, CEO of Nexus Trust, CEO of Compass Academy and a Bromley Councillor have been shared across social media seemingly opposing the consultation on feeder school status. This questions how this information has made it into the local community and whether this is deliberate sabotage by the Trust. Another Trust has recently reversed their feeder school status for the primary schools in their Trust. At the very least LPLT should grant feeder school status to LPPS children in the current Y3 and Y2 and their siblings. After this time a further consultation could take place to revert to the current admission arrangements.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2511	I feel that the proposals are discriminating against other primary schools in the local area and setting a real problem for local residents who want their children to go to a local school. This is a very unfair system and will provide very skewed issues in the local area. The fairest way would be to continue with the current system of nearest location to the school.	Parent of child at another local primary school

2512	<p>Data from the Mayor of London's mapping service shows that children from Hawes Down and Clare House schools live further away from the secondary schools, compared to children attending non-Trust schools – in particular Pickhurst, Oak Lodge and Unicorn. Meanwhile, Langley Park Primary school has a huge 'catchment area' with children living many miles away.</p> <p>In its consultation document, the Trust presents figures which imply that the effect of the policy changes will be small. This is unlikely to be the case - indeed if the impact were not significant, the policy would be a failure on its own terms.</p> <p>Analysis of the available figures suggest that a far more likely outcome is that children admitted under the new policy will not be exactly the same set of children that would have been admitted under the standard 'proximity' policy. Therefore, when children from the Trust primary schools are given priority over other children, the 'catchment area' for non-Trust children must shrink significantly. This will have a number of negative effects.</p> <p>The first and perhaps most important effect of this policy is that every year, many children will be denied any opportunity to attend their nearest school. This places a significant burden on families whose lifestyles are arranged for living in a London borough, and time will be wasted travelling that could otherwise be spent at home or at work. Even a relatively small change in travel distance can have significant impact on a child's education, and the family's time, well-being and finances – especially if it means the difference between a child walking to school independently, or being driven by a parent.</p> <p>This problem will affect children living near to the Trust secondary schools, and also those living near other schools in the borough – in particular, Hayes School. The shrinking of the Langley secondary school's catchment areas will have a knock-on effect on other schools' catchments, at both primary and secondary stages. The demand for secondary school places in Bromley borough is already incredibly high and the shrinking of a catchment of the Langley secondary schools will increase the demand (and reduce the catchment) for places at other secondary schools such as Hayes. Families who had intended to send their children to a secondary school other than Langley Boys or Langley Girls, may find that the policy inadvertently excludes them from their nearest school.</p> <p>The proposed policy will, as intended, inevitably result in more parents choosing one of the Trust's primary schools as their first choice school. There are currently surplus primary school places across the borough, meaning a loss in government grant income for most primary schools. If the policy is introduced, the Trust primary schools will fill to capacity. The empty places – and the associated loss of income – will be transferred to other schools.</p> <p>The existing system incentivises schools to improve standards. The 'marketplace' for pupils is based entirely on two factors – the birth rate, and the quality of the school. No-one can control the first of these factors; but it is within the school's ability to affect the second. Outstanding schools fill their places quickly; those that require improvement will struggle - a debatable system, but it is the framework within which the Bromley (and West Wickham) schools currently operate. The proposals distort this system, and warp the rules in favour of the Trust's primary schools. The other infant and primary schools in the area will experience a drop in admissions despite any measures they may take to keep their school as good or</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2513		Parent of child at another local primary school
2514	The proposal will affect most children in local primary schools especially Oak Lodge The catchment area for Langley School has decreased in recent years, feeder schools from outside this area, (who have secondary schools in their own areas) will take spaces from local children. This is completely inconceivable.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2515	The proposed new admission arrangements are very unfair. I hope that sense prevails and the present admission policy for the LPBS and LPGS is upheld.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2516	I represent in excess of ten members of staff at who have given me permission to voice their thoughts on the matter of priority places for children of staff at the two secondary schools. We believe that allowing this priority will facilitate the continued employment of quality teachers, effectively tying them to the land and helping foster a culture of collective responsibility for all children in the local community.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2517		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2518		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2519		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2520	<p>• Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice</p> <p>• The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school</p> <p>• The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility</p> <p>• The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school</p> <p>• The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances</p> <p>• The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own.</p> <p>• The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community.</p> <p>• So many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, and local environmentalist groups.</p> <p>• The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.</p> <p>• None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable - the only conclusion is that it is designed to fill the 2-form entry of Langley Primary, which should shrink to 1-form to re-balance local supply (which would help with Hawes Down).</p>	Unknown
2521		Parent of child at another local primary school
2522		Parent of child at another local primary school
2523	I think the overall proposals for feeder schools is very unfair and unpopular for all the reasons I have already mentioned. I think that Langley Park schools is a popular choice for many local parents and we would hope for a fair chance of being able to get our children into the schools. Under the proposed changes to admissions our chance of gaining entrance is a lot less.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2524		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2525		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2526		Unknown
2527		Parent of child at another local primary school
2528		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2529		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2530	<p>• Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice</p> <p>• The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school</p> <p>• The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school</p> <p>• The negative effect on Pickhurst may see applications drop due to no fault of their own.</p> <p>• The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups.</p> <p>• None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2531		Unknown
2532		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2533		Parent of child at another local primary school
2534		Parent of child at another local primary school
2535	I am concerned that if this goes ahead, the assumption would be that as children from the feeder schools would be going to LPSG or LPSB, links with other secondary schools would not be maintained. I feel this could make children going to other schools feel even more anxious about the transfer.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school

