

Consultation on Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2023

Outcome of consultation

Response to consultation

1. By the closing date, 70 respondents had submitted an online response to the consultation, some of whom had answered more than one question.

2. The 70 responses were from:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Chair of Governors	1
Family member (other than parent)	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	52
School Governor	4
School staff member	4
Surrey County Councillor	1
Other	4
TOTAL	70

3. 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 2023

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
1	Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Hurst Park Primary School	Enclosure 1	4	18	48
2	Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Langshott Primary School	Enclosure 1	4	16	50
3	Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Meath Green Infant School	Enclosure 1	5	16	49
4	Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Tillingbourne Junior School	Enclosure 1	2	20	48
5	Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Wallace Fields Junior School	Enclosure 1	2	15	53
6	Introduction of catchment area for Walton on the Hill Primary School to replace 'nearest school'	Enclosure 1	3	16	51
7	Introduction of a nodal point to measure home to school distance for Reigate Priory School	Enclosure 1	6	9	55

8	West Ashtead Primary School: Reduction of Year 3 PAN from 30 to 2	Enclosure 1, Appendix 1	4	35	31
9	Leatherhead Trinity Primary School: Introduction of a Year 3 PAN of 4	Enclosure 1, Appendix 1	4	13	53
10	Felbridge Primary School: Introduction of a Year 3 PAN of 2	Enclosure 1, Appendix 1	3	7	60
11	Introduction of priority for children of staff at Surrey's community and voluntary controlled nurseries	Enclosure 1	23	11	36
12	Introduction of a supplementary form for applicants applying on the basis of social/medical need	Enclosure 1, Appendix 6	28	2	40

Analysis of responses to questions within the 2023 admission consultation

4. **Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Hurst Park Primary School** - Overall, four respondents agreed with this proposal and 18 were opposed to it.

5. Of the four respondents who agreed with the proposal one was a Headteacher and three were parents.

6. Of the four respondents who agreed with the proposal, two gave reasons, as follows:

- Seems logical
- I live very close and it wasn't an option for me

7. None of the respondents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

8. Of the 18 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Family member (other than a parent)	1
Headteacher	1
Parent	10
Resident	3
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Surrey County Councillor	1
Total	18

9. Of the 18 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 10 gave reasons, as follows:

- Families have to have priority if they live close to a school
- More families travelling in cars as they will be travelling from a greater distance, leading to increased traffic and parking
- Negatively impacts all the families who are currently in the catchment for Hurst Park including meaning they may have to travel further or not qualify for a priority group at the other schools in Molesey
- Easier for parents to take and collect children from a close school
- May mean parents have to travel miles to get to a school that is much further away
- Children should attend their nearest school
- Fewer children walking to school with parents
- All schools should give priority on the basis of nearest school to address the climate emergency
- Children could be placed at a school with children they don't know as they don't share the locality
- Practical logistical nightmare of not having children as a local school for working parents and those without transport
- Reason not clear for making the change or the likely impact and what would replace it

10. Six of the respondents who were opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal in the following ways:
 - increased parking in the road where they live
 - sister may end up at a different school
 - more traffic, pollution and dangerous roads
 - may not be offered the local school
 - climate change affects everyone
11. **Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Langshott Primary School** - Overall, four respondents agreed with this proposal and 16 were opposed to it.
12. Of the five respondents who agreed with the proposal, three were parents and one was a School Governor.
13. A governor at Trinity Oaks Primary School indicated their Governing Body's support on the basis that it would address their concerns about residents of 'The Acres' who were unable to secure a place at Trinity Oaks, being denied access to alternative local schools as a result of the 'nearest school' criterion at those schools. They believed the proposal would improve access to local schools for residents of The Acres, many of whom they believed were currently having to travel to schools some distance from home.
14. One of the parents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal as the school is one of their 4 nearest schools.
15. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	9
Resident	2
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Surrey County Councillor	1
Total	16
16. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, seven gave reasons, as follows:
 - This will result in more children being driven to school as more children will be attending schools further from home
 - We need less traffic not more
 - Children should attend their nearest school
 - Local children should have priority for local schools
 - Some parents may not have suitable access to transport
 - Removing the distance criteria could force families to travel further for schools, putting pressure on surrounding schools and creating a potentially stressful situation for parents
 - Reason not clear for making the change or the likely impact and what would replace it
17. One of the parents who was opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the basis that it might make it harder to get into local schools, but they also indicated that it might open up another option for a school place for them. The Surrey County Councillor who was opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the basis that climate change impacts everyone.
18. **Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Meath Green Infant School** - Overall, five respondents agreed with this proposal and 16 were opposed to it.
19. Of the five respondents who agreed with the proposal, three were parents, one was a School Governor and one was a Headteacher.

