

Consultation on Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and coordinated schemes for September 2022

Outcome of consultation

Response to consultation

- By the closing date, 141 respondents had submitted an online response to the consultation, some of whom had answered more than one question. Three further responses were received by email, making a total of 144 responses.
- The 144 responses were from:

Academy Trust representative	1
Borough/District Councillor	6
Governing Body	2
Diocesan representative	2
Family member (other than parent)	1
Parent	124
Parish Council representative	4
School staff member	2
Other	2
TOTAL	144
- A summary of the responses to the individual school related questions within the consultation is set out below in Table A.

Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation for September 2022

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
1	Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for the majority of community & voluntary controlled schools	Enclosure 1	25	114	5
2	Beauclerc Infant School: introduction of sibling link with Chennestone Primary	Enclosure 1, Appendix 2	36	6	102
3	Horley Infant School: introduction of sibling link with Yattendon School	Enclosure 1, Appendix 2	28	6	110
4	Onslow Infant School: Reduction of Reception PAN from 90 to 60	Enclosure 1, Appendix 1	13	12	119

Analysis of responses to questions within the 2022 admission consultation

- Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for the majority of community & voluntary controlled schools** - Overall, 25 respondents agreed with this proposal and 114 were opposed to it.
- Of the 25 respondents who agreed with the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Academy Trust representative	1
Governing Body	1
Diocesan representative	1
Parent	19
Parish Council representative	1
School staff member	2
Total	25

6. Of the 25 respondents who agreed with the proposal, 15 gave reasons. Full details are included as Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7. A summary of some of the main points is as follows:

- Just because a family lives close to a certain school doesn't mean they want their child to attend that school
- Creates more variety and options for parents
- Distance must still be used as a deciding criterion
- It will prevent a child being centrally allocated to a school a long way away when they have other schools that are closer if they aren't allocated their nearest school
- It will be more objective, clearer, simpler and more equitable
- Use of 'nearest school' is problematic if used by some schools and not others
- Good for parents who do not have use of a car
- Healthy for parents and children to walk to school

7. In addition to the above comments, the Governing Body of Trinity Oaks CofE Primary School wrote in general support to the proposal. However, they felt that it should apply across all community and voluntary controlled schools and at Langshott Primary school in particular. Further details of their comments in relation to Langshott Primary School are included under the section 'Admission arrangements for which no change was proposed' in paragraph 32.

8. Of the 114 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	6
Governing Body	1
Family member (other than a parent)	1
Parent	101
Parish Council representative	3
Other	2
Total	114

9. Of the 114 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 96 gave reasons. Full details are included as Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7. A summary of some of the main concerns is as follows:

- Impact on ability for children to attend their nearest school
- Disadvantage to children who live further away from their nearest school, especially those living in rural areas
- The devaluation of homes
- Increase in children joining schools from other areas which may destroy the overall performance and reputation of a school
- Impact on ability for children to attend school with their friends who live local to them so they can create bonds
- Impact on ability for children to be able to walk/cycle to school which encourages independence and contributes to health and wellbeing
- Impact on transporting children to school which will have a negative impact on the environment and climate change as it increases the amount of traffic on the road
- Need for children to travel further to school and associated increase in travel time
- Advantage to parents who can afford to move to houses close to a school
- Disadvantage to families who have moved to a specific area to attend a good school
- Accessibility for applicants who do not drive or have transport to access a place at a local school
- Impact on community identity
- Creation of black spots where children are not eligible for any school

- Impact on transport eligibility to nearest school

10. **Beauclerc Infant School: introduction of a sibling link with Chennestone Primary** - Overall, 36 respondents agreed with this proposal and six were opposed to it.

11. Of the 36 respondents who agreed with the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Academy Trust representative	1
Borough/District Councillor	3
Family member (other than a parent)	1
Parent	30
School Staff member	1
Total	36

12. Of the 36 respondents who agreed with the proposal, 14 gave reasons, as follows:

- Sibling links makes life easier and reduce the need for parents to attend multiple schools which increases traffic and the environmental impact
- Makes sense with the link that already exists between the schools
- Reduction of unnecessary trips
- The schools share a headteacher and most siblings are at one or other school
- The schools are close to each other
- A lot of people currently feel they need to move their children earlier than necessary to Chennestone in case they don't get a place in Year 3
- Important for families' wellbeing
- Beneficial for siblings to go to the same school
- Sibling links provide an element of stability and certainty
- Splitting siblings creates practical and emotional difficulties
- Appropriate for children's social, physical and intellectual development

13. Of the six respondents who were opposed to the proposal, four were parents and two were Borough/District Councillors from Guildford Borough Council.

14. Three respondents who were opposed to the proposal provided their reasons, as follows:

- If a family can relocate once they have one child in the school then this will only increase the need for car journeys
- A sibling link intra-school or within the same school is the most effective option
- These schools are not local and can't see why this would be a good idea

15. **Horley Infant School: introduction of sibling link with Yattendon School** - Overall, 28 respondents agreed with this proposal and six were opposed to it.

