



## Determination

<b>Case reference:</b>	<b>ADA3492</b>
<b>Objector:</b>	<b>A parent</b>
<b>Admission authority:</b>	<b>The Academy Trust for Hinchley Wood School</b>
<b>Date of decision:</b>	<b>23 July 2019</b>

## Determination

**In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2020 determined by the Academy Trust for Hinchley Wood School for Hinchley Wood School, Surrey.**

**I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88I(5) and find there are other matters which may not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements but I am satisfied that these issues are being addressed by the admission authority.**

## The referral

1. Under section 88H(2) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (the Act), an objection has been referred to the adjudicator by a parent (the objector) about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for Hinchley Wood School (Hinchley Wood), an academy school for pupils aged 11 – 18. The objection is to the arrangements for admission of pupils to Year 7 for September 2020. In summary the objector considers it unfair that children living within the catchment area for Hinchley Wood but attending St Paul's Catholic Primary School (St Paul's), which is outside the catchment area and is not a feeder school, cannot gain a place at Hinchley Wood. The objector further contends that this position constitutes unlawful discrimination under the Equality Act 2010.
2. The local authority for the area in which the school is located is Surrey County Council (the local authority) which is a party to the objection. Other parties to the objection are the Academy Trust for Hinchley Wood School (the Trust) and the objector.

## Jurisdiction

3. The terms of the Funding Agreement between the academy trust and the Secretary of State for Education require that the admissions policy and arrangements for the academy school are in accordance with admissions law as it applies to maintained schools. The arrangements were determined by the Trust on that basis. The objector submitted the objection to these determined arrangements on 5 February 2019. I am satisfied the objection has been properly referred to me in accordance with section 88H of the Act and it is within my jurisdiction. I have also used my power under section 88I of the Act to consider the arrangements as a whole.

## Procedure

4. In considering this matter I have had regard to all relevant legislation and the School Admissions Code (the Code).

5. The documents I have considered in reaching my decision include:

- the objector's form of objection dated 5 February 2019;
- the admission authority's response to the objection and supporting documents;
- the comments of the LA on the objection and supporting documents;
- the LA's composite prospectus for parents seeking admission to schools in the area in September 2020;
- maps of the area identifying relevant schools;
- confirmation of when consultation on the arrangements last took place;
- copies of the minutes of the meeting at which the Trust determined the arrangements; and
- a copy of the determined arrangements.

I have also taken account of information received during a meeting I convened on 21 June 2019 at the school.

## The Objection

6. The issues which I have found arise from the objection are set out as follows:

- a) Whether the arrangements in relation to feeder schools constitute discrimination on the grounds of religion under the provisions of the Equality Act 2010.

- b) Whether the arrangements in relation to feeder schools comply with paragraph 1.15 of the Code that *“The selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion must be transparent and made on reasonable grounds”*.
- c) Whether the arrangements in relation to catchment areas comply with paragraph 1.14 of the Code *“Catchment areas must be designed so that they are reasonable and clearly defined”*.
- d) Whether the arrangements are *“fair, clear and objective”* in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 14 of the Code.
- e) Whether the arrangements comply with the provisions of paragraph 1.8 of the Code, that *“Oversubscription criteria must be reasonable, clear, objective, procedurally fair, and comply with all relevant legislation, including equalities legislation. Admission authorities must ensure that their arrangements will not disadvantage unfairly, either directly or indirectly, a child from a particular social or racial group...”*.

## Other Matters

7. I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88(5). I note that the following sentence in the arrangements *“As directed by the Local Authority (LA), children with an Educational Health and Care Plan that specifies the school as the placement school will be given separate consideration.”* may not comply with the law relating to school admissions as summarised in paragraph 1.6 of the Code which states *“All children whose statement of special educational needs (SEN) or Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan names the school **must** be admitted”* and may also not meet the requirements of paragraphs 14 and 1.8 of the Code as set out above.