2536	I have attended the primary school open days for LPPS and HDPS in Autumn 2017 and 2018. Both headteachers clearly stated that neither school was a feeder school. In addition, of HDPS clearly stated that if the rules on feeder schools were changed that ALL primary schools in the trust would be treated equally and have equal right to secondary school places at LPBS and LPGS. For this reason I oppose the proposed admission changes regarding primary schools as I do not believe LPPS should have priority over the other trust primaries as it was made clear less than 18 months ago that this would not happen. The only fair option if priority for primary pupils is chosen (and I am not saying this is necessary) would be to give equal access to all the feeder schools.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2537		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2538		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2539		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2540	<p>&#9679; Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice_x000D_ The fact that the proposed plans are open to &lsquo;mid-use&rsquo; by parents who could rent/purchase a very small property to get their first born into one of the feeder primary schools and as their family grows could then move out of the area to a more affordable &lsquo;family home&rsquo; and yet still send all of their children to the Langley senior schools 7 plus years later. _x000D_ &#9679; The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that many_x000D_ non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend &#8203;any&#8203; local school and will be forced to travel a longer distance to school, effectively passing by their LOCAL school._x000D_ &#9679; The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the_x000D_ Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility_x000D_ &#9679; The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school_x000D_ &#9679; The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances_x000D_ &#9679; The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own._x000D_ &#9679; The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust&rsquo;s aim of playing a_x000D_ positive role in the community._x000D_ _x000D_ &#9679; The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers&rsquo; unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups._x000D_ &#9679; The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which_x000D_ does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children._x000D_ &#9679; None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need_x000D_ to change policy. The reason for naming of &lsquo;feeder&rsquo; schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school
2541		Parent of child at another local primary school
2542	This policy consultation is of a divisive nature, which contrasts with the Trust’s aim of playing a_x000D_ positive role in the community. Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice, and discriminated against the local children and community. There is also the environmental damage this will cause, with children travelling longer distances to get to school, either at the trust, or children living locally having to go to a further distance school not of their choice. The reasons given for this policy are not strong enough to warrant a positive impact on education for all and undermines social mobility. Indeed it will have a negative impact on the community and already has._x000D_ There is no need for feeder schools, the policy already in place works well for the community. Thank you for taking into account my views.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2543		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school

2544	My family home is local to Langley and as far as I am aware, local residents were not made aware of this consultation. I have found out through parents. Families will have to make arrangements to travel further afield with their children, this has potential to increase congestion. This congestion is relevant to the local community. Families have moved to this community believing their children would have the opportunity to attend their local school. Introducing a feeder system will reduce their chances of attending their local school. _x000D_ I think a feeder system is not fair to the children of the local community and environmentally this is a step backwards. In the documentation provided it is not clear what benefit this has for children.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2545		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2546		Unknown
2547		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2548		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2549	it would be particularly unfair to implement these changes for 2020/2021. If they are to be implemented it should be when children applying for a primary school place this year reach year six. This would ensure parents can make an informed choice as to their preferred primary school	Unknown
2550		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2551		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2552		Parent of child at another local primary school
2553		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2554		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2555		Parent of child at another local primary school
2556		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2557		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2558		Unknown
2559		Parent of child at another local primary school
2560		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2561		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2562		Unknown
2563		Parent of child at another local primary school
2564		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2565		Parent of child at another local primary school
2566		Parent of child at another local primary school
2567		Parent of child at another local primary school
2568		Parent of child at another local primary school
2569		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2570		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2571		Parent of child at another local primary school
2572		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2573	I am personally very surprised that the 2 only single sex schools in the area have been allowed to partner up with local primary schools in the way they have. Giving pupils at those primary schools an unfair advantage in not only admissions but in other aspects of the primary to secondary transfer. The transfer to secondary school is daunting for ALL children, if you add to this that over half of the intake will have already had access to staff, facilities and become pre-accustomed to the surroundings of their new school how will that impact on the other half of the intake? They will start off their secondary school journey feeling like outsiders. Everyone starting their secondary school experience should be on equal footing, without unfair advantages.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2574		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2575		Parent of child at another local primary school

