OFFICER REPORT TO EXECUTIVE

CONSULTATION ON SURREY’S ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2010 FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS
17 MARCH 2009

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

1. Subsequent to the statutory annual consultation on Surrey’s Admission Arrangements for September 2010 the Executive is asked to consider the responses and recommend to the County Council the Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2010. Some proposal arrangements may now vary in order to:

   i) reflect the responses to the consultation;
   ii) to meet local need.

BUSINESS CASE:

2. On 7 November 2008 the following documents were circulated for consultation with a closing date for response of 9 January 2009. This timeframe was within the new statutory requirements for consultation on admission arrangements:

   i) Surrey’s proposed admission criteria for September 2010 for the majority of Community and Voluntary Controlled schools (Annex 1 Section A)

   ii) Proposed local admission criteria in Epsom and Ewell (Auriol Junior, Wallace Fields Junior and Southfield Park Primary Schools) - Annex 1 Section B

   iii) Proposed local admission criteria in Guildford (The Howard of Effingham and Walsh Church of England Junior Schools) – Annex 1 Section C

   iv) Proposed local admission criteria in Mole Valley (Brockham Primary and Eastwick Junior Schools) – Annex 1 Section D

   v) Proposed local admission criteria in Reigate & Banstead (Warren Mead Junior School) – Annex 1 Section E

   vi) Proposed local admission criteria in Runnymede (New Haw Junior and Ottershaw Junior Schools) – Annex 1 Section F

   vii) Proposed local admission criteria in Spelthorne (Spelthorne Junior School) – Annex 1 Section G
viii) Proposed local admission criteria in Surrey Heath (Hammond Junior and Crawley Ridge Junior Schools) – Annex 1 Section H
ix) Proposed local admission criteria in Tandridge (Hamsey Green Junior, Warlingham and Oxted Schools) – Annex 1 Section I
x) Proposed local admission criteria in Waverley (All Voluntary Controlled and Community Schools in the Borough and Shottermill Junior School) – Annex 1 Section J
xi) Proposed local admission criteria in Woking (The Hermitage Junior and West Byfleet Junior Schools) – Annex 1 Section K
xii) Primary and Secondary Voluntary Aided / Foundation schools giving priority to local applicants (Annex 2a and 2b))
xiii) Surrey’s Coordinated Schemes for primary and secondary schools (Annexes 3 and 4)
xiv) The proposed Published Admissions Numbers (PANs) for 2010 for all Community and Voluntary Controlled schools (Annex 5)
xv) Surrey's proposed Admission Relevant Area for September 2010 admissions (Annex 6)

3. Schools were also sent a suggested form of wording for parents (Annex 7 - attached). The consultation was also published on Surrey’s website and advertised in local Surrey newspapers as required by new legislation

4. A summary of Surrey’s proposed admission arrangements is outlined below:

A. All Surrey schools will operate an Equal Preference System.

B. In order to create stability or consistency for the majority of parents the admissions criteria for the majority of Surrey’s Community and Voluntary Controlled schools will remain the same as those used for September 2009 when a school is oversubscribed:

   1. Looked After Children
   2. Exceptional Arrangements
   3. Siblings
   4. Children for whom the school is the nearest
   5. Any other applicant

   The tie-breaker distance as measured by straight line, from Home to School will apply within each category as a means of prioritising places.

C. There was also a proposal to give priority to infant children to transfer to junior schools on shared / adjoining sites where the PAN of the junior school is equal to or larger than the PAN of the infant school (Annex 1, Sections B – K).

D. It was also proposed to phase out the sibling criterion at Oxted School for 2010, but maintain the nearest alternative school as a distance tie-breaker (Annex 1, Section I.3).

E. It was proposed to maintain different local arrangements agreed in September 2009 for The Howard of Effingham (Annex 1 Section C.1), Brockham (Annex 1, Section D.1) and Southfield Park Primary School (Annex 1, Section B.3) and for schools in the borough of Waverley (Annex1, Section J).
F. Waiting lists: - Initially, schools’ waiting lists will be held for the period of one academic year (September – July), except in the event of request(s) for places. Waiting lists must reflect the admissions criteria for each school.