20. A governor at Trinity Oaks Primary School indicated their Governing Body's support on the basis that it would address their concerns about residents of 'The Acres' who were unable to secure a place at Trinity Oaks, being denied access to alternative local schools as a result of the 'nearest school' criterion at those schools. They believed the proposal would improve access to local schools for residents of The Acres, many of whom they believed were currently having to travel to schools some distance from home.

21. Two of the respondents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

22. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	1
Parent	10
Resident	2
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Surrey County Councillor	1
Total	16

23. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, five gave reasons, as follows:

- This will result in more children being driven to school as more children will be attending schools further from home
- We need less traffic not more
- Children should attend their nearest school
- Some parents may not have suitable access to transport
- Removing the distance criteria could force families to travel further for schools, putting pressure on surrounding schools and creating a potentially stressful situation for parents
- Reason not clear for making the change or the likely impact and what would replace it

24. The Surrey County Councillor who was opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the basis that climate change impacts everyone.

25. **Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Tillingbourne Junior School** - Overall, two respondents agreed with this proposal and 20 were opposed to it.

26. Both of the respondents who agreed with the proposal were parents.

27. Neither of the respondents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

28. Of the 20 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	13
Resident	2
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Surrey County Councillor	1
Total	20

29. Of the 20 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 12 gave reasons, as follows:

- It seems crazy not to prioritise children who live closest to the school; the catchment area principle is not as clear and could leave children living nearby not able to attend the school because of catchment boundaries
- It makes common sense to send children to their closest school. Traffic is bad enough in the morning and if the council wants to send children further away this will only lead to chaos.
- This will result in more children being driven to school as more children will be attending schools further from home
- We need less traffic not more

- It is a local village school for local children
- The current car/parking situation causes absolute havoc in Chilworth at school drop off/pick up time. Where will the extra cars park if families come from further afield?
- Children should attend their nearest school
- While my children are already there it seems unfair that nearby children might not get that school
- There aren't many junior schools in the area and if priority isn't given to those living closer to the school then there may be some children who end up quite far away from their school
- It is essential that children who have this school as their 'nearest school' retain priority. The prospect of going to another school for drop off and pick up for two working parents will cause much anxiety and stress.
- This is our nearest primary school and I am concerned that if this priority is removed, we may end up having to send our children to school further away. With the younger children at the local infant school this would make things incredibly difficult for us and also add additional traffic onto the already very congested roads.
- This will remove the community feel from the school, increase pollution, make parking at the school even worse and mean that the children won't be going to the local senior school with their school mates.
- Some parents may not have suitable access to transport
- Reason not clear for making the change or the likely impact and what would replace it

30. Six of the respondents who were opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal in the following ways:

- Tillingbourne is our nearest school
- My youngest is due to go within the next few years.
- With climate change becoming a huge issue I would have to spend all day driving around collecting children from different places increasing my carbon footprint hugely and potentially unable to get them to school on time which will in terms have a detrimental effect in their education.
- My driveway is already constantly blocked, if the local children who walk to school get refused admission and families further away get into the school this will increase the number of cars to the village and traffic into an already congested school pick up time
- This is a local village school and all local village children should be able to attend their local school.
- Climate change affects everyone
- We may not get a place for my youngest two children there if this priority is removed. Since it is our closest school this feels ridiculous.
- Less community feel, less ability to park, more traffic

31. Removal of priority on the basis of 'nearest school' for Wallace Fields Junior School -

Overall, two respondents agreed with this proposal and 15 were opposed to it.