8. Representatives of the Trust have agreed at the meeting referred to above to reconsider this wording and to seek advice from the local authority on suitable amended wording. That being so I do not need to address this point further in my determination.

## Background

9. Hinchley Wood became an academy in February 2012. It has yet to be inspected by Ofsted but its predecessor school was inspected in September 2011 and found to be outstanding. In 2016 the school received a letter from the Minister for State for Schools with congratulations for the very high standard of achievement in the GCSE exams in 2015. The school has a published admission number (PAN) of 210 for Y7. The admission arrangements for the school for 2019 and 2020 including maps showing the catchment area are easy to find on the school’s website under the *“joining us”* tab which is accessed from the homepage.

10. Hinchley Wood is one of four secondary schools serving the Elmbridge district of Surrey. Each of the four secondary schools had from 2011 to 2014 an exclusive (in the

sense that they did not overlap with each other) catchment area. For Hinchley Wood, the oversubscription criteria for Y7 up to and including September 2014 can be summarised as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children;
- b) Exceptional medical and social needs;
- c) Siblings of pupils at the school;
- d) Children resident in the catchment area;
- e) Any other children.

11. The LA's and the school's view is that initially these arrangements were effective and served local parents well. However, the number of children resident in Hinchley Wood's catchment area and seeking a place at the school has increased. By 2014 it was clear that the school did not have the capacity to admit all the children resident in its catchment area wishing to go there.

12. The school's admission arrangements provided, then as now, that where the school reaches and exceeds its PAN in any oversubscription category, priority would be given to those living nearest to the school. The catchment area is an irregular shape but generally it is longer than it is wide. The northern boundary follows the river Thames with the result that the northwest of the boundary is further north than the northeast. The northern part of the western boundary follows the A309, a main road. The school is located slightly nearer to the north of the catchment area than to the south and slightly to the western side.

13. In addition, Claygate village in the far south of the catchment area fell in part within the school's catchment area and in part within the catchment area of one of the other Elmbridge secondary schools – Esher Church of England High School (Esher High). Claygate children who lived in the part of the village within Esher High School's catchment area would be offered places there but many of those living in the part of the village falling within Hinchley Wood's catchment area could not be offered places at Hinchley Wood.

14. In 2014, following consultation, the Trust determined arrangements which added a priority for children attending feeder schools to the oversubscription criteria and extended the catchment area to cover the whole of Claygate village. The school inform me that due to its popularity each year a number of parents would move to an address closer to the school on a temporary basis, then move back to their previous address once a place at the school was secure. This meant that some families without any lasting connection to the area of the school were gaining places at the expense of children of families with a more enduring connection with the area. The Trust, as admission authority, considered that the introduction of priority for local feeder schools would help to ensure that a higher proportion of children came from families with an enduring connection to the area.

15. The school's decision to change its arrangements was not made in isolation. In parallel, the admission authority for Esher High School consulted on increasing its PAN from 210 to 240 and also changing its catchment area to cover the whole of Claygate

village. Thus the whole of Claygate village fell within the catchment areas of both Esher High and Hinchley Wood.

16. The arrangements have remained substantially unchanged since then, although a priority for the children of staff was added for entry in 2019 and is retained for 2020. No pupils were offered places under the children of staff criterion for September 2019. The arrangements determined for September 2020 can be summarised as follows:

- 1) Looked after and previously looked after children;
- 2) Exceptional medical and social needs;
- 3) Siblings of pupils at the school;
- 4) Children of Staff;
- 5) Children

5a resident in the catchment area who have attended one of the named feeder schools

5b resident in the catchment area who have not attended one of the feeder schools;

- 6) Any other children.

17. Where the school was oversubscribed in any of the above categories, priority is given to those who live closest to the school determined by a straight line from the child's home address to the school.