5. The consultation documents listed in paragraph 2 were sent to:

- Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and Parent Governors of all Surrey Community, Voluntary Controlled, Voluntary Aided and Foundation Schools
- Diocesan Boards of Education
- Neighbouring Local Authorities
- Out-county Voluntary Aided and Foundation Schools within a 3/5 mile (4.8/8.0 km) radius of the Surrey border
- Surrey County Councillors
- Parish Councils
- Members of the Admissions Forum
- Early Years establishments in Surrey
- Local MPs
- District Members responsible for children
- Sustainable Development

6. By the closing date, 9 January 2009, in total 978 responses on the standardised response form had been received. These responses were from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Councillors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Forum Members</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>631*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring Local Authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (including other family members and members of the public)</td>
<td>288*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The majority of these responses were from parents / other groups likely to be affected by the proposed admissions criteria for The Howard of Effingham and the proposed changes for infant and junior schools on shared / adjoining sites in the borough of Epsom and Ewell.

NB Throughout this report where total numbers do not tally this will usually be because the respondents were able to give more than one answer, or failed to answer all the questions.

In addition to the 978 responses on the standardised response form, there were 232 responses in the form of emails, letters and petitions. This gives an overall total of 1,210. This figure includes the petitions but not the number of signatures.

A Summary of Responses:

7. A summary of the responses both on the standard form and by letter/ email and petition can be seen in the tables below in 7.1 and overleaf, 7.2. The full files are available for Members of the Executive to see if they so wish.
### TABLE 1: Summary of Responses to Admissions Consultation for September 2010 on the Standard Response Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All groups</th>
<th>Annex</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements - Epsom &amp; Ewell:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auriol Junior*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>33#</td>
<td>55#</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Fields Junior*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>68#</td>
<td>74#</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Park Primary*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>11#</td>
<td>35#</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements - Guildford:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard of Effingham**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh C of E Junior*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>10#</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Mole Valley:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockham Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwick Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41#</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Reigate and Banstead:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Mead Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Runnymede:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haw Community Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottershaw Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Spelthorne:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Surrey Heath:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond Community Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley Ridge Junior*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18#</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Tandridge:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamsey Green Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I.1</td>
<td>9#</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13#</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Waverley:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in the borough of Waverley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shottermill Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Arrangements – Woking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hermitage Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Byfleet Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lists of F/VA schools – priority to children nearest the school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a / 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional written responses / petitions received also.  
# View of headteacher / governing body.  
** Public meeting held.
TABLE 2: Summary of Additional Responses by Letter / Email / Action Group or Petition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re: School(s)</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
<th>No. Signed</th>
<th>No. of Petitions / statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auriol Junior</td>
<td>PEGS¹</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Fields Junior</td>
<td>PEGS²</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewell Grove Infant &amp; Nursery*</td>
<td>Letters / emails</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewell Grove Infant &amp; Nursery</td>
<td>Local Traders in Ewell Village</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Howard of Effingham#</td>
<td>KHITH³</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DDOCA⁴</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letters / emails</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Park Primary</td>
<td>SPACe⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh Memorial CE Infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh CE Junior</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley Ridge Junior</td>
<td>Letters / emails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted Secondary</td>
<td>Letters / emails</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knaphill Junior</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>LA / emails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Protect Ewell Grove School (parents/carers)
2. Protect Ewell Grove School (Ewell residents)
3. Keep Horsley in the Howard
4. Don’t Drive Our Children Away
5. Southfield Park Access Committee
* Meeting with governing body
# Public meeting

A further analysis of these responses is included in paragraphs 8 – 32.

Summary of written responses:

8. With the exception of Annex 1, A, B.1, B.2, B.3, C.1, C.2, D.2 and H.2, the numbers of responses received on the standard response form were relatively low and therefore one could argue that they are not particularly significant. This being the case it is somewhat difficult to draw conclusions.

