

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

Comments from respondents in support of the proposal (**** indicates where some detail has been hidden)
1. Because I live in **** and I don't **** nor ****. In fact I have had major issues with **** with my two other children that I would rather pay a fine than send my last child there.
2. This will impact children on the outskirts of an area, who are not particularly close to any individual school. Those families and children who close to >1 school will benefit with more choice, but at the expense of locking out those children for whom their nearest school is there only real viable option within walking distance. As a result, children on the outskirts are going to be less likely to go to their nearest school, leading to a greater need for car journeys and making it less possible for them to walk / scoot / cycle to school. Not great for the child or the environment.
3. There has been a number of housing developments in the local area who are directly next to the school which would mean that the distance ratio is likely to be made smaller as more children needing places due to the additional families moving in to the area meaning no spaces for families who live close by.
4. There is too much traffic on the roads so removing this criteria for local children to attend their nearest school does not make sense.
5. We suffered due to this in Sept 2015. Despite living 400m from our nearest school (**** in Redhill) and 600m from our next closest school, we didn't get into to any of our 4 most local preferences and ended up getting centrally allocated a place at our 21st closest school which was 4 miles away. We had friends who lived 200m further away from our second-choice school than us but as it was their nearest school they still got in. It was so upsetting to be sent so far away and if it wasn't for the nearest school rule this wouldn't have happened.
6. The parent gets a wider choice to choose the school.
7. As long as distance is still used as a deciding criteria at some point in the process.
8. I believe that secondary schools should have the local primary schools as feeders. Not everyone is fortunate enough to live on the doorstep of their preferred school which means children who may live that bit further away are separated from their friends, to no fault of their own. Having to start a new school not knowing anyone and trying to form new friendships at that age is daunting and can cause stress and anxiety when it should be a time in their life that's exciting and a moment to look forward to.
9. It will be more objective, clearer, simpler and more equitable (currently can work against Catholic schools when looking at a three year period).
10. For more variety and more options for parents.
11. Just because you live close to a certain school, doesn't mean that you want your child to attend said school.
12. Our school choice is severely affected by existing regulations.
13. A more simplified process.
14. Safe for kids to go to school because of short distance. Good for parents who not using a car. Healthy for parents and kids to walk.
15. For us in ****, the nearest school criteria was problematic when we applied for primary schools where it was applied to some schools and not others. For example where your "nearest school" does not use that criteria but the next nearest school does use it, you can end up not getting into either school. This would be the same for us for secondary schools in Guildford when we come to apply. It is fairer overall for all schools to have the same criteria for admission. The only exception should be faith schools or selective schools, which may have faith or academic criteria for example. Therefore I support this change.