### **The relevant provisions of the Code**

18. The Code sets out the responsibilities of Admission Authorities. *"It is the responsibility of admission authorities to ensure that admission arrangements are compliant with this Code"* (Paragraph 5). *"In drawing up their admission arrangements, admission authorities must ensure that the practices and the criteria used to decide the allocation of school places are fair, clear and objective. Parents should be able to look at a set of arrangements and understand easily how places for that school will be allocated"* (Paragraph 14). *"Admission authorities are responsible for admissions and must act in accordance with this Code, the School Admission Appeals Code, other laws relating to admissions, and relevant human rights and equalities legislation"* (Paragraph 1.1). *"Oversubscription criteria **must** be reasonable, clear, objective, procedurally fair, and comply with all relevant legislation, including equalities legislation. Admission authorities **must** ensure that their arrangements will not disadvantage unfairly, either directly or indirectly, a child from a particular social or racial group, or a child with a disability or special educational needs..."* (Paragraph 1.8). *"It is for admission authorities to formulate their admission arrangements, but they **must not**..."* followed by setting out a number of matters which are not permitted which need not be set out here (paragraph 1.9).

19. In relation to oversubscription criteria the Code sets out specific requirements. *“The admission authority for the school **must** set out in their arrangements the criteria against which places will be allocated at the school when there are more applications than places and the order in which the criteria will be applied” (Paragraph 1.6). It is for admission authorities to decide which criteria would be most suitable to the school according to the local circumstances (paragraph 1.10).*

20. It is important to note that oversubscription criteria apply when the number of applicants for places at a school exceeds the number of places available. When this arises any criteria will lead to some children being admitted and some being unsuccessful. Any change to the criteria will inevitably lead to some applicants who would previously have been admitted being unsuccessful and some who would previously have been unsuccessful being admitted. An admission authority may decide the criteria it wishes to apply and may apply any lawful criteria provided those criteria comply with the relevant provisions of the Code and the law relating to admissions.

21. Generally, it is desirable to have continuity in admission arrangements. It is easier to administer, makes planning school places easier and allows parents to understand the process over a number of years. However, circumstances change. The number of children of the relevant age in any given area will fluctuate, other schools will change their admission numbers, different Ofsted judgements will be delivered and a school’s GCSE results will go up and down. For these reasons and others the reputation of a school amongst parents will vary and once popular schools will become unpopular and vice versa. It would not be helpful for oversubscription criteria to be changed repeatedly to accommodate such fluctuations. An example of fluctuations in the supply of school places in the Elmbridge area was explained to me at my meeting with the parties. There is a recently opened free school in the south of the Elmbridge area, which currently has a PAN of 48 but may, I am told, move to larger premises and increase its intake. A new free school is projected to open in the north of the area, in 2021 or 2022 which currently predicts having a PAN of 150. These factors are predicted rather than certain but may mean that the pressure on places at the school diminishes.

22. The Code sets out specific provisions on some of the more common oversubscription criteria and I will set out those that are relevant to this determination here.

### **“Catchment Areas**

*1.14 Catchment areas must be designed so that they are reasonable and clearly defined. Catchment areas do not prevent parents who live outside the catchment of a particular school from expressing a preference for the school.*

### **Feeder Schools**

*1.15 Admission authorities may wish to name a primary or middle school as a feeder school. The selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion must be transparent and made on reasonable grounds.”*

## Consideration of Case

### Catchment Areas and Feeder Schools

23. Hinchley Wood has had a catchment area since 2011. Catchment areas are not drawn up in isolation but rather in order to divide a greater area between, in this case, a number of secondary schools. Usually catchment areas do not overlap, although in this case there is an overlap in the south as explained above. For this reason catchment areas are not, usually, a circle with the school at the centre, as such an arrangement would have to have extensive overlaps or leave large gaps.

24. Catchment areas, arranged to be in the main exclusive and comprehensive, that is without gaps or overlaps, will, almost inevitably, give rise to a situation in which some residential addresses outside the catchment area are nearer to the school than some addresses that are within the catchment. Similarly, some primary schools will be within the catchment area and some (which may be closer to the secondary school in question than in-catchment primary schools) will be outside the catchment area.