2576	they would have less choice under this proposal, they would be discriminated against for not being at the 'right school' my wife and I both attended Langley and stayed in the area to attend Langley, this would be a devastating blow to us personally and many others at	Parent of child at another local primary school
2577		Parent of child at another local primary school
2578	I am responding to this consultation as a parent who would like to send their children to LPSB.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2579	The new admissions arrangements are detrimental to children living in the local area attending different primary schools. My children attend . There are no affiliated Secondary schools. I feel we should not be penalised for a choice the governors have made over the future of . We live in the local area, we are in the catchment for both LPBS and LPGS, however the new proposals will mean that we have much less chance of getting in.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2580		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2581		Parent of child at another local primary school
2582		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2583	We should not be penalised for a choice the governors of our school have made.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2584		Parent of child at another local primary school
2585		Parent of child at another local primary school
2586		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2587		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2588		Parent of child at another local primary school
2589		Parent of child at another local primary school
2590		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2591		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2592	Having feeder primary schools means children within walking distance could miss out on a place at their local secondary school in favour of children who drive or bus. It's ridiculous to be within walking distance of a good state school and not get in. Also means the primary schools who feed don't need to push for outstanding standards as people will send their children there whatever happens on the promise of good secondary education.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2593		Unknown
2594		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child under 2 years
2595		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local primary school
2596		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2597		Parent of child at another local primary school
2598		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2599	I believe these proposals will unfairly penalise and impact on children and families in other local schools outside of the Trust. These proposals will create an unfair playing field in admissions for those schools, leaving other schools with less interest and funding in an already cash-strapped time.	Parent of child at another local secondary school
2600		Parent of child at another local primary school
2601		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2602		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2603	I wouldnt agree with langley park primary only being named a feeder school. I believe it should be all primaries in the trust or none at all.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2604	Whilst I appreciate the need for trusts when you are already in the school system this change could have a massive impact. I strongly believe that many, many, parents 'play the system' and this will allow them to do so even more. Admission, in my opinion should always be based on the address at the time of applying. I am currently in the catchment for both Langley girls and boys however this could change if this consultation is successful. Why should I be penalised because of a choice I made 7 years ago, to go to a particular primary school, completely unaware of the impact of this choice 7 years down the line?	Parent of child at another local primary school
2605		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2606	I would like to comment on the sibling policy between LPGS & LPBS. Many parents who have girls attending LPGS have to send boys to a school in a different direction making this very difficult for parents logistically with travel and term breaks not being the same!! It is also a benefit to have children attending a school that share the same values and learning cohesion to install this at home to create a partnership between school and home. Please consider this. The new Bullers Wood boys school has a sibling policy with the Bullers Wood girls school. Langley should consider making this the same?!! Thank you	Unknown
2607		Parent of child at another local primary school
2608		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2609		Parent of child at another local primary school
2610		Parent of child at another local primary school
2611	I should add that I have no particular vested interest as on current catchments won't get into Langley Boys' school. It's simply that I strongly object to further fragmentation and unfairness in the admissions system.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2612	I have worked across primary and secondary schools my whole life and I often see students and teachers struggling in secondary schools for various reasons. Often it's because of the gaps in education from primary. I think the chance to develop an 'all through' education system is very exciting for students and staff and offers our children greater opportunities.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2613		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2614		Parent of child at another local primary school
2615	I know the new Eden Park secondary school will be opening shortly, but for those of us on the West Wickham end rather than the Park Langley immediate vicinity, restricting catchment area access to the nearest secondary schools will have a detrimental effect on education provision in the area and our children will have to travel further to school.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2616		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2617		Parent of child at another local primary school
2618		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2619		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2620	I don't feel making these schools feeder schools will have a positive impact on the surrounding areas. Other secondary schools such as Hayes are already under so much pressure for spaces and if by making the Langley schools feeder schools you could be adding even more pressure to Hayes meaning children living in the West Wickham and Coney Hall areas are even less likely to have a place at a local school after primary. Also, by giving priority to children of staff you are taking away from children who actually live in the area and who will then have to travel out of there local area if no spaces are left for them. Unless all primary schools in the borough act as a feeder for secondary schools I don't feel this is a fair and inclusive decision.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
2621		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2622		Unknown
2623	Interest party as a parent with children at primary school they attend. . These plans are unfair to the wider community simply because of the	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2624		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2625		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2626		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2627		Parent of child at another local primary school
2628		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2629	You need to carefully think about the impact that this will have on the community and housing in the area. People move to get their children into good schools. This would encourage people get into the primary school and then potentially move out of the area.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2630	Given the pressures Bromley has on school places I find it surprising this trust would consider feeder schools. It's simply not fair on other children in the local community. I have 2 girls and if they didn't get into Hayes and you have your feeder status I am not sure where they would go!!	Parent of child at another local primary school
2631		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2632		Parent of child at another local primary school
2633		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2634		Parent of child at another local primary school
2635		Unknown

2636		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2637		Parent of child at another local primary school
2638		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2639	We are within the proximity for the school (300yds ATCF) but these new rules would give us no option to attend the LP schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2640		Parent of child at another local primary school
2641		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2642		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2643		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2644		Parent of child at another local primary school
2645		Parent of child at another local primary school
2646		Parent of child at another local primary school
2647		Parent of child at another local primary school
2648		Parent of child at another local primary school
2649		Parent of child at another local primary school
2650		Parent of child at another local primary school
2651		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2652		Parent of child at another local primary school
2653		Parent of child at another local primary school
2654		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2655		Parent of child at another local primary school
2656		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2657		Parent of child at another local primary school
2658		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2659		Representative of a local secondary school (foundation, VA or academy)
2660		Parent of child at another local primary school
2661		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2662		Parent of child at another local primary school
2663		Parent of child at another local primary school
2664	The principle of creating a feeder school through this trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole. It fragments the whole school system. I disagree to it all.	Unknown
2665	Not a fair allocation method. This would not serve the local community, as does not provide one set of rules for all. It would not be a level playing field. One set of rules should be applied to all with out exception.	Unknown
2666		Unknown
2667		Parent of child at another local primary school
2668		Parent of child at another local primary school
2669		Parent of child at another local primary school
2670		Parent of child at another local primary school
2671		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2672		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2673	I would like to see the sibling rule apply to those with siblings in the other secondary school, ie girls with brothers at LPBS and boys with sisters at LPGS. If they are both part of the same academy trust I believe that the secondary schools should give priority to siblings of both schools regardless of gender. I do not agree with the implementation of feeder schools. It will cause oversubscription of those schools, added to which, a large part of the local area is not covered by those schools. Children who live locally and are eligible for consideration under the current rules will not be offered places based on the fact they attended a different primary school despite the fact they may live closer. It feels elitist.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2674		Parent of child at another local primary school
2675		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2676		Parent of child at another local primary school
2677	I think to have three primary schools feed two secondary schools is unfair. The proposal suggests that someone could get their child into reception and then leave the borough and have their child's education sorted until 6th form (as well as their siblings). I think about the well-being of the local children not being able to walk to their local school just because they did not attend a feeder school and that is unjust. I also think about the social communities we try to encourage and local after school friendships that evolve when walking to and from school that wouldn't exist. I also think about the environment and a number of primary schools are encouraging their school to be eco friendly - how can this be embedded if children then can't walk/cycle to their local school just because they didn't go to a feeder school. I think it would stop parents sending their children to other great primary schools in the borough because they would want their child to go to a feeder school. People pay a premium to live in the local areas to have the choice of great schools and this proposal takes that choice away.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2678		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2679		Parent of child at another local primary school
2680		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2681		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2682		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2683		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2684		Parent of child at another local primary school
2685		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2686		Parent of child at another local primary school
2687		Parent of child at another local primary school
2688	This is an unfair system. Locals who have children at different primary schools in the area who also live within a mile of Langley will now potentially struggle to get a place at either Langley secondary schools	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2689		Parent of child at another local primary school
2690		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2691		Parent of child at another local primary school
2692		Parent of child at another local primary school
2693		Unknown
2694		Parent of child at another local primary school
2695		Parent of child at another local primary school
2696		Parent of child at another local primary school
2697	The principle of creating a feeder school through this trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole. It fragments the whole school system. I disagree to it all.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2698		Parent of child at another local primary school
2699		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2700		Parent of child at another local primary school
2701		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2702	The consultation notice states that there would be a maximum of 180 children from the 3 proposed feeder schools, however further down the document you state there were 93 children in year 6 at HDPS this year - so the impact would be larger than stated.	Parent of child at another local primary school