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

Comments from respondents opposed to the proposal (**** indicates where some detail has been hidden)
<p>1. Schools are not evenly distributed and some addresses are closer to a number of schools and will therefore take priority for a school place at ALL of those schools over other addresses which happen to be further from the schools. This amounts to discrimination against some addresses and will increase the inflation of house prices close to schools. As a result more parents will have to drive their children to school because, for example: Child A lives 0.4 mile from school 1; 0.5 mile from school 2. Child B lives 1.4 miles from school 1; 1 mile from school 2 and the next nearest school is 2 miles away. So child A has higher priority for both schools and if they choose school 2, child B (assuming they were not pushed out of school 1 by another child who lives closer) would probably be driven to school rather than walk. THIS IS NOT A GOOD POLICY WHEN YOU HAVE DECLARED A CLIMATE EMERGENCY.</p>
<p>2. Considering the current threat of climate change i think we should be encouraging as many people as possible to attend the nearest school. Id be more in favour of removing all other priority reasons and only sorting children based on the nearest school. You will never reduce the number of vehicles or parking issues from around schools as long as you encourage other means of getting children into schools 9ther than distance.</p>
<p>3. Many of us have bought homes in areas close to good schools. We have all paid a premium for our houses. This decision will devalue our homes and put us out of pocket by tens of thousands of pounds. This decision will also result in an increase in children joining the school from other areas where the children typically live in an environment where there is poor parenting, poor discipline and behavioural problems etc. We have seen evidence of this previously. This proposed change will absolutely destroy the quality of the students in the school and therefore the overall performance and reputation of the school.</p>
<p>4. I feel it's important that my children have a hub of friends local to them, particularly at senior school when they become more independent. Being in a village means that you are closer and more reliant on each other than a town or city. For my child to have to go outside our village for education means he won't create the bonds with local children I would want him too.</p>
<p>5. Being able to walk the children to school is a key priority for me as a parent to avoid use of the car, unnecessarily long journeys and to help them build friends in the local area.</p>
<p>6. This criterion is the number one consideration for the vast majority of parents/residents and to remove this will cause great disquiet and anxiety with all local communities. This will create many more appeals and complaints. I cannot see any upside for parents at all within this proposal - on the contrary it seems to be solely for the benefit of SCC .</p>
<p>7. Guildford Borough Council as part of SCC have declared a climate emergency. Sending children to schools which are not near to them necessitates transporting them which can only add to the negative impact on climate change. Applications for housebuilding usually cite a school in the vicinity without ensuring it is available to future families. At least offering the 'nearest school' as part of the admissions policy makes endeavours to guard against excessive travel from existing and future family housing.</p>
<p>8. As a Mum I have seen that it is important for my children to be able to walk to school for their health, it also means friends are local, reduces school traffic plus pollution and enhances community identity. The other local schools are faith schools which can mean additional requirements can be imposed that can't be satisfied. Additionally, my children are now at the local middle and secondary schools but it would have been impossible to negotiate an infant school further away and still be able to take an elder sibling to the local middle school.</p>
<p>9. At present the "nearest school" criterion is worded to be binary, i.e. yes or no, giving equal weighting to those who have the school as their nearest. The proposed change would give priority purely on distance and advantage parents who can afford to move to houses (very expensive ones) very close to the school. Further driving local house price unbalancing and elitism, creating a school of haves/have nots with only parents with £900K houses joined by a few very disadvantaged children. All changes so far seem to have disadvantaged average</p>

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

income hard working parents. I therefore do not see this as a positive progressive change and do not agree.
10. I believe current arrangements are fair.
11. In the consultation document, once distance is removed, there is a large category called 'Other children' but this makes it very unclear as to the basis that the other children would be selected on. This ought to be clarified to avoid accusations of nepotism or other sorts of bias in the admissions system. If this can't be done then revamp (using probably available technology), the system used to calculate 'nearness'.
12. People going to their closest school should be encouraged so that more children walk/cycle to school. Many parents will have moved to a location in order to be close to a school and this will undermine their effort and desire for that school.
13. We picked where we were going to live to be near good schools.
14. Not at all, I think this is incredibly unfair and damaging to the children of those of us who have specifically sought, with a decade of planning, to move to a specific area for a school. No one wants to be in a catchment area with **** and most of the other secondaries are hideously oversubscribed or require significant travel which does not benefit a secondary school aged child with two working parents.
15. Proximity to a school helps ensure that the ease of getting to and from a school is as quick and easy as possible. It allows older children to get to school on their own, allowing them to develop their independence. It also means that fewer journeys use cars or public transport reducing the carbon footprint and encouraging exercise.
16. I believe this will increase the volume of traffic on our roads, something which you are trying to reduce. I live opposite the back gate to **** and there are already a huge volume of parents choosing to drive and use our road to drop off. The cul de sac is hugely congested already, with parents blocking each other, spotting in the middle of the road, stopping across drives, leaving their engines running and exceeding the 20mile an hour limit on this and the surrounding roads. This plan would increase these issues and pollute the area further.
17. Because we live within walking distance from **** and therefore we will not add to the overburdened Guildford road system. This will in turn reduce our environmental impact. It seems vastly more sensible to school children as close to home as possible without the need to traverse town in order to reach another clogging up the roads and increasing our environmental impact.
18. Our closest secondary school is still a 30 minute walk and all others are well out of area to walk. The bus service where we are is poor as it is and there are not school buses that go from our area to the other secondary schools. I feel there is a massive element of my daughter's safety if she is sent to a secondary school where she is having to completely leave our area. It makes no sense what so ever to not place children in their closest school.
19. Community is crucial to school success, by removing the "closest school" criteria you risk creating sink schools. You also risk increasing the number of children who are driven to school, increasing the risk of accidents and of environmental damage.
20. We have a duty to send children to their nearest school for lots of reasons. These include environmental impact (more petrol burnt when parents drive), congestion in the local area and the loss of community if children are all going to schools out of their area.
21. I am concerned that removing the 'nearest school' criterion will negatively impact children who live south/south-east of Hoe Valley School in their ability to obtain a place at HVS. Bearing in mind HVS was set up specifically to fill a gap and provide secondary school places for the children of South Woking, it seems very unfair that they will lose any priority in securing a place at HVS. Many children in Old Woking are currently out of catchment area for Winston Churchill and Woking High and are effectively barred from SJB if they have not attended a Catholic feeder school so have no other local option other than HVS. Taking away the nearest school criteria will mean children living north/north-west of HVS will have the option of HVS or Winston and may well gain a place at HVS ahead of a child in South Woking who has no other option. This does not seem fair or just.