25. Broadly speaking, children living within catchment will tend to go to primary schools that are within catchment (although many do not) and secondary schools will also tend, over time, to develop closer relationships with the primary schools within their catchment area than with those outside catchment.

26. Hinchley Wood chose as feeder schools all of the primary and junior schools within the expanded catchment area. I acknowledge that both the inclusion of Claygate village within the catchment area and Claygate Primary School as an additional feeder school occurred simultaneously, and that, at least theoretically, St Paul's could have been included within the catchment area and as a feeder at that or some future point. I am told, however, that at the time feeder schools were introduced St Paul's was consulted and made it clear that it did not wish to be added as a feeder school. St Paul's position has since changed and the governing board have had discussions with the Trust on the question of its becoming a feeder school.

27. The circumstances which led to the inclusion of Claygate village within the catchment and Claygate Primary as a feeder school were considered by an Adjudicator in the Determination ADA2587, 2588, 2596, 2620, 2641 & 2642 dated 4 June 2014 (the first 2014 Determination) and in ADA2760, 2761, 2770 and 2783 (then second 2014 Determination). In both determinations the Adjudicators found that the underlying reason was to address a situation which had arisen whereby children resident in the part of the village which lay within Esher High's catchment gained places there but children living within Hinchley Wood's catchment were not getting places at Hinchley Wood or at Esher school. I agree with the findings in those determinations that the expanded catchment area was both reasonable and clearly defined at that time.

## **The choice of feeder schools**

28. I find that the choice of feeder schools is transparent. The feeder schools are clearly named in the admission arrangements. The school has selected all the schools within its catchment area with a Year 6 cohort. I find that this is a reasonable ground for selecting feeder schools. The question also arises as to whether it is reasonable and/or fair to select feeder schools again for 2020 entry when circumstances have changed and the school will not have the capacity to accommodate all pupils attending those schools who seek a place.

29. In both of the 2014 Determinations it was noted that Hinchley Wood's projections were that children living within catchment but not attending a feeder school (Criterion 5b in the admission arrangements for 2020) would be offered a place (if a preference was expressed) if they lived within about 0.8 of a mile of the school. In the first 2014 Determination the Adjudicator observed that where arrangements would not allow the school to accommodate all those from feeders let alone other local children, those arrangements "*might well not be reasonable or fair*". In fact, for entry in recent years, no children falling within criterion 5b were admitted. The data suggests that this position is likely to continue in future years.

30. It is clear that meeting the criteria relating to catchment area and feeder schools will not guarantee a successful application for a place at Hinchley Wood. I have gone on to consider two further points. What secondary places have been offered to children attending feeder schools who are not offered a place at Hinchley Wood and whether there is some change to the arrangements which would make access to Hinchley Wood more reasonable and/or fair.

## **The supply of secondary places**

31. In the first 2014 Determination the Adjudicator considered the introduction of feeder schools and the inclusion of Claygate within the catchment area in the oversubscription criteria for 2015. She observed that the sum of the PANs of the feeder schools was 270 in 2015. Since then the PAN at Hinchley Wood Primary School has increased to 90. There have been a number of bulge classes in the feeder primaries, Claygate currently has 75 pupils in Year 5 (PAN 60) Long Ditton has 74 pupils in Year 4 (PAN 60) and Thames Ditton has 117 pupils in Year 6 (PAN 90).

32. The PAN for Hinchley Wood Secondary School is 210. However, the school has admitted 10 pupils over PAN in each year from 2015 to 2019 and the school has confirmed that it will continue to admit 220 pupils in 2020. It should be noted that Claygate village is also within the catchment area for Esher High School and that for entry in 2019 16 pupils gained their first preference for that school. Overall the data shows that for the four feeder primaries 50 pupils were offered places at a first preference school other than Hinchley Wood Secondary or went to independent schools or to an SEN setting. If that number is subtracted from the total number of pupils attending feeder schools it leaves 273 for 2019 and, hypothetically, 256 for 2020 and 263 for 2021. So for 2020 there may be some 250 to 260 pupils transferring to secondary education from feeder schools and seeking places at

Hinchley Wood. The 220 places available at Hinchley Wood Secondary School represent a significant shortfall.

