

**Analysis of Responses to Public Consultation
Summary Report**

**Proposed Relocation of Jessie Younghusband Primary School,
Expansion of St Anthony's School, and Catchment Area Review**

A public consultation exercise was undertaken by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) between 14 December 2023 and 31 January 2024 via social media, email, paper form and online via the Your Voice website <https://yourvoice.westsussex.gov.uk/jessie-younghusband-st-anthony-s-and-catchments>

The consultation sought views on the proposals from stakeholders, the local community and responses were collected via the Your Voice webpage.

The consultation sought feedback from the community on the intention to;

Relocate Jessie Younghusband Primary School from its current location to a new 1 Form of Entry (FE) Primary School (210 places) which is being built on the housing development West of Chichester, known as Minerva Heights.

Expand St Anthony's school by circa 50 places, utilising the vacated buildings of Jessie Younghusband Primary School, providing much needed additional places for children aged between 4 and 16 with moderate learning needs.

The proposals also included the revision to the catchment areas for Jessie Younghusband Primary School, Parklands Community Primary School and Fishbourne C of E Primary School, these catchment changes will only be implemented if the proposal to relocate Jessie Younghusband Primary school are approved. Details of the proposed revisions can be found in Appendix 2.

There were 624 survey responses received during the consultation, entered on the Your Voice website from parent/carers, local residents, school staff and governors. No responses were discounted as all were correctly input. There were no postal responses received. One response was received after the closing date of 31 January 2024 and therefore is not included and does not form part of the analysis of comments received.

Representations opposing the proposals were received from the following groups and associations; The Governing Body of Jessie Younghusband Primary School, , The East Broyle Residents Association, Summersdale Residents Association and local members of Chichester District and City Councils. The Chair of Governors of Parklands Community Primary School submitted a response on behalf of the full governing body that confirmed they neither opposed or supported the proposals.

An online petition was organised objecting to the proposals for the school to relocate to the new housing development known as Minerva Heights and was brought to the attention of the County Council. It had 666 signatures on 31 January. The response levels that the petition has received are noted, however the petition has not been submitted in a format whereby the County Council is able to verify addresses and names with regard to duplication, accuracy, or locality, in line with the Council's [Petitions guidance](#) .

Appendix 1

A petition was received via the County Council's e-petitions page of the website requesting a Pedestrian Crossing Sherbourne Road/Norwich Road, Chichester. The petition closed on 31 January 2024, coinciding with the closure of the public consultation on the proposals regarding Jessie Younghusband School. The petition received 23 signatures, which have all be verified as valid.

The consultation webpage received 1,641 visitors in total, 624 or 38% of whom went on to complete the survey.

Of the 624 responses received, in relation to the relocation of Jessie Younghusband Primary School 223 (35.7%) were in support of the proposals, 370 (59.3%) were opposed to the proposals and 31(5%) neither supported or opposed the proposals.

442 (70.8%) respondents made varied comments and concerns in relation to the relocation of Jessie Younghusband Primary School. The main focus of these concerns has been summarised in the table below: -

| Concern Raised | Response to Concerns |
|---|--|
| <p>The number of proposed houses at the Minerva Heights (MH) development justifies its own school, why have you decided to move Jessie Younghusband Primary School (JYH) and reduce the number of school places available for in excess of 2,500 homes?</p> | <p>The Minerva Heights development is only expected to deliver some 1,600 homes when fully complete. The first phase (currently underway) is for 750 homes with an expected 850 homes in the second phase. Pupil numbers will therefore grow over time but the level of initial demand for places will be small. This size of development will, in time, require up to a 2 Form Entry (FE) (420 pupils) primary school. The relocation of Jessie Younghusband Primary School allows an existing primary school to move into the new buildings and increase, over time, to 2FE and ensure sufficient local provision. Overall pupil numbers across the City have declined in recent years and there is sufficient capacity across the whole of the City to meet projected demand.</p> |
| <p>Why is the school at MH not being built as a 2 form entry from the outset.</p> | <p>The developers are building the first phase of the primary school which will have classrooms for a 1 Form Entry (FE) primary school (210 pupils) but with core facilities sized to meet a 2FE (420 pupils) need in the future. The pupil demand from the Minerva Heights development does not warrant a 2FE primary school at this stage. However, the County Council has stated that it does expect, in time, to require the school to expand. As Jessie Younghusband Primary School currently admits pupils from across the city the relocation to Minerva Heights should enable local need from the proposed catchment area to be met.</p> |