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

	Please could you review this specific situation and assure me that the children of South Woking will not (yet again) be disadvantaged when it comes to secondary school places.
22.	Because we may have to go further.
23.	Having a local school where all the kids from the surrounding area go is a huge part of the community. For both the children and adults. Having the chance to meet and know so many of people who live in the surrounding roads really helps people to work together and invest in their shared area. It also means children can walk or cycle to school do the environmental impact is far lower.
24.	I completely disagree with the removal of this rule. We are lucky to have good schools in our area and they attract pupils who live in other boroughs. The children who live in this area should take priority over those who live outside the area and pay their council tax elsewhere. Children who live in in this area should get priority before those who live further afield.
25.	People have moved to certain properties in order to be close to schools - we bought this house as it is close to the schools we would like our son to attend. I do not drive so need to be near to the schools. I do not want to have to pay for public transport to get my son to school. In an emergency I want to be near my son's school - as the Corona Virus issue has highlighted. Due to work I do not have the time to travel to another school before and after. I want my son to be safe travelling to school which means not travelling far. I want my son to be at school with local people from the area - a community.
26.	Allowing nearest school to be a priority ensures that applicants who live close to the school have a higher priority than those living far away. Not only does this reduce traffic but also ensures that applicants who do not drive or have transport have a better chance of receiving a place at a local accessible school.
27.	I think it should not be the top priority but children should be allowed to attend their local school.
28.	We fell foul of the 'as the crow flies' method of measuring school distance and were given a school out of our borough that our children would need to catch two buses to get to or trek across private fields and farms. We had to appeal and it was a stressful time. Also children further away, were given our nearest school, then coached in at extra cost...!
29.	Parents and children should have plenty of choice in which school to attend. However there are often advantages in attending the nearest school, e.g. children being able to walk to school rather than parents having to drive their children to school, causing congestion and pollution.
30.	This will result in significantly increased travel times for all children. Especially ill-advised due to the health emergency, local congestion and the deterioration of local air quality.
31.	Surely getting rid of it as a priority means children will potentially get into schools further away and therefore end up driving? More cars on the road, more kids not exercising.
32.	It's not good for the environment making parents travel unnecessarily. More should be done to ensure schools are spaced out.
33.	I think this is a terrible idea. This would result in a lot of unnecessary traffic on already very congested roads. This affects those travelling to work and also has a big impact on people living next to schools. As I live on a road next to **** and walk my child to the school I see the impact of heavy traffic on a small residential road every morning and afternoon. Every day we have parents speeding down the road in their cars and reversing onto the pavement with no regard for the safety of children and parents walking to school. They often leave their car engines running whilst waiting to pick up their children causing unnecessary air pollution. It would result in fewer children walking to school because they have further to travel, reducing the amount of exercise children get. How does this fit in with the Surrey Physical activity strategy?
34.	A child's nearest school should remain a key consideration.
35.	Good schools in this area is already too popular to meet the demand, and house prices are more expensive within catchment area. This would give incentives to opportunists who rented for 1 year for a small apartment to get in the school, then move further away as their younger children will be prioritised as siblings. I believe you always need the criteria of having a sibling + the school is nearest to your home address to avoid this kind of issues. I understand council will check proof of address etc, however, let's say if a parent bought a small apartment to get into the school, then moved further away out of the catchment area, and rented their apartment out