33. Data provided by the local authority shows that overall within the Elmbridge area for September 2019 there were 1078 secondary places for a forecast demand of 1027. The actual number of first preferences expressed for Elmbridge secondary schools was 1159. All children were offered places, some for first preference school, some for lower preferences and some for schools for which no preference had been expressed. The outlook for 2020 is similar, with the same number of places available and anticipated demand for 1016 places. There may be additional places available in future years from the expansion of Cobham Free School and plans are coming to fruition for a five form entry secondary academy in Walton. Overall there are sufficient places to meet demand but supply is tight and first preferences cannot always be met, with some parents not obtaining a place at any school for which they have expressed a preference.

### **Secondary destinations for pupils attending feeder schools**

34. The table attached at Appendix A shows the secondary school destinations for pupils at the four feeder schools (and St Paul's). A brief analysis is set out below.

35. **Claygate.** Of the total of 57 pupils shown in the table 44 (77 per cent) of pupils whose destination is known to the local authority either gained their first choice or went to independent (not publicly funded) schools. I am mindful that parents may not put a preferred school as first preference for a number of reasons, for example if they are aware they have little or no chance of getting a place there. As stated above Claygate lies within the catchment areas of both Hinchley Wood and Esher High. Pupils' destinations are split almost equally between the two schools. No pupil achieved a destination lower than their third preference.

36. **Thames Ditton.** Of the total of 116 pupils shown in the table 91 (78 per cent) either gained their first choice or went to independent (not publicly funded) schools. Eight children were allocated second or third preference and five children were allocated fifth or sixth preference. Nine pupils were allocated none of their preferred schools (if preferences were expressed) and were allocated to other schools, most to Three Rivers Academy. It is concerning that a high number of children only achieved a low preference and even more concerning that a high number did not gain a place at any preferred school, although for some of these preferences had not been expressed for the maximum of six schools allowed.

37. **Hinchley Wood Primary School and Long Ditton Primary School.** The data for the other feeder primaries shows that the majority of pupils went to first preference schools with the remainder obtaining places at second or third preference schools or went on to independent schools, with one pupil moving to a special educational needs setting.

## **Conclusion on feeder schools and catchment area**

38. Hinchley Wood Secondary School is very popular. The numbers seeking places there are growing. Where a school is oversubscribed it is, to state the obvious, impossible to accommodate all applicants. It is for the admission authority for the school to set the oversubscription criteria which will determine who is to get a place and who will not. The admission authority for Hinchley Wood have chosen to prioritise those within catchment and, of those within catchment, those who attend the feeder schools. The Code allows for oversubscription criteria to include both catchment areas and feeder schools.

39. The catchment area is clearly defined and the feeder schools are named and their selection is transparent being those schools with a year 6 cohort within the catchment area. The catchment area is reasonable, being part of an overall jigsaw of catchment areas which have been used for many years (with some changes from time to time) to divide up this area of Surrey. The changes to the catchment area introduced from 2015 are reasonable, having been introduced to address, in conjunction with Esher High, specific issues in that part of the Elmbridge area.

40. To change the oversubscription criteria in any significant way would have a knock on effect on neighbouring catchment areas and admissions to other secondary schools. Given the overall position with supply of school places it is not clear what changes could be made to address a problem which essentially stems from the number of places available at Hinchley Wood being insufficient to meet the demand. To increase the number of feeder schools would exacerbate the problem. To take out the criterion of feeder schools would mean that those on the extremities of the catchment area would not gain places. To cease the use of both catchment areas and feeder schools would have a knock on effect and would mean that only those living within a certain radius of the school gain a place, leaving those outside that radius, whether living within the old catchment area or not, unable to gain a place and leaving them with no catchment school in an area where other addresses did belong to catchment areas.