Appendix 1

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Moving JYH away from the centre of the current estate will damage the community focus.</p> | <p>The County Council would hope that Minerva Heights will provide an extended community rather than something separate. This should be helped by providing a link to the new area through the full use of the school site from the start. The new location for Jessie Younghusband Primary School should not prevent it from meeting the community needs and focus of its proposed catchment area as schools typically serve a large community area.</p> |
| <p>JYH is already oversubscribed increasing the catchment area will make it harder for residents in North Chichester to secure a place</p> | <p>The new school will have the capacity to expand and meet demand for this popular school. Overall demand for places is decreasing.</p> |
| <p>The majority of children currently walk, cycle or scoot to JYH, there is no safe way for this to continue, Centurion Way has no lighting and regularly floods, the other option is walking along the narrow path along the main road, which is not safe, with no pedestrian crossing</p> | <p>Centurion Way is used by many walkers and cyclists and is a popular route. Flooding is infrequent and very seasonal and only significant on a small stretch and can be managed as for any path affected by wet weather. Discussions have begun with WSP.com (a multinational engineering and design firm) on options for improvements. Feedback from local residents and observation of school start and finish times shows that many pupils are already transported to school in vehicles. The alternative route crossing St Paul's Road and using a tarmac footpath alongside St Paul's Road to enter Minerva Heights from the North is no different to many other routes used by parents and carers to accompany their children to schools across the County.</p> |
| <p>Increased traffic to/from the MH development is not promoting WSCC transport/climate change policies</p> | <p>The County Council will look to the school to develop its existing School Travel Plan and encourage greater numbers of pupils to walk, cycle or scoot to school, accompanied as necessary by parents/carers, and thereby reduce the need for parents/carers to use vehicles.</p> |
| <p>MH school site is inadequately designed with roadways too small and insufficient parking to consider pickups / drop offs. This will result in dangerous environment for children at both ends of the school day.</p> | <p>The County Council wishes to encourage more pupils to walk, cycle or scoot to the new school site, accompanied as necessary by parents/carers, and thereby reduce the number of vehicles that might wish to access the school. It is not considered sustainable to design school settings to accommodate vehicle pick up and drop off.</p> |

Appendix 1

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Why wasn't there a public meeting held to share openly the proposals and respond to parent's concerns?</p> | <p>The format of online consultations has been used since 2020 to allow the opportunity for anyone interested to read the proposals rather than limiting the opportunity to one public meeting. Many people find it easier to make their views known through digital media rather than in a public forum. It also provides a better record of comments. The consultation itself is the opportunity for anyone to express their concerns so that all issues are considered by the Cabinet Member in making their decision on the proposals. Responses to issues cannot always be given immediately when voiced as they may need to be considered more fully.</p> |
| <p>Jessie Younghusband Primary should not move location. Therefore, its catchment should not increase. As part of the planning approval for Minerva Heights, a primary school was promised. That should be delivered.</p> | <p>A primary school is being delivered for Minerva Heights as required through planning. The County Council initially suggested a reduced catchment area for Jessie Younghusband Primary School to the Co-Chairs of Governors and they asked that the consultation should be on retaining the existing catchment and increasing it to include most of the Minerva Heights development. The current proposals fulfil the requirement that a school will be delivered on the Minerva Heights development.</p> |
| <p>All schools are popular and do not have spaces. This will just add further pressure for school spaces in an area of the city which has no other options for primary schools. Previously promised new schools were never built which is why JYH is already oversubscribed.</p> | <p>Many of the existing primary schools across Chichester such as St Joseph's Infant & Junior Schools and Kingsham Primary School have pupil numbers significantly below the school's capacity and therefore alternative school places are available in the City. A proposed primary school at Graylingwell was not progressed due to the limited pupil demand from that development and the site constraints did not allow for it to be expanded. The County Council recognises Jessie Younghusband Primary School is a popular and oversubscribed school and that is due to parental preference as places do exist at other schools across the City. The proposals provide the best means of enabling the school to expand.</p> |

Of the 624 responses received, in relation to the expansion of St Anthony's school into the vacated Jessie Younghusband Primary School buildings 229 (36.7%) were in support of the proposals, 332 (53.2%) were opposed to the proposals and 63 (10.1%) neither supported or opposed the proposals.