9. However, the strength of feelings evident in comments on the standard response forms and other responses by individuals, action groups, etc, cannot be ignored. The relevant written comments both for and against the proposals are represented in figures 1 – 9 on pages 6 to 8 of this report.
### Figure 1 - Annex 1 Section B.1 - AURIOL JUNIOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It makes sense for children at adjoining junior school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but continue current sibling rule for 5 years</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would damage viability of Ewell Grove Infant &amp; Nursery</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to children attending other infant feeder school</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits 'choice' for children from Ewell Grove</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental to local community</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2 - Annex 1 Section B.2 - WALLACE FIELDS JUNIOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains continuity of education and social/peer groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less unsettling for children / parents</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage viability of Ewell Grove Infant</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate children resident in Ewell Village and threatens community</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits / changes choice</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to children attending other infant schools</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased pollution/traffic congestion, longer journeys, road safety issues</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would discourage children walking to local school</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not carry local consent</td>
<td>+ Petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 3 - Annex 1 Section B.3 - SOUTHFIELD PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would disadvantage residents of Horton Hill, Vancouver Close</td>
<td>Petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 4 - Annex 1 Section C.1 - HOWARD OF EFFINGHAM SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep Horsley in the Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surport feeder school criterion and catchment area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local schools for local children/HowE is local school for Horsley residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children should be able to walk/cycle to local/nearest/independent travel to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to nearest alternative school unfair to other local communities but advantages Horsley/prefer straight line distance/difficult to understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatens local communities / social friendships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic congestion travelling time, pollution/health detrements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5 - Annex 1 Section C.2 - WALSH CHURCH OF ENGLAND JUNIOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of learning &amp; shared values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better for pupils and parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name St Paul's (Tongham) as a feeder school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6 - Annex 1 Section D.2 - EASTWICK JUNIOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes sense for children attending the infant school to get priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages other feeder schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages local children who do not qualify for admission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits / changes parental choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would threaten viability of Polsden Lacey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes against Effingham Learning Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 7 - Annex 1 Section H.2 - CRAWLEY RIDGE JUNIOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removes uncertainty regarding junior education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of education/friendship groups and less disruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stressful for pupils/parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains close links with both schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes travel arrangements easier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase numbers walking to school and reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to children attending other infant (feeder) schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes/limits parental choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would damage viability of neighbouring schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 8 - Annex 1 Section I.3 - OXTED SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protects places for children living in the catchment area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to Catholic children living in catchment area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverock Independent School should be a named feeder school for Oxted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With projected falling rolls change is unnecessary (Governing Body) etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 9 - Annex 1 Section K.1 - HERMITAGE JUNIOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimises stress and uncertainty for parents and pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to children attending other infant feeder schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. These comments must be considered in conjunction with the responses expressed in Table 1 (paragraph 7.1) and Table 2 (paragraph 7.2) on pages 4 and 5 of this report.

**Analysis of Responses:**

11. It would not be a fair test in this analysis just to consider solely the numbers of responses and comments received, in as much as some responses were orchestrated and some communities/groups were larger than others. This is indicated by the higher numbers of responses and comments for a certain secondary school, and the lower number of responses for some junior schools.

12. Overall, 143 agreed that we should continue the admission arrangements for the majority of our schools as outlined in paragraphs 4A and B. 103 disagreed whilst 732 had no opinion.

13. The proposal in paragraph 4.C regarding infant and junior schools on shared/adjoining sites outlined in Annex 1, Sections B – K prompted mixed responses both in terms of numbers agreeing and disagreeing and in additional written responses.

14. In addition, Walsh Memorial Church of England Infant and Walsh Church of England Junior Schools consulted on an additional proposal to include St Paul’s Church of England Infant School as a named feeder school to Walsh Junior School. All these schools are Voluntary Controlled schools and this proposal and the one in paragraph 13 above were strongly supported by those that responded.

15. Knaphill Junior School also applied to have its PAN increased from 81 – 90 to match the PAN of Knaphill Lower School and asked that priority for admission to the junior school be given to these children attending the infant school for those parents that wanted it.

16. The headteachers and governing body of The Hermitage Junior and Oaktree Infant Schools, Ottershaw Junior and Ottershaw Infant Schools, Hamsey Green Infant and Junior Schools were among those respondents who supported the proposal to give priority for admission to those children attending the infant school on the shared/adjoining sites.

17. There was also strong opposition to the proposal to give priority for admissions to Wallace Fields Junior school to children attending Wallace Fields Infant School. This was evident at the meeting of the Governing Body which senior officers attended and also in responses on the standard response form (68 agreed, 74 disagreed) and in the additional comments received. Whilst circa 91 of the written comments indicated support for the proposal, circa 193 of the written comments were against the proposal because people felt that the proposal, if agreed, would damage the viability of Ewell Grove Infant and Nursery School and the local community and would increase traffic congestion (with all the knock-on effects) and limit/change parental choice. Petitions from PEGS (parents and carers), PEGS (Ewell residents) and local traders in Ewell Village also supported these views. The petitions are on file and also available at this meeting.