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

<p>to others parents who wanted to do the same to get in the school, I don't believe you would have a way to stop this unfair cycle. It is not fair for parents who actually settled and live close to the school for the long term. Not only it is not fair, but also if the kids attend the school live far away from the school as reasons above, it will be difficult for children to bonding and socialising after school. Also property developers will capture this trend to build more flats near the school, which will make a good school more difficult to meet the local demands.</p>
<p>36. For social, economic and environmental reasons it makes complete sense that children should be allowed and encouraged to attend their nearest school. Less congestion on the roads can only benefit everyone and particularly if children are able to walk safely to and from school.</p>
<p>37. For the most part this is the only objective criteria which would apply to most applicants who apply for their first child's school place.</p>
<p>38. Priority should be granted to nearest children for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Children living nearby will likely walk to school. Encouraging children from other areas will mean an increase in road traffic and therefore an increase in risk to pedestrians. The area of Merrow already struggles with an extreme volume of school traffic. 2. Where children are encouraged from outside of the area, the school will lose its sense of local community. Parents of children outside the area will be less likely to participate in school events and will be less likely to help in the necessary fundraising activities. This in turn will impact the local parish and other clubs/societies that rely heavily on local community. 3. Choosing a school is a massive factor in choosing where to live. Diligent parents will have factored schooling into their choice of home address - even if such a decision impacts upon them financially. Why should a parent, who has knowingly (and perhaps without due care) chosen to live in a "cheaper" area, have the same schooling options as a parent who has made financial (and perhaps other) sacrifices to live in a catchment area? That seems neither fair nor reasonable.
<p>39. We need to be reducing the volume of traffic, particularly at school start/finish - closest school will often be within walking distance of home. Consider the environment, impact to local traffic and child safety!</p>
<p>40. I feel it is correct to keep this rule. This would stop a build-up of traffic in the area due to parents driving a further distance to get their children to school. At the moment, many parents can walk to their local school and if they don't get a priority space this would mean driving further afield.</p>
<p>41. Environmental reasons include the disincentive for parents and children to walk to school if they don't live locally. We don't want people coming large distances to school and using vehicles to do so. Practical reasons include the right of accessibility. Priority must be given in such a way as to support easy access to education.</p>
<p>42. I live very close to the school.</p>
<p>43. It may be an idealistic idea, but I want my child to be able to walk to her local school, whatever that school may be. I fail to see how removing this criteria, and therefore forcing parents into ever longer driven school drop-offs benefits the county. More cars on the road, more pollution, more traffic problems. Also, I fail to see how, if this criterion were removed, schools would fairly select pupils for their intake? Already, at my local school for example, my child would only get a place if there is a low sibling intake. If the next criteria isn't proximity, what would be a fair selection criteria?</p>
<p>44. The Parish Council neither agrees or disagrees with the proposal but does have concerns on the impact to Salfords primary school and our local residents. If secondary schools choose to draw catchment areas such as Reigate, it may be detrimental to Salfords and this would have an impact on how far our local children would have to travel to go the school. In a world where we are trying to improve our carbon footprint, by removing the option of closest school as selection criteria, this heightens the amount of travel a pupil may be expected to make to attend a school. This cannot be beneficial for the environment. It also does not benefit the child if they have long travel times to and from school impacting on their time for homework and family time.</p>
<p>45. Not practical for parents generally and children living nearby should have some level of priority available to them albeit attending the local school shouldn't be mandatory. Perhaps addition of workplace requirement so having a parent working nearby or living nearby is sufficient. Risk of</p>