16. Of the 28 respondents who agreed with the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Academy Trust representative	1
Borough/District Councillor	2
Parent	24
School staff member	1
Total	28

17. Of the 28 respondents who agreed with the proposal, 13 gave reasons, as follows:

- Sibling links makes life easier and reduce the need for parents to attend multiple schools which increases traffic and the environmental impact
- Reduction of unnecessary trips
- It will help parents as they won't need to have siblings in different schools
- Important for families' wellbeing
- Beneficial for siblings to go to the same school
- Sibling link should work both ways

- Allows for better transition
- Reduces anxiety for all concerned and reduces the stress of having children at different schools
- Impractical for parents to have a child at Yattendon School and not be able to get a place for their younger child at Horley Infant School.
- Two school runs in different locations is unrealistic and impractical.
- Sibling links provide an element of stability and certainty
- Splitting siblings creates practical and emotional difficulties
- Appropriate for children's social, physical and intellectual development

18. Of the six respondents who were opposed to the proposal, four were parents and two were Borough/District Councillors from Guildford Borough Council.

19. Three respondents who were opposed to the proposal provided their reasons, as follows:

- If a family can relocate once they have one child in the school then this will only increase the need for car journeys
- A sibling link intra-school or within the same school is the most effective option
- Loss of school spaces to local families and more pollution

20. **Onslow Infant School: Reduction of Reception PAN from 90 to 60** - Overall, 13 respondents agreed with this proposal and 12 were opposed to it.

21. Of the 13 respondents who agreed with the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Academy Trust representative	1
Borough/District Councillor	2
Diocesan representative	1
Parent	9
Total	13

22. Of the 13 respondents who agreed with the proposal, three gave reasons, as follows:

- 90 children over a year group is too much
- It's a terrific school and has traditionally had capacity for 3 Reception classes – capacity should not be reduced when pressure on places is already significant
- This has the potential to reduce the number of good school places in my local area

23. Of the 12 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 10 were parents, one was a representative of a non-local Parish Council and one was a school staff member of an unrelated school.

24. Two respondents who were opposed to the proposal provided their reasons, which were as follows:

- may reduce the opportunity for our children to access this school which is within 500m and walking distance of our home
- Loss of school spaces to local families and more pollution

25. **Surrey's Relevant Area** – No comments were received in response to the consultation, but one email was received from a Diocesan representative in support of Surrey's proposed Relevant Area.

26. **Admission arrangements for which no change was proposed** - Overall, 40 respondents chose to make comments on other aspects of the proposed admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Within scope of this consultation

27. 24 respondents made further comments in relation to use of 'nearest school' which had already been consulted on as part of the admission arrangements.

28. Two respondents made comments about giving priority to siblings, as follows:

- It is unfair when people get one sibling into a school, then move away from the area, but are allowed to get other children into the school based on the sibling rule. This excludes children who

live closer, but who have not got siblings there. The sibling rule should not apply if the parents have moved a considerable distance away in the meantime

- The sibling rule needs to be removed - the theory of delivering and collecting all your children from the same school is a good one but it allows families to move out of an area yet still continue to place children in the school. If a family move from a catchment area then all their children should also move to the nearest school to the new home - this is an environmentally friendly thing to do as it will reduce car journeys

29. One respondent made a comment in relation to the wording around multiple birth children in Section 15 of Enclosure 1 and suggested that there was no need for random allocation as Surrey would be offering out to all children of a multiple birth anyway.
30. One respondent made a comment in relation to the waiting lists and suggested that, within each criterion, new applicants should go to the bottom of a waiting list.
31. One respondent made a comment about the admission arrangements for Wallace Fields Junior School. The respondent suggested that the criteria should better prioritise children attending the infant school, irrespective of whether the infant/junior school is the nearest school to ensure that children who already attend the infant school are given greater priority for the junior school.
32. The Governing Body of Trinity Oaks CofE Primary School made a comment about the non-removal of the nearest school criterion at Langshott Primary School and their belief that the criteria for this school should be reviewed in line with other schools for which it has been proposed to remove the 'nearest school' criterion. A copy of their letter is included as Appendix 2 to Enclosure 7. Alternatively, they suggested that Trinity Oaks CofE Primary School is added to the list of schools which would be disregarded in the assessment of nearest school to ensure children on the Acre estate are not disadvantaged in the admissions process.
33. Cranleigh Parish Council requested that the Local Authority consider schools in potentially competing catchment areas when increasing PANs to prevent an increase in PAN having a detrimental impact on schools in Cranleigh. It gives the example of Glebelands School being a valuable resource for a growing community and it would be a considerable loss to residents if its viability was threatened by placing unnecessary and competitive pressures on it as the school continues its rapid improvement in outcomes.

Outside scope of this consultation

34. Four respondents made comments in relation to use of faith-based criteria, used by some faith schools. Surrey does not use faith-based criteria for community and voluntary controlled schools and as such these comments fall outside the remit of this consultation.
35. Two respondents made comments in relation to the development of new houses and how this links to school admissions.
36. Two respondents made comments in relation to procedural matters, in relation to schools making their own decisions to support the community and communication on admissions criteria.
37. One respondent made a comment about Salfords Primary School and the fact that this school is also concerned about low numbers, especially with the recent opening of new reception classes in Horley (Westvale Park) and Redhill (Hatchlands).

This page is intentionally left blank