18. To a lesser degree the same proposal for Auriol Junior School was not well-supported by the schools concerned on the standard response form nor by PEGS and some parents.

19. For Eastwick Junior School, 21 agreed with the proposal whilst 41 disagreed. This was supplemented by additional written comments on the standard response form the majority of which objected to the proposal because it would disadvantage other feeder schools and threaten the viability of Polsden Lacey Infant School and limit or change parental choice.
20. There was very little response to the proposals for Warren Mead Junior School either on the standard response form (8 agreeing and 8 disagreeing) or by the number of additional written comments.

21. The same is true of responses in relation to New Haw Community, Ottershaw Junior, Spelthorne Junior, Hammond County Junior, Shottermill Junior and West Byfleet Junior Schools, although the views of the headteacher and governing body of the schools listed in paragraph 16 of this report should also be noted.

22. 35 agreed and 18 disagreed with the proposal for Crawley Ridge Junior School and this is supplemented by additional written comments in support of the proposal.

23. 11 agreed and 35 disagreed with the proposed admissions criteria for Southfield Park Primary School, namely giving priority to those living in the fixed catchment area, living the furthest distance from school. This proposal was objected to from those parents living just outside the catchment area in Horton Hill and Vancouver Close, who wanted their roads to be included in the catchment area. They formed the action group, SPACe and presented a petition to the Executive on 2 December 2008. Copies of the petition are on file but also available at this meeting. However, the Local Authority is increasing the number of places available at the school for both 2009 and 2010, so there should be enough places for children in the catchment area and for those for whom it is the nearest school.

24. On the standard response form 16 agreed and 13 disagreed with the proposal to phase out sibling priority for Oxted School but in the additional comments received it should be noted that the headteacher and governing body of Oxted School now do not support this proposal as the projected numbers show falling roles and therefore they feel this change is now unnecessary. Colleagues in School Place Planning support the fact that rolls are decreasing in the area (See Annex 7a). 16 of the additional written comments indicated that the arrangements were unfair to Catholic children in the catchment area and wanted St Francis Catholic Primary School to be included as a named feeder school for Oxted School. It would be unusual for a denominational school to be a named feeder school for a non-church state school.

25. In the additional comments for Oxted School (16) there were 8 requests for Laverock Independent School to be included as a named feeder school for Oxted. However, paragraph 2.72 of the new Code of Practice on School Admissions does not allow for independent schools to be named feeder schools to state schools.

26. There was no significant response to the proposals to maintain the arrangement of giving priority to those attending named feeder schools in Waverley before those children who live nearest to the school.

27 Again there was no significant response to maintaining a catchment area for Warlingham School.

28. The numbers of responses on the standard response form to the proposal to maintain the current 2009 arrangements for The Howard of Effingham School was by far the largest to the consultation with 526 agreeing and 202 disagreeing. The number of responses from the residents of Horsley, Keep Horsley in The Howard Action Group and responses from residents in Fetcham, Bookham and Don’t Drive Our Children Away Action Group indicated opposing views particularly with regard to the nearest alternative school rule being used as a distance tie-breaker within each category. (See Tables 1 and 2 and Figure 4). Both groups also claimed that the school was their local school. At a well-attended public meeting held at the school on 2 December 2008 those views were also expressed. The minutes of this meeting are on file as well as the submissions from Keep Horsley in The Howard Action Group and Don’t Drive Our Children Away Action Group.
Copies are also available for Members at this meeting. Their arguments were well-balanced. The only agreement (if one can call it that) was that the inclusion of the ‘feeder-school’ criterion should be maintained with Horsley respondents stating it was an acceptable compromise and Fetcham / Bookham respondents stating this criterion should be maintained if the nearest alternative school rule continued to be used as the distance tie-breaker in the future. There is no easy way to resolve these conflicting views to the benefit of both groups. The headteacher also attended the meeting of the Admissions Forum on 13 February 2009 to request that the Forum agree to include The Royal Kent School as an additional feeder school to The Howard of Effingham. The Forum agreed.

29. 12 agreed, 8 disagreed and 858 had no opinion regarding the list of Foundation / Voluntary Aided School that gave priority to local children in Annexes 2a and 2b.