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

	parents targeting best schools and without a valid reason for needing to be near school geographically potentially leads to multiple journey.
46.	I live up the road from ****, where I will be able to walk my son to school. A healthy and better for the environment option. Any other school I would need to drive to, adding unnecessary traffic to the road and pollution.
47.	We are supposed to be encouraging people to walk to school, so nearest school as a priority must be an option.
48.	From an environmental perspective, it makes sense to ensure that the children attending the school live relatively locally, so the children can walk or cycle to school. From the perspective of children, it is much nicer to attend a school where your friends also live locally and you can (COVID-19 rules permitting) socialise with your friends easily outside of school. That is also helpful for parents, so we don't have to drive them all over the county to have play dates.
49.	Given the appalling level of traffic coming through our village every morning and late afternoon/evening, it makes no sense at all to allow people to pick and choose schools at any distance rather than attend the nearest school. I think this would be a very short-sighted decision to make. I have always felt that if the local school fell short, then parents should join the governing body of that school and bring it up to scratch.
50.	In the past, living in a London Borough, the absence of the "nearest" school criteria meant that there can be "blackspots" where children cannot get into any schools nearby. We lived 300m from a primary school, and yet we were initially offered the 13th closest school! By the time term started, lists had shifted and my son started at the 4th closest school. This was well outside of our community. In fact, the proposed changes here would benefit my daughter, since it would make it more likely that she would have a choice of our two closest secondary schools. However, I still do not think that it makes sense for families overall.
51.	I don't drive. I'm fairly sure I'm not the only person who thinks it's good for children to get a place at a school near where they live and for them to live near their other school friends. Working parents in practice share school runs with neighbours, I can't see how this would work.
52.	Not really having a school 'near' my house, I do think it would give everyone more of an equal chance. But I think it does depend upon what the new rules would be. But, likewise, would it be fair for a child to live within walking distance of a school to not get a place and then have to drive or get some other transport, for another child, who would also have you travel to get a place there.
53.	There are several reasons why I think it is a bad idea to change this criteria. Firstly I believe it is important to maintain the connection between a local community and its local school, if you remove this criteria you risk splitting up the cohesion of local communities. Secondly, given the growing environment crisis, moving children to schools further away than their local school will inevitably force more people to drive further at the very time we should be reducing our carbon footprint. Thirdly, at this point we don't know how long we will have to live with the threat of COVID-19 but it may be for some time and moving large numbers of children out of their local community to schools in other areas increases the risk of spreading the disease and makes it even harder to maintain small bubbles.
54.	With local children accessing their local schools, they can walk or ride their bikes resulting in a positive impact on health and the environment. We do not need more parents transporting their children further distances and clogging up the roads.
55.	We have 1 local school which is oversubscribed as it is. By removing this as a criterion, children can be forced to go to other schools outside the local area. Removing them from friendship groups, forcing them onto public transport, or requiring parents to make alternative childcare arrangements. This will have a negative impact on the child's and parent's mental health.
56.	I think schools should be a priority to people living closest to them. I live next to **** and the dangerous driving and parking by parents is a daily nightmare!

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

57. Allowing children to come from further away encourages more use of cars - if a child can walk to school they should be encouraged. It also tends to have the affect of making certain schools more popular, which turns into a vicious cycle. More popular schools tend to attract parents who wish to push and encourage their child, allowing them to 'cherry pick' which pupils they want in their schools, which drives up results. The less popular schools then tend to end up with the less encouraged and possibly slightly less able children, leading over time to poorer and poorer results. **** and **** Schools were a classic example of this a few years ago, until SCC enforced the 'nearest school' rule. Both schools then had an even demographic in their intakes, allowing **** to finally be able to show their real capability.
58. Going to the nearest school promotes walking to school and minimises the need to car travel to get children to school.
59. Because it is difficult enough to get your child into a school locally as it is, especially as the majority of schools in this area are faith schools. Why should my council tax pay for children from say Kingston to be educated in the schools in my borough? For example. Why should I pay for a catholic from Kingston to come to St Paul's, or a Christian from Hampton to come to Bishop Wand? It makes no sense at all. Surely we should be prioritising schools to those that live locally to cut down on all those unnecessary journeys. How many mothers would drive their children from other boroughs, clogging up the roads and destroying the already bad air quality of the area. Invest in decent schools which don't have a faith bias with priority given to those that live locally!
60. It is essential for the environment that we reduce the need for car journeys. To remove this priority is highly likely to increase journeys by car and therefore increase pollution with all the climate change concerns this has. In a similar way, if a family moves out of the immediate area of the school, then they should apply to join the nearest school to their new home. The sibling rule is taken advantage of hugely in our area which has resulted in more traffic as many families move out of the area once they have the first child in the school of their choice.
61. Disadvantages people who move to an area for work. Advantages those who temporarily rent a house to get into the catchment of the feeder schools. Will result in children having to travel further to school which is less good for working parents and less good for the environment.
62. The nearest school criterion is difficult for many people to understand and is difficult to apply when the nearest school is in the area covered by another AA. It has, however, the feature that it can give students who live in rural areas a better chance of getting a place in a preferred school, where that school would otherwise fill up with those living nearer to the school. It can be argued that Surrey's operation of this criterion has been defective, because in practice it starts measuring from the school- nearest pupils- rather than starting its measurement from the home-nearest school - in the event of the criterion being over-subscribed. Retaining the criterion in a modified form could help those in remoter country areas in their education and travel.
63. It is important that small community schools continue to serve their communities as a priority.
64. If you don't get the closest school to where you live. Getting the child to and from school could be a big problem. You will have parents who would be walking to pick up their child having to drive which will increase the pollution Reigate is a nightmare to drive in during school picking up time this would just increase the amount of cars on the road and they will park on the roads around the schools who are already busier with parked cars. You will also have parents who cannot pick up their children if the school is to far apart from each other.
65. Having invested substantially in living in the immediate area it seems incredibly unfair that priority would then be given to others when they clearly have nearer schools they can attend.
66. Students who live locally need to have option to attend nearest school to reduce carbon footprint/commute journeys and enable child independence to working families.
67. It makes sense and I have seen nothing in terms of reasoning for changing it. Without it travel times, pollution, cost, loss of local friendships, loss of community will all be impacts.
68. In order to improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions, we should be making it easier for families to walk or cycle their children to school. Removing the nearest school priority will result in longer journeys, necessitating car use.