32. Both of the respondents who agreed with the proposal were parents and neither indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

33. Of the 15 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	8
Resident	2
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Surrey County Councillor	1
Total	15

34. Of the 15 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, five gave reasons, as follows:

- This will result in more children being driven to school as more children will be attending schools further from home
- We need less traffic not more
- Children should attend their nearest school
- Local children should have priority for local schools
- Some parents may not have suitable access to transport
- Reason not clear for making the change or the likely impact and what would replace it

35. The Surrey County Councillor who was opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the basis that climate change impacts everyone.

36. **Introduction of catchment area for Walton on the Hill Primary School to replace 'nearest school'** - Overall, three respondents agreed with this proposal and 16 were opposed to it.

37. Of the three respondents who agreed with the proposal, all were parents.

38. Of the three respondents who agreed with the proposal, two gave reasons, as follows:

- Seems logical
- It makes sense because otherwise children in the village might lose out to people who actually live nearer Tadworth school than Walton

39. None of the parents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

40. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	10
Resident	2
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Total	16

41. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, four gave reasons, as follows:

- This will result in more children being driven to school as more children will be attending schools further from home
- We need less traffic not more
- Children should attend their nearest school
- Reason not clear for making the change or the likely impact and what would replace it

42. One of the parents who was opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the basis that they live in the village and the reception year was completely full when they applied for their daughter.

43. **Introduction of a nodal point to measure home to school distance for Reigate Priory School** - Overall, six respondents agreed with this proposal and nine were opposed to it.

44. Of the six respondents who agreed with the proposal, all were parents.

45. Of the six respondents who agreed with the proposal, three gave reasons, as follows:

- If the measuring point is not kept at the current Priory School site this risks us and other parents to the north of the current site being without a junior school
- This seems like the only fair approach
- We have made infant educational choices for our children and chosen to live in this area on the basis that attending Priory for Junior school is a realistic option (so therefore that the entrance criteria to Priory would be determined by reference to the current site). The new site is further south in the borough. That area already has Sandcross School available for infant school children moving up to junior who live locally. If Priory's admissions measuring point moves to the

new site this would leave those children graduating from infant schools who live in the north of the borough without priority to a junior school.

- As a parent that would have been impacted had the school move taken place earlier, I am fully supportive of protecting the admissions of families in the Nutley Lane area that do not have another nearest school

46. Three of the parents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

47. Of the nine respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	1
Parent	5
Resident	1
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Total	9

48. Of the 9 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, only two lived within the area of Reigate and Redhill.

49. Of the 9 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, three gave reasons, as follows:

- The measuring point should be the location of the school. The school is proposed to move, and therefore the measuring point used should move with it, rather than become fixed
- There needs to be more clarity about the intention for this, how it would operate, and the perceived implications
- If the school moves 0.7 miles south, children from North Reigate will have to travel 0.7 miles south from the current location, potentially through the city centre. Yet some children who live closer to the new proposed location will have to travel to any other school but this, because the school's fictional location will be 0.7 miles north.
- The choice of decent schools for ages 7-11 is very limited in Reigate and Redhill. Reigate Priory School not surprisingly is the first choice for many. The fact that some other schools are closer does not guarantee the child will get a satisfactory level of education.
- Instead of using a nodal point, why not work on improving the quality of education in the remaining schools first or why not establish a new school at the new location?

50. Two of the parents who were opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal in the following ways:

- If the proposed measuring point is used, Sandcross school will be 2 miles from us and Reigate Priory will be 2.1 miles away. The quality of education in Sandcross and Reigate Priory is markedly different. If the proposed measuring point is not used, Reigate Priory will be potentially 1.4 miles away.
- Once the school has moved, the measuring point will distort applications to the school. This means some journeys will be unnecessarily long and the schools selected for children will not be optimised at the overall community level

51. **West Ashted Primary School: Reduction of Year 3 PAN from 30 to 2** - Overall, four respondents agreed with this proposal and 35 were opposed to it.