30. 16 agreed and 8 disagreed and 954 had no opinion about Surrey’s Relevant Area.

31. One neighbouring Local Authority emailed objecting to the date for exchange of information in Surrey’s Coordinated School for secondary admission. It would be impossible to exchange information with neighbouring Local Authorities any earlier given the vast numbers of applications we deal with. However, this might be possible in future / subsequent years if the number of on-line admissions increases as these applications download straight into EMS.

32. In relation to Surrey allowing parents to state 3 ranked school preferences, 2 parents felt we should allow 6 preferences where they apply out-county for grammar schools places for their children.

Conclusion

33. Given the relatively low numbers of responses overall to the consultation it is difficult to draw conclusions other than to say that there was no significant strength of feeling either for or against the proposed admission arrangements for 2010.

34. The exceptions to this were the responses in relation to the admission arrangements for the Howard of Effingham, Eastwick Junior, Wallace Fields Junior and The Walsh Church of England Junior Schools.

35. **EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS:**
This has been completed and is attached in Annexes 12a and 12b.

36. **SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY:**
The Section 151 Officer confirms that all material financial and business issues have been taken into account in this report.

37. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**
It is recommended that the Executive recommends to the County Council the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2010 for Surrey’s Community and Voluntary Controlled schools:

37.1 Given these facts, it is **RECOMMENDED** that we keep the admission arrangements unchanged for the majority of Surrey’s community and voluntary controlled schools. These are as follows:

1. **First priority: looked after children**
Children who are registered as being in the care of a Local Authority (LA) (for example, fostered or living in a children’s home).
2. **Second priority: exceptional arrangements**
   Occasionally there will be a very small number of children for whom exceptional arrangements will apply. These exceptional arrangements may override other admissions priorities and the LA may apply them when they first offer places. The LA may also ask schools to admit over their Published Admission Number at other times under this category.

3. **Third priority: brothers and sisters (siblings)**
   After ‘exceptional arrangements’, places are then offered to siblings. A sibling is a child who will have an older brother or sister still at the school concerned at the time of the younger sibling’s admission. (So, a younger sibling will be given priority for admission only if the older sibling will still be at the school in September 2010.)

   Please note that this does **not** apply if the older brother or sister joined the school at sixth-form level.

4. **Fourth priority: children for whom the school is the nearest to their home**
   Currently the nearest school is defined as the school closest to the home address admitting pupils of the appropriate age-range, as measured by a straight line. The distance is measured from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey, to the nearest school gate available for pupils to use. Parents should note that if they apply for free transport different criteria apply and the distance from home to school will be measured using a different route.

   The nearest school may be either inside or outside the county boundary.

   The Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools in Surrey taken into account when assessing priority for admission to the nearest school are attached in Annex 2a for primary schools and 2b for secondary schools.

5. **Fifth priority: any other applicant**
   Distance as measured by a straight line from Home to School will apply within each category as a means of prioritising places. If there are two applicants from the same block of flats the applicant with the lowest door number will be given priority.

   **37.2 Reasons for Recommendations:**

   i) This would create stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey’s parents, pupils and schools;
   ii) They enable parents to have some historical benchmarks by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences;
   iii) These arrangements are also working reasonably well; and
   iv) Enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest school;
   v) This also reduces travel and supports Surrey’s Green Policies;
   vi) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.
The following local arrangements using different admission criteria are also working well with little / no evidence of objection:

i) Brockham Primary School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings of existing pupils who will be attending the school at the time of admission and for whom the school is the nearest community, voluntary controlled or foundation school
4. Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest community, voluntary controlled or foundation school
5. Siblings for whom the school is not the nearest school
6. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed, within any category, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

ii) Warlingham School

1. Looked after children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children who live within the fixed catchment area (attached in Annex 8)
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.
iii) Local Admission Arrangements in Waverley

1. Looked after children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children attending a named partner school. In alphabetical order these are:

   **Hale Primary School**
   Folly Hill Infant
   Weybourne Infant

   **Potter’s Gate Primary**
   St Andrew’s Infant

   **South Farnham Junior School**
   All Saints CofE (Aided) Infant
   The Bourne Community Infant
   St Andrew’s CofE (Controlled) Infant
   St John’s CofE (Aided) Infant
   St Mary’s CofE (Aided) Infant

