

Appendix 5: Summary of Representations Received During the Statutory Notice Period

This appendix summarises the representations received in response to the statutory notice on the proposal to discontinue the use of the Valley Campus as an additional site of Hove Park School and consolidate all provision onto one site at the Nevill Campus with effect from 1 September 2028. A total of 17 representations were received in response to the statutory notice: 15 submitted through the online consultation portal, of which 14 included substantive written comments, and a further 3 received by email. In line with normal practice, individual responses have not been reproduced; instead, the representations have been analysed and grouped into the main themes raised, set out below.

Overall, the representations reflect a range of views on the principle of consolidation, with opposition to the proposal expressed more frequently than support. Some respondents supported bringing the school onto a single site, recognising the educational and financial rationale for doing so. However, the majority of responses raised concerns about the wider implications of the proposal, particularly for local residents living near the Nevill Campus and for the future capacity of the school.

Summary of Themes Raised

These themes will be considered alongside the educational, financial and operational reasons for the proposal.

Detailed matters such as final site layout, traffic management, construction impacts, lighting and noise mitigation, and community use of sports facilities will be considered separately through the planning process, including further engagement with affected neighbours on the siting of sports facilities where relevant.

1. Financial Implications and Value for Money

A number of respondents raised concerns regarding the financial impact of the proposal. Some felt that the school had already been financially disadvantaged by operating across two sites and were concerned that consolidation could bring further unfair financial impact if not carefully managed.

Others expressed concern about the capital cost of building new facilities at the Nevill Campus, and felt that the Council should avoid unnecessary borrowing or expenditure by making fuller use of existing facilities before constructing new ones.

A number of respondents also questioned whether consolidation would deliver the intended savings, noting that ongoing costs such as staffing, energy and maintenance would continue regardless of the number of sites, and that funding is linked to pupil numbers, which some felt could be put at risk by any reduction in overall capacity. One respondent argued that, if funding pressures were driven by pupil numbers, the Council should instead pursue measures to attract more pupils to the school rather than reducing capacity, which they felt would be counterproductive to that aim.

2. Land Use, Site Development and Loss of Green Space

Several respondents questioned the underlying rationale for the proposal, with some suggesting it was driven primarily by the disposal of the Valley Campus site for housing development and associated financial return, rather than by educational need.

Concerns were also raised about over-development of the Nevill Campus and the potential loss of green/playing field space, with a preference expressed for retaining existing open space and minimising new-build footprint.

A number of respondents linked this to anticipated population growth from nearby housing developments, arguing that the additional capacity provided by the Valley Campus site should not be given up given future demand in the area. Several referred to specific developments either under construction or planned in the vicinity, including at Sackville Estate, Hove Gardens, Toads Hole Valley, Lyon Close and Benfield/North of Hangleton Lane, and felt that falling birth rate projections did not adequately account for this anticipated growth in the school-age population. A small number of respondents also noted that, while pupil numbers can fluctuate over time, the loss of a school site would be permanent, and felt that any decision on this basis should therefore be delayed pending a fuller assessment of future demand.

3. Location and Impact of the New Sports Pitch(es)

This was the most frequently raised theme. Respondents living near the Nevill Campus raised concerns about the proposed position of the new all-weather (3G/4G) sports pitch, in particular its proximity to neighbouring residential boundaries and gardens. Concerns included potential noise and light pollution from floodlighting, use of the pitch outside school hours (including evenings, weekends and holidays), and a request that a noise and light pollution assessment be carried out and shared before a final decision on pitch location is made.

Several respondents asked to be involved in decisions on the final siting of the pitch, and suggested alternative locations further from residential boundaries (for example nearer the allotments or in the south-east corner of the site) to reduce impact on neighbours. One respondent referenced Sport England guidance on recommended separation distances between floodlit pitches and neighbouring properties, and felt the proposed location did not meet this; another stated that, under one of the draft layout options, floodlights would be sited less than five metres from the nearest residential property. A number of respondents suggested that development, including any 3G/4G pitch, would be better located towards the south-east corner of the site near the Old Shoreham Road/Nevill Road junction, making use of the existing netball courts and an associated access from Old Shoreham Road, so as to reduce disturbance to the rest of the school site and to neighbouring properties.

4. Traffic, Parking and Road Safety

Respondents raised concerns about existing traffic congestion and illegal or inconsiderate parking around the Nevill Road/Nevill Avenue area at school drop-off and pick-up times, noting that several schools already share this route.

There was concern that consolidating pupil numbers onto a single site, together with a new access point for Year 7 pupils, would increase congestion and safety risks on an already busy road, and that current parking restrictions are not well enforced. Some respondents also referred to existing pressure on Old Shoreham Road and the surrounding junctions, noting that four schools already share this general area, and cited additional local traffic generators including the introduction of the 3X bus route along Nevill Avenue and traffic associated with nearby retail premises.

Suggestions to mitigate traffic impacts included the introduction of speed humps on Nevill Avenue and landscaping improvements to the roundabout at Nevill Avenue/Nevill Road to discourage unsafe pedestrian crossing.

5. Consultation Process and Stakeholder Engagement

Some respondents felt that the concerns of local residents had not been sufficiently acknowledged in feedback on the consultation outcomes, and that the focus had been placed on educational and SEND considerations without addressing environmental and residential impact.

Concerns were also raised about the length of time available to comment, and a perception that many consultation responses opposing the proposal had not materially influenced the outcome. A small number of respondents stated their belief, based on their own reading of consultation responses, that a majority of respondents were opposed to the proposal, and felt that this should carry significant weight in the decision-making process; the specific figures quoted for the proportions opposed and in support varied between respondents.

6. Support for Consolidation in Principle

It should be noted that several respondents were supportive of the principal of consolidating the school onto a single site, and in some cases explicitly welcomed the benefits this could bring for pupils. Their representations focused on how specific elements of the scheme, particularly the sports pitch location and pedestrian crossing provision, should be implemented rather than opposing consolidation itself.

7. Educational Benefits of the Split-Site Model

A number of respondents, including parents of current pupils, valued the existing split-site arrangement and felt that a smaller campus setting benefited pupils who are anxious, vulnerable or neurodiverse, making it easier for them to access school than a larger, single combined site might allow. Concerns were also raised that consolidating pupil numbers onto one site would reduce the amount of outside space available per pupil, and that this should be weighed against the operational and financial case for consolidation.