443 (70.9%) respondents made varied comments and concerns in relation to the expansion of St Anthony's School into the vacated Jessie Younghusband Primary

Appendix 1

School buildings. The main focus of these concerns has been summarised in the table below: -

| Concerns Raised | Responses to Concerns |
|---|---|
| <p>St Anthony's school should not expand on the Jessie site, it serves a wide catchment area there will be a greater increase in traffic as the majority of pupils arrive by minibus, taxi or car generating traffic unrelated to the area, at the expense of a school serving the immediate locality, in safe walking distance of most pupils.</p> | <p>The Governing Body of St Anthony's Special School believe the expansion of places on the current Jessie Younghusband site will enable a greater benefit to meeting the needs of its pupils rather than operating on a split site. The proposed increase in pupil numbers at St Anthony's will allow it to meet more needs from the Chichester area and reduce the need to send children with SEN further afield. The number of vehicles accessing the site will be similar to that at most other Special Schools across the County. It will be the same, or possibly greater, if the expansion is across two sites.</p> |
| <p>Support the need for increased SEND provision, however St Anthony's site is large enough for an expansion, which is the obvious solution and not at the expense, disruption and inconvenience of pupils and staff at Jessie Younghusband School?</p> | <p>This is not the case and is not supported by the Governors. Further expansion on the St Anthony's site whilst retaining the current number of pupils at Jessie Younghusband Primary School will place significantly greater pressure on the traffic accessing the site. The proposals allow for increased numbers of children with SEN to receive local provision and for Jessie Younghusband Primary School to relocate into a modern building that has the capacity for expansion when need requires.</p> |
| <p>We are aware of the huge deficit that the council is carrying (£70m) and that currently no feasibility study has been undertaken and no budget has been set for the proposed adaptation and refurbishment of JYH for use by St Anthony's so how can this even be a viable proposal?</p> | <p>This may be a reference to an accounting deficit related to SEND as part of the level of Government funding for education. It has no bearing on the Council's capital investment in delivering school places. The Council must meet demand for such provision and the funding deficit does not override that obligation.</p> <p>The proposals will help limit the significant financial cost of SEN provision by increasing provision for the Chichester area and limiting the need for pupils to be transported to other schools. All capital projects require a Business Case that progresses through the County's Capital Governance procedures to ensure an appropriate budget is secured.</p> |
| <p>St Anthony's school currently has 235 places. The proposed plan would provide a further 50 places from the conversion of JYS. WSCC anticipate that 300 places will be required over next 5 years. This means that by the time the relocation and</p> | <p>The additional 50 places will provide a much needed increase in SEN Places. The County Council will continue to explore options for increasing SEN places across the County. A number of other schemes are underway or in preparation as part of</p> |

Appendix 1

| | |
|--|--|
| conversions are complete, capacity is likely to already be insufficient. The proposal does therefore not meet the stated aim of expanding SEND provision to meet the anticipated demand. | an earlier Cabinet commitment to SEND provision. |
|--|--|

Of the 624 responses received, in relation to the revision of the catchment area for Jessie Younghusband Primary School 173 (27.7%) were in support of the proposals, 328 (52.6%) were opposed to the proposals and 123 (19.7%) neither supported or opposed the proposals.

Of the 624 responses received, in relation to the revision of the catchment area for Parklands Community Primary School 178 (28.5%) were in support of the proposals, 194 (31.1%) were opposed to the proposals and 252 (40.4%) neither supported or opposed the proposals.

Of the 624 responses received, in relation to the revision of the catchment area for Fishbourne C of E Primary School 180 (28.8%) were in support of the proposals, 150 (24.0%) were opposed to the proposals and 294 (47.1%) neither supported or opposed the proposals.