   **William Cobbett Junior**
   Badshot Lea Infant
   Folly Hill Infant
   Weybourne Infant

   **Farnham Heath End School**
   Potter’s Gate Primary
   St Michael’s CE Junior (Hampshire)
   The Hale Primary
   William Cobbett Junior

   **Woolmer Hill School**
   Beacon Hill Community Primary
   St Bartholomew’s Church of England (Aided) Primary
   St Mary’s Church of England (Aided) Primary
   Shottermill Junior

5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
6. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed, within any category, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

37.4 It is therefore RECOMMENDED that Surrey maintain the local arrangements as set out in paragraph 37.3 above for September 2010.
37.5 **Reasons for Recommendations:**

i) This would create stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey’s parents, pupils and schools;

ii) They enable parents to have some historical benchmarks by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences;

iii) These arrangements are also working reasonably well; and

iv) Enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest school;

v) This also reduces travel and supports Surrey’s Green Policies;

vi) These arrangements also meet local need;

vii) It supports the view of the Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.6 Although there was an objection by SPACe in the form of a petition to the catchment area for Southfield Park Primary School these arrangements were the subject of an in-year variation upheld by the Office of the Schools’ Adjudicator last year. This being the case it is RECOMMENDED that the arrangements for Southfield Park Primary School as follows should not be changed for 2010:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children living in the defined catchment area (attached in Annex 9) of the school. If the number of applicants in the defined catchment area is greater than the number of places available at the school, places will be offered to those living the furthest distance from the school, measured in a straight line.
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category, other than 4. above, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

37.7 **Reasons for Recommendations:**

i) It is not sensible to keep changing the arrangements because those who are disadvantaged by them do not support them. The arrangements were the subject of an in-year variation to protect places at the school for those residents living some distance from the school on the new housing estates that the new school was built to serve.

ii) For 2009 and 2010 additional accommodation is being provided at the school and this will provide enough places for all children living in the catchment area and for children living outside the catchment area for whom it is the nearest school.

iii) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.
The Howard of Effingham School admission arrangements are as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Those children who both live in the catchment area, and who attend one of the following partner / feeder schools:

- Oakfield,
- Eastwick,
- St Lawrence,
- The Raleigh,
- The Dawnay

5. Those children who live in the catchment area (attached in Annex 10) but do not attend one of the partner/feeder schools named in 4. above
6. Any other applicant

If there is oversubscription from applicants within the catchment area, priority will be given to children who live furthest from their nearest alternative school as measured by straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

If the school is oversubscribed from applicants living outside the catchment area we will offer places, after all other criteria have been satisfied, according to distance from the permanent home address to the school. Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

i) As outlined in paragraph 28 there was a high level of responses both for and against these proposals. There is a definite split between the residents of The Horsley’s and residents of Bookham / Fetcham, particularly with regard to the Nearest Alternative School criterion as the distance tie-breaker;

ii) Although this is not supported by Bookham / Fetcham residents, it appears to be working for both sets of residents living within the catchment area and attending local named feeder schools in that children that qualify under the conjoint criterion do get offered places at the school;

iii) As stated in paragraph 28 the headteacher has now requested that the Royal Kent School should be added to the list of feeder schools to The Howard of Effingham. If this is agreed, this will now include all the schools in the Effingham Learning Partnership.

iv) Children living outside the catchment area may be offered The Howard if they live near the school but if not they have another local school they can be offered, albeit perhaps not the preferred first-ranked school.

It is therefore RECOMMENDED that the admission arrangement for The Howard of Effingham School remain unchanged for September 2010, as detailed in paragraph 37.8 above, except for the inclusion of The Royal Kent as a named feeder school.
37.9 **Reasons for Recommendations:**

i) The arrangements for the schools have been the subject of much debate and change in recent years. There seems little point in changing the admission arrangements yet again.

ii) A period of stability is needed to enable these arrangements to be tested robustly and to provide some benchmarking for parents to be able to make informed decisions.

iii) These arrangements include a ‘compromise’ made by both sets of residents in that only agreement on both sides is that the inclusion of the ‘feeder school’ criterion should be maintained with Horsley respondents stating it was an “acceptable compromise” and Fetcham / Bookham respondents stating this criterion should be maintained if the nearest alternative school rule continued to be used as the distance tie-breaker in the future.