41. I do not find that the fact that not all children within catchment or attending feeder schools and not all children both living in catchment and attending feeder schools who want a place at Hinchley Wood can secure one, renders the use of those criteria automatically unfair. All children were offered places at suitable secondary schools for entry in 2019. The evidence before me does not suggest that children who did not secure a place at Hinchley Wood come predominantly from any particular social or racial group or otherwise constitute a group that is disproportionately disadvantaged. I also take into account that the number of places at Hinchley Wood is limited and that any change to the oversubscription criteria would be unlikely to make the position any more fair. On balance I find that the oversubscription criteria relating to catchment areas are compliant with the provisions of the Code and relevant law relating to school admissions.

## **St Paul's not being a feeder school for Hinchley Wood**

42. The table at Appendix A also shows the secondary school destinations for pupils attending St Paul's. Of the total of 51 pupils shown in the table 47 (92 per cent) either gained their first choice or went to independent (not publicly funded) schools. I am mindful that parents may not have expressed a first preference (or any other level of preference) for Hinchley Wood because they believed (rightly) that as St Paul's is not a feeder school for Hinchley Wood they would have little or no chance of being admitted. It may also be that some of the parents who eventually chose an independent school would have sent their children to Hinchley Wood had they been able to secure a place there. On the other hand St Paul's is a Catholic primary school and it is not unexpected that, as shown in the table, many of the pupils will go on to attend Catholic secondary schools. I find that children attending St Paul's are offered places at suitable schools and that parental preference is met to a reasonable degree. I note that St Paul's is within the catchment area for Esher High although no child from St Paul's is currently transferring to Esher High in 2019.

43. For the reasons set out above I find the selection of feeder schools for Hinchley Wood to be transparent and made on reasonable grounds. St Paul's lies outside the catchment area for Hinchley Wood. It is only just outside but it lies on the far side of a main road which, in my view, constitutes a reasonable objective boundary. It is reasonable to choose as feeder schools those that lie within the catchment area and inevitable that some primary schools will be situated just outside that area. It is also likely that the catchment area for such primary schools will overlap with the catchment area for the secondary school and that some children will live within the catchment area for both the primary and secondary schools but will attend the primary that is outside the catchment area for the secondary school. The real difficulty is that the supply of places at Hinchley Wood is greatly exceeded by the demand. Unfortunately, this means that some children will not secure a place at the school even if it is their catchment school or their nearest secondary school.

44. I find that the exclusion of St Paul's from the group of named feeder schools for Hinchley Wood is reasonable and is fair.

## **Discrimination**

45. The objector contends that the admission arrangements breach the Equality Act. Section 81 of the Act states "*The responsible body of a school to which this section applies must not discriminate against a person...in the arrangements it makes for deciding who is offered admission as a pupil*".

46. I do not know the proportion of children at St Paul's who are Catholic but will assume that it is a higher proportion than would be Catholic at other schools in the area which do not have a Catholic religious character. People of the Catholic faith are people with a protected characteristic under the Equality Act. Discrimination can be direct or indirect. The reason that Catholics attending St Paul's are not likely to be offered a place at Hinchley Wood is not because they are Catholics; children attending other local schools, whether Catholic or not, are treated in the same way. I do not find that there is any direct discrimination against Catholics in these circumstances.

47. The list of feeder schools does not include any schools outside the catchment area. St Paul's, a school with a Catholic religious character, is outside the catchment area. There are some 26 schools outside the catchment area but within three miles of Hinchley Wood. Of these 12 have a religious character and of those 12, four have a Catholic religious character. Taken overall it is unlikely that a disproportionate number of Catholic children are disadvantaged compared to children who are not Catholic. I do not find that there is indirect discrimination.