52. Of the four respondents who agreed with the proposal, one was a Headteacher and three were parents.

53. Of the four respondents who agreed with the proposal, two gave reasons, as follows:

- I have a son going to school in 2025 and its one of our local schools
- If my local school is full this would be the nearest school in our area

54. Of the 35 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
-----------------------------	---

Chair of Governors	1
Headteacher	1
Parent	26
Resident	2
School Governor (out of County school)	1
School Staff Member	3
Total	35

55. 24 respondents who were opposed to the proposal provided their reasons, as follows:

- Families at infant schools with siblings at West Ashtead will now be leaving earlier to ensure they have a space at West Ashtead
- Why reduce primary schools when the demand is growing?
- Reducing places will put greater pressure on places in West Ashtead
- Where will children go to from St Giles?
- The school should be doing everything it can to improve its Ofsted rating to draw in more pupils rather than reducing numbers to the detriment of current and future families
- A reduction in PAN at West Ashtead will leave up to 30 children from St Giles fighting for a junior place with limited options
- Leatherhead Trinity is not a suitable option – traffic into Leatherhead is already atrocious so adding extra cars will make it worse
- It would cause the school to decline
- With the proposal for further housing development this seems short sighted
- Families will have to travel further afield to get their children in to school
- It will reduce applications to Barnett Wood and St Giles infant schools due to fear of not getting into a primary school at Year 3
- There is not enough capacity within existing place numbers to allow the removal of 28 spaces
- The school is on a huge site – it would be a waste of resources to reduce it to one form of entry all the way through
- One primary school can't meet local demand in Ashtead

56. The Governing Body at St Giles' also opposed the proposal. They strongly believe that the reduction in PAN at West Ashtead will have a direct impact on the sustainability of St Giles' C of E (A) Infant School, with almost immediate effect. Their research shows that with declining places in the area, local parents will seek to place their infant children at all through primary schools rather than risk not being able to get a place at Year 3. They believe that the planned PAN reduction at West Ashtead Primary School aggravates this prospect. Whilst the proposals are for 2023, their research shows that approval will cause parents in St Giles' current Year 1 class to seek to move children ahead of the West Ashtead Primary School PAN reduction being enacted. St Giles' will then be in the same "reduced income" position that West Ashtead seek to mitigate by reducing their PAN.

57. The Governing Body at St Giles asks that other ways of managing the impending fiscal deficit should be encouraged, such as soft federation, sharing of resources, staff or facilities and that Surrey adheres to its planning principles in the Surrey School Organisation Plan 2020-2030, which includes an obligation to promote and strengthen local links between schools that would benefit the schools and the community. They also believe that a reduction in PAN (with the consequential damage as described) is also contrary to the planning principles of the Surrey School Organisation Plan 2020-2030, namely, "to consider the challenges and actions that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability of existing small local schools". St Giles' C of E (A) Infant School is such a school.

58. They also believe that the effect of the PAN reduction is contrary to the statutory duties that local authorities have to provide school places that increase opportunities for parental choice (Education and Inspections Act 2006) and that the proposal diminishes St Giles' CofE (A) Infant School's Governing body's statutory responsibilities to plan, provide and fund school places for the faith sector. The Governing Body challenges the statement in the planning principles that it is too soon to quantify what effect, if any, the pandemic will have on the birth rate, housing or migration. Strong

anecdote shows that birth rate in the area has increased as a consequence of lockdown and any dip in the surplus of school places is to be short lived.

59. Of the 35 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 27 indicated that they would be affected by it.
60. **Leatherhead Trinity Primary School: Introduction of a Year 3 PAN of 4** - Overall, four respondents agreed with this proposal and 13 were opposed to it.
61. Of the four respondents who agreed with the proposal, three were parents and one was a headteacher.
62. None of the respondents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
63. Of the 13 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Parent	10
Resident	1
School Governor (out of County school)	1
Total	13