iv) To include The Royal Kent School as a named feeder school supports the principles of the Effingham Learning Partnership and the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.10 The proposed admission arrangements for the following schools did not receive strong support:

i) **Auriol Junior School**

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending The Mead Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed, within any category, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

ii) **Wallace Fields Junior School**

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Wallace Fields Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed, within any category, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.
iii) Eastwick Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Eastwick Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

iv) In the case against the proposals for Wallace Fields Junior School (and to some extent Auriol Junior School) there were sufficient objections in the form of 3 petitions by different groups who stated that if this proposal was agreed, it would seriously damage the viability of Ewell Grove Infant and Nursery School.

v) To a lesser extent the responses to the proposed admission arrangement for Eastwick Junior School were similar in that responses stated that the proposal would damage the viability of Polsden Lacey Infant School.

It is therefore RECOMMENDED that the admissions arrangements for 2010 do not give priority for admission to children attending the infant schools on the shared / adjoining sites, and the admission arrangements for Auriol Junior School, Wallace Fields Junior School and Eastwick Junior School should remain unchanged from those arrangements for September 2009.

37.11 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) It was never the intention for the proposed arrangements to threaten the viability of any school or block other existing recruitment between schools.

ii) It demonstrates consideration of the views of those who responded to the consultation.

iii) This decision would have the support of local residents.

iv) It protects the local infant schools in question and the local communities.

v) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.12 It is RECOMMENDED that Surrey agrees the proposal to give priority for admissions to the junior school on shared / adjoining sites for the following schools:

i) Warren Mead Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Warren Mead Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant
If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

ii) New Haw Community Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending The Grange Community Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

iii) Ottershaw Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Ottershaw CofE Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

iv) Spelthorne Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Spelthorne Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.
v) Hammond Community Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Lightwater Village Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

vi) Crawley Ridge Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Crawley Ridge Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

vii) Hamsey Green Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Hamsey Green Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.
viii) Shottermill Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Shottermill Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

ix) The Hermitage Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending The Oaktree Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

x) West Byfleet Junior School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending West Byfleet Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.
37.13 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) Although little response was received in relation to these proposed admission arrangements given that there was no substantive objections it would provide reassurance for parents and pupils and provide continuity of education.

ii) It would also give parity of provision similar to that experienced for children attending all through primary schools.

iii) In the case of Hamsey Green Infant and Junior Schools, Ottershaw Junior School and The Hermitage Infant and Junior Schools this would have the support of the headteachers and governing bodies.

iv) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.14 Knaphill Junior School also applied to have their PAN increased from 81 – 90 to match the PAN of Knaphill Lower School and asked that priority for admission to the junior school be given to these children attending the infant school for those parents that wanted it. It is therefore RECOMMENDED that the Published Admission Number of Knaphill Junior School be increased from 81 to 90 and that priority for admissions to the school be given to those children attending Knaphill Lower School. The admissions criteria will therefore be:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Knaphill Lower School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

37.15 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) It has the agreement of the headteachers.

ii) It puts the schools on a ‘level playing field’ with the other schools on shared / adjoining sites named in para 37.12 (i) – (x).

iii) It provides reassurance for parents and pupils.

iv) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.16 It is RECOMMENDED that:

i) Surrey gives priority for children at Walsh Memorial Church of England Infant School to have priority for admission to Walsh Church of England Junior School; and
ii) Surrey gives priority for children attending St Paul’s Church of England Infant School (Tongham) to Walsh Church of England Junior School but as lower priority below children at Walsh Church of England Junior School. The admissions policy would be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Walsh Memorial Church of England (Controlled) Infant School
4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
5. Children attending St Paul’s Church of England Infant School (Tongham)
6. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

37.17 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) This has the support of all three schools and local parents.
ii) It demonstrates consideration of responses to the consultation
iii) The Published Admission Number of Walsh Church of England Junior Schools is larger than the Published Admission Number of the Infant School on the shared / adjoining site and therefore can also accommodate applicants from St Paul’s School in Tongham.
iv) It maintains the ‘church ethos’ of all three Voluntary Controlled schools.
v) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.18 It is RECOMMENDED that the proposed change to the sibling rule for Oxted School is not agreed. The admissions arrangements for September 2010 would therefore be:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings who both live in the catchment area (attached in annex 11) and who attend one of the following partners/named partner/feeder schools:
   - Crockham Hill, (Kent)
   - Dormansland,
   - Godstone,
   - Holland,
   - Lingfield,
   - St Catherine’s,
   - St John’s,
   - St Mary’s,
   - St Stephen’s,
   - Tatsfield and Woodlea