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

69. My argument for not removing is based on the fact that the majority of the working class like me will find it difficult to manage the traveling of children to school as it will add to more effort, time, economic cost as well as child's vulnerability within the constraint situation.
70. The ability of our children to access a nearby school is critical to our ability to work full time. An extended school run on top of an extended commute would be very difficult. At present, the close proximity of our children's school allows us to walk or cycle to school, a healthy and sustainable commute, whereas a longer commute would mean a less sustainable commute by car, and possible additional costs for morning clubs. I think the proposal is preposterous.
71. The school resources here is very limited, and even so for over-subscribed school. Our nearest school is 0.5km away, however, it is a very popular school and we are just on the verge looking at historical allocation data. If the nearest school is removed, then there will be more children whose nearest school is nearer than us however has other schools available, that will get priority than us. They will be able to have more options with more schools to choose. However, for us apart from this school, all other schools are at least 1km away, and within 2 km there is only a handful of schools. All these schools are over-subscribed, which means that if we cannot get into our nearest school, we will probably drive miles every day for the school run, which will be the worst nightmare. I would also like to understand why council proposed this option, what kind of benefit would this give to the community? Would it not be better to focus on how to create more schools and increase the intake number of existing schools? Also please bear in mind that people moving into this area for nice schools and family environment. And they will plan ahead a few years, or even before child is born for the move. Therefore for them it would be deeply unfair, as when they moved in the criteria would allow them to get into a school, however, afterwards the changes will impact them.
72. Practically, it makes the most sense for children to attend their nearest school. Furthermore, it would be unfair to move the goalposts for families that have moved to an area with a particular school in mind.
73. It will dis-proportionally displace children from surrounding villages whom otherwise would have obtained entry to their closest school, unreasonably replacing them with children who may live closer to that particular school but whom have alternative options even closer still. For example children in a village attending their closest school 4 miles away would be displaced by children living, for example, 1 mile away from the same school but whom could have attended an even closer school to their home just 0.25 miles away. The removal of the criteria gives an unfair and (depending on individual circumstances) a potentially discriminatory advantage, by offering more choices to children who live in areas where there is a cluster of schools available at the expense of preventing other children from attending their nearest school. The displaced children from the villages would be forced into other schools an even greater distance away - this could be 5,6, 7 even 8 miles away or more, or could be the opposite side of town, simply to accommodate children who in actual fact had other closer, probably walkable, options. This is bad for traffic, bad for the environment, and will cost the council significantly more in transportation arrangements since the village children currently bused in to their closest school would be scattered around to a variety more distant schools on the basis of remaining places available. In conclusion, it will cost the council and the tax payer more, it will be increase traffic and pollution across the town, and it unreasonably forces children living further away into even greater yet unnecessary distances, all at the expense of the closer child whose parents for whatever reason decided their closest school wasn't good enough for them. That is not acceptable nor a proposition that can be supported by any reasoned logic.