48. In any event if there is indirect discrimination I would find that the inclusion of feeder schools in order to decide the allocation of places when the school is oversubscribed, which I have found to be reasonable in itself for the reasons set out above, is a proportionate means to achieve a legitimate end. That being so any indirect discrimination arising would be lawful.

49. I find that there is no discrimination as defined by the Equality Act and consequently no breach of Section 81 of that Act.

## **Determination**

50. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I do not uphold the objection to the admission arrangements determined by The Academy Trust for Hinchley Wood School, Surrey.

51. I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88I(5) and find that the other matters which may not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements are being dealt with by the admission authority and that a finding here in relation to those matters is not required.

Dated: 23 July 2019

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Tom Brooke

## Appendix A

### Claygate Primary School

Destination School	1 <sup>st</sup> Preference	2 <sup>nd</sup> Preference	3 <sup>rd</sup> Preference	Independent	Unknown (OOC child)	Total
Chessington School (OOC)	1					1
Cobham Free School		1				1
Esher CofE High School	14	7	1			22
Hinchley Wood School	17					17
Other				11	2	13
Southborough High School (OOC)	1	1				2
The Holy Cross School (OOC)		1				1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>57</b>

### Hinchley Wood Primary School

Destination School	1 <sup>st</sup> Preference	2 <sup>nd</sup> Preference	Independent	SEN Setting	Unknown (OOC child)	Central Allocation	Total
Hinchley Wood School	77						77
Other			2	1	2		5
Southborough High School (OOC)	1						1
Therfield School	1						1
Three Rivers Academy		1				1	2
Tiffin School (OOC)	2						2

Destination School	1 <sup>st</sup> Preference	2 <sup>nd</sup> Preference	Independent	SEN Setting	Unknown (OOC child)	Central Allocation	Total
Tolworth Girls' School and Sixth Form (OOC)	1	1					2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>90</b>

### Long Ditton St Mary's CofE (Aided) Junior School

Destination School	1 <sup>st</sup> Preference	2 <sup>nd</sup> Preference	3 <sup>rd</sup> Preference	Central Allocation	Unknown (OOC child)	All offers declined	Total
Chessington School (OOC)				1			1
Epsom and Ewell High School			1	1			2
Hinchley Wood School	40						40
Other					5	1	6
The Hollyfield School and Sixth Form Centre (OOC)		3					3
Tolworth Girls' School and Sixth Form (OOC)	1	3					4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>55</b>

## St Paul's Catholic Primary School, Thames Ditton

Destination School	1 <sup>st</sup> Preference	2 <sup>nd</sup> Preference	3 <sup>rd</sup> Preference	4 <sup>th</sup> Preference	Unknown (OOC child)	Independent	Total
Other					1	10	11
Salesian School, Chertsey	22	1	1				24
St Andrew's Catholic Secondary School	11						11
The Holy Cross School (OOC)	3	1		1			5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>51</b>

## Thames Ditton Junior School

Destination School	1 <sup>st</sup> Preference	2 <sup>nd</sup> Preference	3 <sup>rd</sup> Preference	4 <sup>th</sup> Preference	6 <sup>th</sup> Preference	Abroad (Moved or Staying)	Central Allocation	Independent	All offers declined	Total
Epsom and Ewell High School							1			1
Esher CofE High School	2	2								4
Hinchley Wood School	71	1								72
Howard of Effingham School	1									1
Jubilee High School				1						1
Other						1		16	3	20

<b>Destination School</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Preference</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Preference</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Preference</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Preference</b>	<b>6<sup>th</sup> Preference</b>	<b>Abroad (Moved or Staying)</b>	<b>Central Allocation</b>	<b>Independent</b>	<b>All offers declined</b>	<b>Total</b>
Southborough High School (OOC)				1						1
Three Rivers Academy			3	2	1		7			13
Tiffin School	1									1