2703		Parent of child at another local primary school
2704		Parent of child at another local primary school
2705		Parent of child at another local primary school
2706		Unknown
2707		Parent of child at another local primary school
2708		Parent of child at another local primary school
2709		Parent of child at another local primary school
2710		Parent of child at another local primary school
2711		Parent of child at another local primary school
2712		Parent of child at another local primary school
2713		Unknown
2714	when based on our address we would be in the catchment for the Langley Schools; not all children in the proposed feeder primary schools live in the area so this unfairly impacts children who do live in the catchment area (particularly on the catchment area edge) but who don't go to a proposed feeder primary. With the Harris secondary Beckenham also consulting to make the neighbouring Harris Primary their feeder there could be significantly less choice for resident families for all secondaries not in feeder primaries; it's not fair.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2715	and these changes will be affecting him.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2716		Parent of child at another local primary school
2717		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2718		Parent of child at another local primary school
2719	This trend of consulting on feeder trusts is incredibly harmful to the chances of children across the borough. It reduces parental choice and children's opportunities.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2720		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2721		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2722		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2723		Unknown
2724		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2725		Representative of a local primary school (community or VC)
2726		Parent of child at another local primary school
2727		Parent of child at another local primary school
2728	many of whom are local residents to Langley Boys and Girls Secondary School. These children are at risk of having to travel further taking unnecessary public transport in order to attend a secondary school because they were not in a feeder school enabling them to attend their local school. We as a family and most other people I have spoken to at our school feel this is absolutely ludicrous and extremely unjust.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2729		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2730		Parent of child at another local primary school
2731		Parent of child at another local primary school
2732		Parent of child at another local primary school
2733		Parent of child at another local primary school
2734		Unknown
2735		Parent of child at another local primary school
2736		Parent of child at another local primary school
2737		Parent of child at another local primary school
2738	how unfair this would be on our girls who are currently in the catchment and deserve the opportunity to attend this school. I feel it is discriminatory to put their own group of schools before that of local children in the area that surely have a right to attend	Parent of child at another local primary school
2739		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2740		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school

2741	I really don't see the need for feeder schools. Please don't make it even harder for parents to get their kids into local schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2742		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2743		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2744		Parent of child at another local primary school
2745		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2746		Parent of child at another local primary school
2747		Unknown
2748		Parent of child at another local primary school
2749		Parent of child at another local primary school
2750		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2751		Parent of child at another local primary school
2752		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2753		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2754		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
2755		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2756		Parent of child at another local primary school
2757		Parent of child at another local primary school
2758	There is no need to break a system that works well and serves those it needs to serve: the local children.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2759		Parent of child at another local primary school
2760		Parent of child at another local secondary school
2761		Unknown
2762		Parent of child at another local primary school
2763		Parent of child at another local primary school
2764	This seems to have been hushed up. That the this proposal will go ahead regardless. All this is just lip service.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2765		Parent of child at another local primary school
2766		Parent of child at another local primary school
2767		Unknown
2768		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2769		Parent of child at another local primary school
2770		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2771		Parent of child at another local primary school
2772		Parent of child at another local primary school
2773		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2774		Parent of child at another local primary school
2775		Parent of child at another local primary school
2776		Parent of child at another local primary school
2777		Parent of child at another local primary school
2778		Parent of child at another local primary school
2779	An outrageous proposal which puts large numbers of local children at a distinct disadvantage, not being able to to go to their local school as places are unfairly given to those most likely further away simply based on primary school choice.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2780		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2781		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2782		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2783		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2784		Parent of child at another local primary school
2785		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2786		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2787		Unknown

2788		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2789		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2790		Parent of child at another local primary school
2791		Parent of child at another local primary school
2792		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2793		Parent of child at another local primary school
2794	This is the second such consultation I have seen locally in recent months, the other pertaining to Harris. To penalise the chances of other children because they are at schools in a different academy is grossly unfair. All children within the catchment should be given equal access to their local school, we should not expect children to travel miles to other schools because a change in admissions such as this mean they miss out on their local / nearest school. This adds undue stress to families and could mean five years of commuting in some circumstances. We have our entire working lives to be a part of that process, let's not inflict that on 11 year olds as well.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2795		Parent of child at another local primary school
2796		Parent of child at another local primary school
2797		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2798		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2799		Parent of child at another local primary school
2800	Base the criteria on location and maintain a fair system	Parent of child at another local primary school
2801	I am quite frankly appalled at the prospect of the majority of these new proposals going through. As things stand at the moment, my son's future attendance at his local secondary school, ie. Langley Park School for Boys, is in jeopardy. Would anyone making this decision like to walk in my shoes?? As mentioned previously, many people have gone out of their way, myself included, to ensure that they are in the catchment area for the Langley Schools in order to give their children the best chance of getting into these schools. Now with this proposal, all of this seems to have been in vain. Why does the system have to change? Everyone knows what the criteria is, so why not stick with what is there already? I implore the Trust NOT to adopt the admission criteria changes.	Parent of child at another local primary school:
2802		Parent of child at another local primary school: yes
2803		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2804		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2805		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2806	This proposal has enraged many residents, I personally do not think the current arrangement, other than the point about employees and 6th form (both mentioned above) need to change	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above);,Representative of a Local Authority:
2807		Parent of child at another local primary school:, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school:
2808		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2809	Local children should be able to attend their local schools, ie Langley Park Boys and Langley Park Girls. Grandparent of two girls who attend Langley Park Girls School and local resident	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above):
2810		Parent of child at another local primary school:, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:

2811	The proposal to ease transition arrangements for Langley Park Learning Trust primary pupils does not take into account that the secondary schools will need to consider the transition arrangements for at least 280 additional pupils transferring from other primary schools. The consultation indicates that the Trust has designed their own curriculum including key standards for the end of Key Stage 2 in all subjects. The 2014 Primary National Curriculum sets out these standards clearly for schools to follow. Therefore the rationale for change is not credible.	Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy):
2812	I was against the MAT initially and felt the decision had been made regardless of people's wishes, I feel strongly that the admissions criteria should not be changed as a result of the MAT being formed.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:
2813		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2814	The proposal should be withdrawn, they serve no real educational purpose and are to the detriment of the local community.	Parent of child at another local primary school:
2815		Parent of child at another local secondary school:
2816		Parent of child at another local primary school:, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:
2817	If this goes ahead it will set an extremely dangerous precedent which could result in complete chaos for the school admission system. I am a grandparent of children that attend the trust primary and secondary schools	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above):
2818		Unknown
2819		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:
2820	I do not fall into any of the interested party categories set out below but have been a resident in the catchment area of the Langley Park schools for 35 years and both our children attended both schools. I am a strong believer in local schools for local children in order to avoid skewed standards of education for different groups in society. There are many ways advantage can be gained by deviating from the general rule of proximity and special priority can be just as selective as selection on the basis of achievement or faith.	Unknown
2821		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:
2822	I am a parent of two boys both of whom went to Langley Park Boys School. I live 0.1 miles from the school on the road where the school is but, under these proposals, my children would have been very likely to be denied a place. I am a concerned member of the local community.	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above):
2823		Parent of child at another local primary school,
2824		Parent of child at another local primary school:, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:
2825		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:

2826	<p>I would like to reiterate that on the whole I find the proposed changes, specifically the proposals for feeder schools, and for priority of children of staff at either LPSG or LPSB to have priority in admissions to either of the schools, to be unfair and unjust. My primary reasons for these are that for however long, the idea has been that children should attend the schools closest to them. This is still promoted in schools in the sense that children and families are urged, in a very strong way, to walk to school 'where possible'. These proposed changes will undoubtedly make this less possible, and go against what schools and Local Authorities have suggested we do in terms of walking to school, being safe and caring for the environment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">All incredibly reasonable</p> <p>questions. These proposals aren't just letters and forms and numbers and statistics, children aren't statistics. They are young people with feelings and needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Explaining how they are fair and reasonable, as I am totally unable to do so. I would</p> <p>also like for someone to explain to us how staff at either school having priority over admissions across both schools (considering them as one) can be seen as in any way far at all, when that is not extended to families who have children at either of the schools in terms of the sibling policy. As previously mentioned I am sure this must go against some code of conduct of fairness. In my reasonable and logical mind, as well as my heart, I deeply hope LPLT sees sense and does not go ahead with these proposed changes. If they do, I and I'm sure many others, will be taking this matter as far as possible for the sake of my son Shay and all of the other local children who deserve the right to go to their most local school and the school alongside their siblings.</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school.; Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools:
2827		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above):

2828	<p>Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that non-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local school The policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community. The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children. None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neither transparent or reasonable There are sections of the consultation document that contain selective figures. The Trust has and does not provide admission figures for previous years from Hawes Down and Clare House Primary Schools, detailing how many children were allocated a place elsewhere because they were outside the LP catchment areas. This would highlight and be a more accurate representation of the admissions, because all those applicants would be guaranteed a place in future years under the proposed new system. Society should be engaged with attempting to bring the local community together and schools are one of the pillars of our community. The proposals of feeder schools are unfair and divisive. To deny children the option and opportunity to attend a local school is detrimental to all. These proposed feeder school would increase the foot fall for children and has a significant impact in the individuals, parents and the environment. Children will have to travel further and not be able to walk to their local school. The environmental impact cannot be dismissed. There will be more cars on the road and there will be increased congestion around the LPS. I live in the area and South Eden Park Road from around 08.00 is already at gridlock. The proposals would favour children from feeder schools that live further away, and they would need to travel further. We moved into the area in 2018 to provide our children with the best opportunity to attend a local secondary school in LPBS. At this time, we enquired about our children attending LPP school and specifically asked re feeder schools. We categorically told that there were no plans for feeder schools and had there been this would have influenced our final decision for a primary school. At great financial cost we moved to West Wickham / Beckenham borders following and with adherence to the current admissions policy of LPB.</p> <p>LPBs and we moved with the expectation of being within the current catchment area and for him to walk to school, thus promoting a healthier work, live balance and most importantly ensuring there would be no long commute for our . This sudden proposed change would further increase uncertainty and anxiety in an already anxious and apprehensive family around which school my would be 'allocated'. There has been no appropriate time for families to adjust to these proposed forced changes. We now have no control over these proposed changes that will directly impact my family. The deadline for secondary school choices is Oct 2020, this is not enough time to relocate to another area to guarantee us of another school or enquire about moving schools, which would cause inevitable and unacceptable disruption at this delicate time in a child's educational and overall development. You refer to through life education from 5-18 in your MAT, however where is the 5-year plan for primary school children? How can you plan within 10 months? This is totally unacceptable. I would like to see the move where local schools provide the highest standard of education, promoting local schools for local children, enabling more children to walk to school. I do not support these proposals and vehemently object to them. I feel that</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school:
------	--	--