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

<p>The closest school rule is simple, fair, logical, causes the least traffic and pollution and costs the least in terms of transport. The only reason for removing this rule is to accommodate parents who decide their closest school isn't good enough for them so they want to force their child into the second or third closest school at the expense of forcing out children for whom the school is their closest. I do not believe the council should set policy to pander to such reasoning. The removal of the closest school criteria will be devastating to the surrounding villages of Guildford.</p>
<p>74. I fear this will make it harder for children to secure places in schools close to them and will increase the distance children will have to travel to get to school.</p>
<p>75. I believe the catchment area/'nearest school' priority should remain in place. If this is removed there will be an influx of applications from potential pupils from all distances competing for schools with better ratings. How would the application process then work? If a lottery system then nearby children could potentially have to travel much further than would have been required. This would be a logistical nightmare for parents. The focus should be on boosting school ratings in all areas and receiving the right support and funding to provide all students regardless of location with a fantastic start in life at their local school. We should not create a school lottery which could require children and parents to travel longer distances vs. attending their local school. There are enough pressures and difficulties on working mums/parents as is without adding further complexities i.e. travel.</p>
<p>76. This would be detrimental to the community who the schools are there to serve. Schools should be serving the local community and if people cannot get into a school because although it is their nearest they are not Catholic, then they will be forced to travel further afield to get into a school. This fragments friendships formed at primary school as well as the community. In addition, 6 out of the top 10 state secondary schools in Surrey according to the Real Schools Guide 2020 (which takes into account 51 different data points - including factors like Progress 8, pupil-teacher ratios and absence rates) are Catholic or Christian denomination schools. If this new proposal to change the admissions policy goes ahead then these schools will be discriminating against the religious or indeed non-religious background of prospective students. I understand, as I used to work as a teacher in one of these schools, that these schools were set up to provide an education for Catholics but in today's day surely this is discriminatory and exclusive? Students seeking an excellent education will find that they are not able to attend their nearest school unless they satisfy the religious criteria (because I cannot imagine what other criteria there would be, besides LAC, military and those with EHCPs). As a Christian myself (CofE) surely schools with such faiths should continue to be inclusive to those from all creeds? How else are we to bring up students understanding our rich diversity? I strongly object to the proposal that the nearest school option be removed from admissions criteria to continue an inclusive education opportunity for the whole community that the school lies in.</p>
<p>77. No. There is no rational or fair reason for doing this. It will increase inequality in access to schools and add to pollution in Surrey and increase congestion on the roads.</p>
<p>78. The criterion of 'nearest school' is relatively straightforward to understand and makes some sense. Of course there will be instances where the actual practical distance in terms of walking or road will be further in most cases but at least it gives local children a chance at getting into a school relatively close to them. We should be aiming to reduce unnecessary journeys and pretty much every other school admission criterion (especially the religious criteria) do the exact opposite.</p>
<p>79. Children should be able to easily attend the school which is closest to where they live - this should always be a priority.</p>
<p>80. It is very unfair on the rural community (especially in a three-tiered system) whose children end up being sent to schools miles away from their communities. As I am in that situation at present it means my daughter goes to a junior school where she knows no one and will happen again at secondary level instead of following the rest of her class to the local schools. Children miss out on extra-curricular activities due to the time spent commuting and siblings spend an unnecessary long time active in the car. I understand you sometimes provide taxis, but it doesn't make up for everything else they miss out on. Removing the clause just gives preference to people who live in towns who usually have several choices of school. In the countryside we</p>