64. Of the 13 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, four gave reasons, as follows:
- Leatherhead families do not want to send their children here
 - Will there really be sufficient places?
 - This proposal will result in overly big classes - better to maintain the number of classes, even if they have to operate at a slight loss due to some spare capacity, rather than have classes with numbers in mid-30s
 - We should not be looking at increasing two neighbouring schools to decrease numbers at the other (West Ashted)
 - This is a decrease that will have a huge impact on local families and the other local primary schools, resulting in children having to travel further and parents needing to drive more. There is not enough provision within the existing number of year 3 places for Leatherhead Trinity to remove their provision, particularly as for local families the alternative is West Ashted which is trying to do the same thing
 - If there is already an established school in the local area this should not be a consideration
 - This will also affect the local pollution and traffic with more families having to travel further for their primary schools to either Greville or Leatherhead Trinity instead of their potentially nearest school, or local option
65. Two of the parents who were opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal. One indicated their reason was on the basis of increased traffic; the increased pollution; housing prices; housing needs and local jobs.
66. **Felbridge Primary School: Introduction of a Year 3 PAN of 2** - Overall, three respondents agreed with this proposal and 7 were opposed to it.
67. Of the three respondents who agreed with the proposal, two were parents and one was a headteacher.
68. None of the respondents who agreed gave reasons or indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
69. Of the 7 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Parent	4
Resident	1
School Governor (out of County school)	1

Total 7

70. None of the respondents who were opposed gave reasons or indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.

71. **Introduction of priority for children of staff at Surrey's community and voluntary controlled nurseries-** Overall, 23 respondents agreed with this proposal and 11 were opposed to it.

72. Of the 23 respondents who agreed with the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	17
School Governor (out of County school)	1
School Staff Member	1
Surrey County Councillor	1
Total	23

73. Of the 23 respondents who agreed with the proposal, nine gave reasons, as follows:

- Agree but would be keen to know what happens for NHS workers
- It seems daft for a worker to drop their child at one nursery on their way to another setting
- Logistics
- Lowers emissions
- Will encourage good quality candidates

74. Four respondents who agreed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the basis of them working as a member of staff.

75. Of the 11 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, the breakdown is as follows:

Parent	8
Resident	1
School Governor	2
Total	11

76. Of the 11 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, five gave reasons, as follows:

- Having too many children of staff in the staff surroundings can create a difficult atmosphere for non-staff children and potential conflicts of interest especially in smaller nurseries.
- This introduces serious conflict of interest issues and should not be a defining reason for assigning places. Priority should not be granted on the basis of employment but need. Need should be established in individual circumstances rather than by being assumed as a result of employment. Benefitting employees will not necessarily have focus on the interests all the children but rather their own child.
- Where will the rest of the children go?
- Many people work in the public sector and do not receive priority for schools or the services they work in
- Priority should be given to local children

77. Three of the parents who were opposed indicated that they would be affected by the proposal on the following grounds:

- Not a nursery worker and may affect son's placement
- It will deprioritise other families in an unfair way

78. **Introduction of a supplementary form for applicants applying on the basis of social/medical need-** Overall, 28 respondents agreed with this proposal and 2 were opposed to it.

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

Borough/District Councillor	1
-----------------------------	---

Headteacher	2
Parent	21
Resident	1
School Governor	2
School Staff Member	1
Total	28

80. Of the 28 respondents who agreed with the proposal, nine gave reasons, as follows:
- It has become more prevalent for parents to apply to schools on the basis of their child having a particular need without that need having been diagnosed at the point of the application - they know that the social/medical need will give them a better chance of getting a place
 - Without the SIF it may not be clear how severe the child's requirements might be, with the result that a child may not get the right educational/emotional support at a particular school.
 - Full details should be provided when seeking a priority place
 - Clarity/transparency
 - There should be proof and reasoning behind any supplementary admission regardless of the reason
 - Seems logical
 - All entry criteria should be backed by evidence and proof
 - The information is confidential so families should be willing to justify their 'need' especially if it is to gain a place over another child due to this need
81. Of the two respondents who were opposed to the proposal, one was a parent and one was a resident. Neither gave a reason or indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
82. **Admission arrangements for which no change was proposed** - Overall, 6 respondents chose to make specific comments on other aspects of admission arrangements in Surrey.

Within scope of this consultation

83. One respondent asked why The Greville was not mentioned in the consultation
84. Two respondents suggested that travel requirements needed to be taken in to account when considering admissions policies needed to ensure the impact on the environment was taken in to account.
85. One respondent suggested that it would be helpful to see on a map the catchment area for each school.

Outside scope of this consultation

86. One respondent asked about the admission arrangements for Reigate School which is an academy.
87. One respondent suggested that a new Ofsted inspection should be arranged for West Ashted Primary School.

This page is intentionally left blank