2829	<p>Shrinking catchments will deprive many local parents of any choice The knock-on effect of small catchments at other schools will mean that mannon-Trust children will find themselves unable to attend any local schoolThe policy discriminates against poorer children, which is directly against the Department for Education policy to tackle social mobility The environmental damage due to more children travelling by car to school The safety issue due to more children travelling further distances The negative effect on non-Trust primary schools, who may see applications drop due to no fault of their own The divisive nature of the policy, which contrasts with the Trust's aim of playing a positive role in the community. The fact that so many people oppose the plans: the local MP, local councillors, the London Borough of Bromley, the other local Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), teachers' unions, Park Langley Residents Association, and local environmentalist groups. The misleading and incomplete nature of the consultation document itself, which does not take into account sibling admissions when presenting the new combined figure of 280 places available to non-trust primary school children.None of the reasons given in the consultation document are persuasive of the need to change policy. The reason for naming of 'feeder' schools is therefore neithertransparent or reasonable There are sections of the consultation document that contain selective figures. The Trust has and does not provide admission figures for previous years from Hawes Down and Clare House Primary Schools, detailing how many children were allocated a place elsewhere because they were outside the LP catchment areas. This would highlight and be a more accurate representation of the admissions, because all those applicants would be guaranteed a place in future years under the proposed new system. Society should be engaged with attempting to bring the local community together and schools are one of the pillars of our community. The proposals of feeder schools are unfair and divisive. To deny children the option and opportunity to attend a local school is detrimental to all. These proposed feeder school would increase the foot fall for children and has a significant impact in the individuals, parents and the environment. Children will have to travel further and not be able to walk to their local school. The environmental impact cannot be dismissed. There will be more cars on the road and there will be increased congestion around the LPS. I live in the area and South Eden Park Road from around 08.00 is already at gridlock. The proposals would favour children from feeder schools that live further away, and they would need to travel further. We moved into the area in 2018 to provide our children with the best opportunity to attend a local secondary school in LPBS. At this time, we enquired about our children attending LPP school and specifically asked re feeder schools. We categorically told that there were no plans for feeder schools and had there been this would have influenced our final decision for a primary school. At great financial cost we moved to West Wickham / Beckenham borders following and with adherence to the current admissions policy of LPB.</p> <p>which is 0.5 miles from LPBs and we moved with the expectation of being within the current catchment area and for him to walk to school, thus promoting a healthier work, live balance and most importantly ensuring there would be no long commute for our . This sudden proposed change would further increase uncertainty and anxiety in an already anxious and apprehensive family around which school my would be 'allocated'. There has been no appropriate time for families to adjust to these proposed forced changes. We now have no control over these proposed changes that will directly impact my family. The deadline for secondary school choices is Oct 2020, this is not enough time to relocate to another area to guarantee us of another school or enquire about moving schools, which would cause inevitable and unacceptable disruption at this delicate time in a child's educational and overall development. You refer to through life education from 5-18 in your MAT, however where is the 5-year plan for primary school children? How can you plan within 10 months? This is totally unacceptable. I would like to see the move where local schools provide the highest standard of education, promoting local schools for local children, enabling more children to walk to school. I do not support these proposals and vehemently object to them. I feel that</p>	Parent of child at another local primary school:
2830		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2831		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2832		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2833	<p>The options being considered seem biased in favour of only one primary school within the Trust, to the detriment of the other two, when that school has no higher standing in the Trust and that hardly seems fair.It also hardly seems fair for the children of other local primary schools who are nearer to Langley Park Boys School and Langley Park Girls School to be penalised just because they attend nearer schools who are not part of the Trust.It seems to me that there will also be a higher environmental cost by having more children who live much farther away attend LPBS and LPGS over children who live closer (as well as having these closer children having to travel further to other, less-near schools too). These higher traffic levels caused by the need to transport these children over longer distances will mean there will be an attendant rise in pollution levels It hardly seems conducive to having harmonious local school and community relations to be setting up such a feeder system. The proposal has already caused a lot of local tension. Finally, there is already talk of legal challenges, which the Trust will have to defend. Indeed, in similar circumstances, where other multi-academy trusts have put forward similar proposals, legal challenges have occurred. Any money spent by the Trust in legal costs will mean that there will be less money in the Trust to spend on the education of the children attending the Trust's schools. Our schools are finding it hard enough on the tight budgets they have without them suffering from having even less funds available to them.</p>	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2834		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2835		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2836		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2837		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:

2838		Parent of child at another local primary school
2839	Children living a lot closer to Langley Schools but not attending Clare House or Hawes Down but other local schools are disadvantaged by this proposed arrangement. Children living the closest should have priority and should not be disadvantaged because their school is not in MAT or Trust with the only secondary school within walking distance.	Parent of child at another local primary school:
2840	Please find below detailed reasons for our objections. Please note they are in no particular order of priority and for the record we strongly object to the proposed change to the LPLT Admissions code for 2021-22.LPSB and LPGS are not 'all through' schools so all primary schools in the area should have equal access.Most of your reasons for giving priority to children at LPLT primary schools are generic working together practices that take place across all schools.Any change in the admission policy will limit the choice of secondary schools for pupils including children who do not attend a LPLT primary and live within the locality. We believe it will set a bad precedent for other Trusts within Bromley which include both primary and secondary schools to alter their criteria.If the admission policy is changed, children from a greater distance away could join the Langley secondary schools by having attended the primaries in the Trust, therefore disadvantaging children from other local schools who live in proximity to the Langley schools. As a publicly funded body, all families within the area should have equal access and not be disadvantaged by not attending an LPLT primary.Many secondary school aged children will have to make their own way to school and it is surely preferable that they walk to school where possible, which is better for both their health and the environment. It makes no sense to priorities children that live further away, adding more traffic on the already busy roads.We believe it is not fair on families that have made the decision in the last few years to move in to the catchment with the sole intention of getting their children in to one of these highly regarded schools. Regularly families are paying inflated prices for houses that are in the area. We also disagree with feeder schools as we believe it would change the whole dynamic of secondary schools. There would be vast groups of children from the same primary schools joining, leaving those from non-feeder schools in the minority, making it harder for them to settle and integrate.Another reason we strongly object is that under the new proposal's families can get their children into a feeder school at age 4, move out of the area, safe in the knowledge that their child education is guaranteed until 18. Meanwhile, the availability of houses increases around the secondary schools, but those that move in won't be able to secure a place at those schools as they'll be held for those that move out (where house prices are lower) and their any number of siblings.	Parent of child at another local primary school:, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school:
2841		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2842		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above):
2843		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above):
2844		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools:
2845		Parent of child at another local primary school:
2846		Parent of child at another local primary school
2847		Parent of child at another local primary school
2848		Parent of child at another local primary school
2849	Why are best practised stated in the proposal not shared across all schools rather than kept within the trust. It is one education system so seems a bit odd to benefit just 5 schools. I believe all schools would be better if they shared information with each other including non-Bromley schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2850	Child looking to enter primary school	Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above)
2851		Unknown
2852		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2853		Unknown
2854		Parent of child at another local primary school
2855		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2856	This is not a fair, or equal, way of selecting pupils to attend such a popular school when it does not benefit the majority, and especially for an intake due to happen very soon.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2857		Parent of child at another local primary school
2858		Unknown
2859		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school

2860		Parent of child at another local primary school
2861		Parent of child at another local primary school
2862		Parent of child at another local primary school
2863		Parent of child at another local primary school
2864		Parent of child at another local primary school
2865		Parent of child at another local primary school
2866		Parent of child at another local primary school
2867		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2868		Parent of child at another local primary school
2869		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2870		Unknown
2871		Parent of child at another local primary school
2872		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2873		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2874		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2875		Parent of child at another local primary school
2876		Parent of child at another local primary school
2877		Parent of child at another local primary school
2878		Parent of child at another local primary school
2879		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2880		Unknown
2881		Parent of child at another local primary school
2882		Unknown
2883		Unknown
2884		Parent of child at another local primary school
2885		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2886		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2887	To make these changes would have such a detrimental effect of local families. Families that have invested to live in a fairly safe catchment area and have built a life and settled their children will be deeply affected. Many people live less than 1 mile from the secondary school but could lose a place to children living further away. Those children that would not get in if you change the admissions policy will be left in and effective now man's land' they will be too far for Hayes and end travelling out of their area. I can only say again how devastating this would be for so many local families. The effects would be far reaching including children being moved from schools where they are settled to get into feeder schools or even considering moving. The Langley secondary schools have a great local reputation and are a credit to West Wickham and the surrounding area. I would be concerned that the trust would then move to a primary selection model further excluding many local children.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2888		Parent of child at another local primary school
2889		Parent of child at another local primary school
2890		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2891		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2892		Unknown
2893		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2894		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2895		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2896		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2897		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

2898		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2899		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2900	Option B. Has the potential to increase traffic in the area as children and parents from CHPS and HDPS are more likely than LPPS to commute from a further distance.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2901		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2902		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2903		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2904		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2905		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2906		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2907		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2908		Parent of child at another local primary school
2909		Parent of child at another local primary school
2910		Parent of child at another local primary school
2911		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2912		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2913		Parent of child at another local primary school
2914		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2915		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2916		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2917		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2918		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2919		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2920		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2921		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2922		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2923		Parent of child at another local primary school
2924		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2925		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2926		Parent of child at another local primary school
2927		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2928		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2929		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2930		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2931		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2932		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2933		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2934		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2935		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2936		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

2937		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2938		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2939		Parent of child at another local primary school
2940		Parent of child at another local secondary school
2941		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2942		Parent of child at another local primary school
2943		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2944	I think it's absurd that a child living in the current Clare House or Hawes Down catchment area would have priority over those currently in LGSB/LPSG catchment area and in particular those children attending Unicorn Primary School	Parent of child at another local primary school
2945	Not everyone can afford to live in the catchment for these secondary schools, so if the primary school is given consideration that can only be a good thing. I am a bit concerned that the primary schools will become heavily oversubscribed due to the admissions policy.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2946		Unknown
2947		Parent of child at another local primary school
2948		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2949		Parent of child at another local primary school
2950		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2951		Parent of child at another local primary school
2952		Parent of child at another local primary school
2953		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2954	I understand to a degree the appeal of having a formula that is set out from primary to secondary school, however I think that by taking children out of the area leads to a breakdown in community, children are less able to meet up with their friends, walk to school together. They will all be ferried in by car. It also limits access to variety of children from different backgrounds and academic abilities.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools, Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
2955		Parent of child at another local primary school
2956		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2957		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2958		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2959		Parent of child at another local primary school
2960		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child under 2 years
2961	I strongly feel that all local schools- such as Unicorn should be included as feeder schools. Not just the schools that are in the same trust. The trust schools should not have an unfair advantage.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2962	I would hope that a local secondary school offers a fair system for all local students so that education is not a lottery based on blind luck when trying to gain entry to a school at primary level.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2963		Parent of child at another local primary school
2964		Parent of child at another local primary school
2965		Parent of child at another local primary school
2966		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2967		Parent of child at another local primary school
2968		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2969		Parent of child at another local primary school