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

	<p>don't have this luxury. We maybe the minority because we live outside a town, but it doesn't mean the welfare of our children are any less important and we feel we are being discriminated.</p>
	<p>81. This rule was put into place for a specific reason and removal of the rule will discriminate against families who live more rurally like ourselves. Our daughter has already been affected when she moved from her previous primary school to her closest junior school (just over the road) because they DO NOT Having this rule.</p>
	<p>82. I feel like a lottery could have the potential for children who live right by there school to have to travel unnecessary longer distances. One of the reasons we purchased our house was because of the location, and the proximity to the school. A lottery would increase the need for travel - which in turn increases road users and CO2 emissions. I can only speak for Dormansland, but I imagine it applies across other schools, that the school community isn't just about the school, but the village as a whole and the local community that pulls together. Our PTA fundraising efforts rely heavily on the school community, which would be made more difficult if parents weren't living (for the majority) in the village.</p>
	<p>83. I am concerned that this would lead to removal of school transport to "nearest school".</p>
	<p>84. Children should be able to walk to school if possible. Traffic congestion will increase if school is not local. Parking already an issue at drop off and pick up time and would be worse.</p>
	<p>85. I strongly object to this change. Local children should always be given preference. It makes very little sense to have children travelling long distances to attend schools. It would exhaust children if they had to make long journeys. In addition, it would make traffic worse. These proposals don't provide information on the alternative criteria that would be used to select which children attend a school. Therefore, I can only assume that some form of entry exam system would be put into place. This would be a terrible idea.</p>
	<p>86. It makes sense for kids to attend nearest possible school as it reduces traffic locally as well as unnecessary stress in the morning for parents. Regardless if school is voluntary controlled majority of the funding comes from the local authority that should give equal rights to parents contributing to local authority funding to attend school of their first choice or nearest.</p>
	<p>87. Several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discourages walking to school - pollution caused by carers driving children to schools far from home - limited cycling paths in Surrey - limited bus options in Surrey - discourages accessibility by disabled family members to participate in collection of children - high cost to taxpayers for taxis when school is far away - lower participation by parents/ carers in school volunteering and fundraising events - sending children to schools far from home is not a long-term solution to the overdevelopment of housing in Surrey with inadequate planning for adding nearby schools - if schools are so full that Surrey would like to send children farther from home, please invest in developing more schools, walking and cycling rather than more offices, flats, and car-focused living.
	<p>88. The school I am targeting for my child is the nearest school.</p>
	<p>89. We recently moved to **** due to its proximity to both **** and ****. We aim to lead healthy lifestyles and wanted our children to walk to and from school - hence the reason for the location of our new home. Catchment areas are key in providing local support groups for both children and parents, as children often form friendship groups with those who live and school locally. As new residents to our estate we are keen to 'set up home' and really build a healthy and productive lifestyle for ourselves and our children. If, due to the proposed changes, our children do not get into our local junior school, this will create a huge impact on our above plans. It will mean driving to school, increased congestion, increased pollution and reduced daily activity from our family members. I think it is fair that distance is considered as part of the criteria as this is why certain areas become desirable to live in.</p>
	<p>90. This will likely result in families having to travel further to schools. A local school is important for children to understand local community. It would also favour children with siblings in schools already of that criteria stays which in turn penalises single child families.</p>

Appendix 1 to Enclosure 7 – Comments on Nearest school

91. This would drastically increase the traffic in surrounding roads as people drive to school instead of walk/cycle.
92. The "nearest school" should be a priority reason for admission. 1) Surrey CC have declared a climate emergency. Not encouraging attendance at the local school simply leads to longer commuting times and with it more traffic on the roads. 2) the policy will make it easier for pushy middle class parents to get their children into the more desirable schools at some distance from their homes - unfairly disadvantaging those lower income families who may end up excluded from schools in their immediate vicinity, and forcing them to endure longer commutes, which they may be unable to afford.
93. A school should be associated with the local community to engender an enduring social, cultural, intellectual and economic relationship. For this to work the pupils naturally need to go to their nearest school, and/or the one that has the closest ties with the local community to which their home and immediate family belongs.
94. In principle, this appears a reasonable suggestion, as it would remove the postcode lottery, and house price affordability issues of people trying to move within a catchment of a particular school. However, I have a number of concerns: a) What (if any) criteria will replace this? b) How will the authorities determine places for 'Outstanding' schools that will inevitably be hugely over-subscribed, and lower rated schools that will be under-subscribed c) Presumably, parents can now choose to apply to any school within the county - likely leading to an increase in travel distances (most likely by car), and therefore how does this fit in with active travel plans, carbon emission strategies, and congestion issue. d) Schools should form a natural part of the local community, a greater dispersal of students and parents will not assist in this.
95. If this was removed it would mean that more children that are further away would be granted a place, rather than those children that have a sibling in the school or children that are close to the school. This is already an oversubscribed school and now that there are no plans for a secondary school at Forgewood.
96. I believe children living nearest the school should be prioritised because of issues relating to transport.

This page is intentionally left blank