249 (39.9%) respondents made varied comments and concerns in relation to the revision of the catchment areas with the majority of the comments relating to the proposals for Jessie Younghusband Primary School. The main focus of these concerns have been summarised in the table below:-

| Concerns Raised | Response to Concerns |
|--|--|
| The new catchment area for JYH will mean that children from North Chichester will be phased out of being able to attend the school in the future | As Jessie Younghusband Primary School is already heavily oversubscribed this currently means many families are unable to secure places. The relocation and expected future expansion of the school will give more pupils the opportunity to attend the school. Children from the North of Chichester are still able to attend other schools in the area such as St Josephs Infants & Junior School, Parklands Primary and Portfield Primary. |
| JYH is already oversubscribed increasing the catchment area will make it harder for residents in North Chichester to secure a place | Parents already have the ability to express a preference for any school and this may not always be to the closest school to the home address. As the school is already oversubscribed the admissions criteria are currently used to allocate places up to the Published Admissions Number and all pupils are offered a place at an alternative school. The proposals will provide an opportunity for JYH to expand. |
| Why has the Parklands Catchment been reduced by over half for a two form entry school and JYH catchment increased massively for a one form entry school? | The revised catchment area for Parklands School reflects the need to revise its catchment if Jessie Younghusband Primary School relocates to Minerva Heights and the wishes of the Co-Chairs of Governors at Jessie Younghusband |


| | |
|---|---|
| | Primary School to retain their existing catchment area and expand to include most of the Minerva Heights development. It also anticipates the potential expansion. |
| The proposed new catchment for Jessie Younghusband is completely unrealistic, for an already as the council describe "oversubscribed primary school" to triple the size of the catchment area, but only create 210 additional primary school placements is not a long term investment | The proposed catchment area is larger than initially proposed by the County Council. As catchment areas are reviewed on a regular basis this may be an issue to explore at a future date. Pupil numbers and demand for places will continue to be assessed to inform any review of catchment areas. |

The County Council asks social demographic questions to help monitor the effectiveness of its surveys and to undertake an equalities analysis in fulfilment of its Public Sector Equalities Duties under the 2010 Equalities Act.

In line with the county council’s policy outlined above not all respondents chose to answer the following questions.

Which of the following best describes you?

| | | |
|--|-----|-------|
| Parent/Carer | 253 | 40.5% |
| School Staff (including support staff) | 65 | 10.4% |
| School Governor | 9 | 1.4% |
| Local Resident | 255 | 40.9% |
| Other | 42 | 6.7% |
| Student | 0 | 0% |




Appendix 1

● Parent/Carer (please specify) ● School Staff (including support staff) ● Student ● School Governor ● Local Resident ● Other

If you are a Parent/Carer, how old are your children?

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Pre school 0-4 | 83 |
| Primary Age 4-11 | 225 |
| Secondary Age 11-16 | 49 |
| Post 16 | 18 |
| Not Applicable | 27 |




Age

| | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|
| 12 or under | 4 | 0.6% |
| 13 - 19 | 3 | 0.5% |
| 20 - 24 | 9 | 1.5% |
| 25 - 34 | 61 | 9.9% |
| 35 - 44 | 201 | 32.6% |
| 45 - 54 | 107 | 7.3% |
| 55 - 64 | 63 | 10.2% |


Appendix 1

| | | |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| 65 -74 | 78 | 12.6% |
| 75 - 84 | 35 | 5.7% |
| 85+ | 2 | 0.3% |
| Prefer not to say | 54 | 8.8% |




Sex (note this question is about sex as defined by the 2010 Equalities Act. It is not about gender)

| | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|
| Male | 178 | 29% |
| Female | 373 | 60.8% |
| Prefer not to say | 62 | 10.1% |



What is your ethnic group?


| | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| White British | 497 | 81.6% |
| White Other | 24 | 3.9% |
| Mixed | 8 | 1.3% |
| Black | 6 | 1% |
| Asian | 7 | 1.1% |
| Other | 2 | 0.3% |
| Chinese | 0 | 0% |
| Gypsy/Irish traveller | 0 | 0% |
| Prefer not to say | 65 | 10.7% |



What is your religion?

| | | |
|--------------------|-----|-------|
| No Religion | 216 | 35.5% |
| Christian | 297 | 48.8% |
| Buddhist | 1 | 0.2% |
| Hindu | 3 | 0.5% |
| Jewish | 1 | 0.2% |
| Muslim | 3 | 0.5% |
| Sikh | 1 | 0.2% |
| Any other religion | 6 | 1% |
| Prefer not to say | 80 | 13.2% |

Appendix 1



An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed in more detail (Appendix 3) showing no detrimental impact on the equality groups of age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership, pregnancy or maternity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, part-time workers or those with caring responsibilities, socio-economic groups or other socially excluded communities).