2970	changes and would like to see a local secondary school for local children. . We are against these	Parent of child at another local primary school
2971		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2972		Parent of child at another local secondary school
2973		Parent of child at another local primary school
2974	My only other comment would be that of fairness. Should a local child be refused access to one of the Langley secondary schools in preference to a student of Clare House who lives much further away, that would appear colossally unfair.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2975		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2976		Parent of child at another local primary school
2977		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2978		Parent of child at another local primary school
2979		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2980		Parent of child at another local primary school
2981		Parent of child at another local primary school
2982	narrowing down the catchment of one of the few good secondary schools in the area seems inappropriate and unfair to the other schools that contain children that would currently be in the catchment area due to home address. Application to the school should remain fair to all local children and not limit itself to a small number of schools.	Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2983		Parent of child at another local primary school
2984	The proposal to have feeder schools is completely unfair. We have purchased our house (similar to lots of other parents) to be within the Langley catchment our children attend Oak Lodge.	Unknown
2985	This would be catastrophic for parents of students that live near the Langley secondary schools but that would now have a much lower priority than those potentially living the other side of	Parent of child at another local primary school, Representative of another interested organisation
2986		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
2987		Parent of child at another local primary school
2988		Parent of child at another local primary school
2989		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at another local secondary school
2990		Parent of child at another local primary school
2991		Non-parent who is an interested party (please state why in the comments section above), Representative of a local primary school (community or VC)
2992	I feel these proposals are discriminating against local children attending primary schools in trusts that don't contain secondary schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2993	both schools are within a short walking distance from our home address. I would like both my children to be on the same campus and not to have to walk past a good secondary school to attend one further away. I feel these proposals are discriminatory against children attending Primary schools in trusts that don't contain secondary schools.	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2994	As a state school, it should be open equally, fairly, and in an unbiased way to all the residents and local tax payers - it should not be predicated based upon which primary school was selected by the council 7 years previously.	Parent of child at another local primary school
2995		Parent of child at another local primary school

2996	Overall, this seems to mark a shift from an equal and fair system, that allows state schools to remain open to all local residents. All residents pay taxes that fund the school, and parents at feeder schools pay no more or less than those of other residents. There is no reason for them to be given preferential treatment, rather education should remain open to all those that wish to attend	Parent of child at another local primary school
2997	Bullers Wood Secondary schools have adopted a sibling rule for children at either the girls or boys schools which is essential for parents trying to keep families closer together, especially for working parents.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
2998		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
2999		Parent of child at another local primary school
3000		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3001		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3002		Parent of child at another local primary school
3003		Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of child under 2 years
3004		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3005		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3006		Parent of child at another local secondary school, Parent of child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
3007		Parent of child at another local primary school
3008		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3009		Parent of child at another local primary school
3010		Parent of child at another local primary school
3011		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3012		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3013	As parents of children at Langley Park Primary School we were promised that the primary school would become a feeder school. We all chose the school on this basis and would be very disappointed if this did not become the case. Some may even leave the primary school.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3014		Parent of child at another local primary school
3015	I would like to retain the current status quo. My son is in year 5 and I will be applying next year and think it's fair to keep to the current format.	Parent of child at another local primary school
3016		Parent of child at another local primary school
3017	What is the justification for excluding PICKHURST JR SCHOOL but including Clare House which is not even close to the Secondary Schools?	Parent of child at another local primary school
3018	I think prioritising staff's children for the purposes of attracting and retaining staff is a very good idea.	Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3019		Parent of child aged 18 years or under who is not currently attending school
3020	The whole of Bromley schools admission (and indeed most of England) operates on a distance-to-school basis. This creates a fair system where children are on the whole travelling to schools close to them, avoids extra traffic and allows children to live and attend school in the same community, creating a cohesive learning/life environment. To upend this throws families into chaos. I refer you to the case of the Rivers Academy in Feltham which tried to bring in a similar regime, that was strongly opposed by local parents. 'The Fair Admissions Campaign (FAC) said it could lead to "greater manipulation" and "cheating" in policies while the Office Schools Adjudicator's chief adjudicator Elizabeth Passmore raised similar concerns.'	Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3021		Parent of child at another local primary school
3022		Non-parent who is an interested party
3023		Parent of child at another local primary school
3024		Parent of child at another local primary school
3025		Parent of child at another local primary school
3026		Parent of child at another local primary school
3027		Representative of a local primary school (foundation, VA or academy)

3028		Non-parent who is an interested party
3029		Non-parent who is an interested party
3030		Unknown
3031		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3032		Unknown
3033		Parent of child at another local primary school
3034		Unknown
3035		Parent of child at another local primary school
3036		Unknown
3037		Parent of a child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3038		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3039		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3040		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3041	These proposals seem very unfair to local primary schools in Beckenham where traditionally many children have transferred to Langley Park schools – Unicorn, Marian Vian, Worsely Bridge. Giving preference to the Trust primary schools will increase the catchment area and goes against the generally accepted criteria of distance from school that has been used in the past and which maintains community cohesion in the area.	Non-parent who is an interested party
3042		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3043		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3044		Unknown
3045		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
3046		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
3047		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3048		Parent of child at another local primary school
3049		Non-parent who is an interested party, Representative of a local primary school
3050		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
3051		Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
3052		Parent of child at another local primary school
3053		Non-parent who is an interested party
3054		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3055		Parent of child at another local primary school
3056		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3057		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of a child aged 2+ years who has not yet started school
3058		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3059		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3060		Unknown
3061		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3062		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools, Parent of child at another local secondary school
3063		Parent of child at another local primary school
3064		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3065		Unknown
3066		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3067		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools
3068		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools

3069		Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3070		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3071		Parent of child at another local primary school
3072		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3073		Parent of child at another local primary school, Parent of child at one of the Trust's secondary schools
3074		Non-parent who is an interested party
3075		Parent of child at one of the Trust's primary schools

Parent of
child at
one of the
Trust's
secondary
schools

Parent of
child aged
2+ years
who has
not yet
started
school