4. Non-siblings who both live in the catchment area and who attend one of the partner/feeder schools in 3. above
5. Those children who live in the catchment area but do not attend one of the partner/feeder schools named above

6. Any other applicant

If there is oversubscription within any category priority will be given to children who live furthest from their nearest alternative school as measured by straight line from the address point of the pupil’s house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

37.19 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) It was the direct wish of the headteacher and governing body to keep the existing sibling criterion without change.

ii) It was felt that the proposed change to the sibling rule was complicated and not easily understood.

iii) It would necessitate maintaining different waiting lists with different sibling criteria for a number of years.

iv) With declining rolls there is now no need for this change.

v) The response to this proposal did not receive significant support.

vi) The present arrangements for Oxted are working well and have local support.

37.20 It is also RECOMMENDED that some amendments to the Published Admissions Numbers for primary and secondary schools as outlined in Annex 5 be approved.

37.21 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) It enables the Local Authority, in discussion with headteachers and governing bodies, to plan for the anticipated increase in local demand for schools places.

ii) Forecasts predict a likely shortage of primary school places in the Elmbridge area.

iii) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

37.22 i) It is RECOMMENDED that the coordinated schemes for primary and secondary schools (Annexes 3 and 4) be approved to include further statutory changes outlined in the New Code of Practice on School Admissions. In the case of the Primary Scheme paragraph 1.75 of the new Code of Practice states “Schools must not require parents to attend the school in person in order to collect an application form and must not require parents to return the completed application form to the school. This being the case it is proposed that all applications for Year R children are sent to the Local Authority and not to the school of the parents’ first ranked preference.

ii) There will be further required changes to both the primary and secondary coordinated schemes for 2011 and beyond. These changes will include national closing dates for applications.

37.23 Reasons for Recommendations:

i) Only one objection to a secondary date was received.

ii) There is a statutory requirement to have coordinated admissions schemes.

iii) In order to comply with the legislative requirement in para 1.75 of the new Code of Practice which came into effect on 10 February 2009.
37.24 It is **RECOMMENDED** that Surrey’s Relevant Area be approved as outlined in Annex 6.

37.25 **Reasons for Recommendations:**

i) No substantive objections were received.

ii) It satisfies statutory duties.

37.26 Given there were only two objections to maintaining three parental preferences under the Equal Preference System, it is **RECOMMENDED** that Surrey gives parents the opportunity to state three preferences on their application forms.

37.27 **Reasons for Recommendations:**

i) It fulfils our statutory duty.

ii) It maintains consistency and treats all applicants fairly.

iii) As agreed for the 2009 admissions round the local authority will continue to consider those applicants who wish to submit six preferences because of exceptional circumstances on an individual basis.

iv) It supports the view of Surrey’s Admissions Forum.

38. The Schools and Learning Select Committee considered these proposals on Thursday 26 February 2009 and will submit their recommendations in a separate report.

---

**Lead/Contact Officer:** Anne Macavoy, Principal Manager for Admissions and Transport (Strategy), tel: 01483-517689

**Consulted:**

Peter Martin, Executive Member for Schools, Children and Youth Services  
Andy Roberts, Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families  
Nick Wilson, Head of Schools and Learning  
Peter-John Wilkinson, Strategic Lead of School Commissioning and Leadership  
Headteachers, Chair of Governors, Parent Governors of all Surrey Community, Voluntary Controlled, Voluntary Aided and Foundation Schools, Diocesan Boards of Education, Neighbouring Authorities, Out of County Voluntary Aided and Foundation Schools within 3/5 miles radius of the Surrey border, Surrey County Councillors, Parish Councillors, Members of the Admissions Forum, Early Years establishments in Surrey, Local MPs, Borough/District Members responsible for children, General Public consultation via the website/contact centre and an advert was placed in local newspapers, Schools and Learning Select Committee

**Informed:**

**Sources/background papers:** Reports to the Schools and Learning Select Committee dated 16 October 2008 and 26 February 2009 and report to Executive on 21 October 2008