



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference: ADA4395

Objector: Wilstead Primary School, Wilstead, Bedfordshire

Admission authority: Bedfordshire Schools Trust Limited for Robert Bloomfield Academy

Date of decision: 5 September 2025

Determination

In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I partially uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2026 determined by Bedfordshire Schools Trust Limited for Robert Bloomfield Academy, which is in the local authority area of Central Bedfordshire.

By virtue of section 88K(2) the adjudicator's decision is binding on the admission authority. The School Admissions Code requires the admission authority to revise its admission arrangements within two months of the date of the determination.

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 the governing body of Wilstead Primary School (the objector or WPS), about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for Robert Bloomfield Academy (the School or RBA), an academy middle school, for September 2026. The objection is to WPS being named as a feeder school for RBA.
2. The local authority for the area in which the School is located is Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC). CBC is a party to this objection. Other parties to the objection are: the objector; the School; Bedfordshire Schools Trust (the Trust or BEST), which is the admission authority for the School; and Bedford Borough Council (BBC), which is the local authority for WPS.

Jurisdiction

3. The terms of the academy agreement between the multi-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. These arrangements were determined by the academy trust, which is the admission authority for the School, on that basis. The governing body of WPS submitted its objection to these determined arrangements on 13 February 2025. 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.

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:

- a. a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the board of trustees at which the arrangements were determined;
- b. a copy of the determined arrangements;
- c. the objector's form of objection dated 13 February 2025 and supporting documents, including copies of email exchanges between WPS and the Trust;
- d. responses of the Trust, CBC and BBC to the objection and to my requests for further information;
- e. responses of WPS to my requests for further information;
- f. minutes of the meeting of BEST trustees of 28 January 2025 (the BEST January meeting);
- g. the Google Maps website; and
- h. information available on the websites of the School, Ofsted and the Department for Education (DfE), and "Get Information About Schools" (GIAS).

6. The objection cited a number of adjudicator determinations, involving schools other than RBA and WPS, which considered the matter of feeder schools. The objector referred to these as "OSA case law". I make it clear that an adjudicator's determination does not set a precedent which must subsequently be followed; I have not taken into account any other determinations in my consideration of this case. It is my role to determine whether or not the arrangements of RBA comply with the Code and the law as it relates to admissions.

The objection

7. The objector asserts that the inclusion of WPS as a feeder school in the arrangements for RBA is not reasonable or fair, and gave the following reasons for this view:

- i. Listing a primary school as a feeder school for a middle school is unreasonable.
- ii. There are no links or relationship between WPS and RBA.
- iii. WPS does not in fact feed into RBA (that is, the majority of WPS pupils do not transfer to RBA at the end of Year 4).
- iv. WPS is a significant distance from RBA, unlike the other feeder schools in RBA's arrangements.
- v. Transfer of pupils from WPS to RBA at the end of Year 4 negatively affects WPS in terms of pupil numbers and the school budget.

8. The objector identified specific paragraphs of the Code which they allege the arrangements breach, stating:

"In listing Wilstead Primary School as a "feeder school" in its oversubscription criteria, Robert Bloomfield Academy's (RBA's) admission arrangements breach the Code's requirements as to reasonableness and fairness.

Listing Wilstead Primary School as a "feeder school" is in breach of the Code's requirement in paragraph 1.8 that "oversubscription criteria must be reasonable" and, in particular, the requirement in paragraph 1.15 that "[t]he selection of a feeder school or schools as an oversubscription criterion must be transparent and made on reasonable grounds." In breaching these requirements, RBA's admission arrangements fail to satisfy the Code's overriding principle of fairness."

9. Paragraph 1.8 of the Code states:

"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, and that other policies around school uniform or school trips do not discourage parents from applying for a place for their child. Admission arrangements **must** include an effective, clear, and fair tie-breaker to decide between two applications that cannot otherwise be separated."

10. Paragraph 1.15 of the Code states:

"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."

11. I have identified other relevant paragraphs of the Code when I come to my detailed consideration.

Background

12. RBA is an academy converter school that opened in May 2011. It is part of the Bedfordshire Schools Trust Limited, a multi-academy trust which comprises twelve academies: primary, middle and secondary schools. RBA is situated in Shefford, a town which is roughly to the south-east of Bedford.

13. RBA provides education for girls and boys aged from nine to thirteen years. The School is non-selective and does not have a religious character. The normal year of entry is Year 5, and the published admission number (PAN) for 2026 is 240. The School was most recently inspected by Ofsted in February 2025, when it was judged to be 'Outstanding' in all areas.

14. In the event of oversubscription, after the admittance of children with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) which names the School, priority for places in Year 5 is determined by application of the following criteria (in summary):

1. Looked after and previously looked after children.
2. Children of staff.
3. Children with siblings at the school.
4. Children living in the catchment area of the School.
5. Children who attend "the traditional feeder schools – Shefford, Clophill, Haynes, Southill, Wilstead, Stondon, Shillington, Campton and Gravenhurst".
6. Any other children.

15. The arrangements do not state the full names of the feeder schools. I find this to be unclear and hence contrary to paragraph 14 of the Code, which requires that parents are able to look at a set of arrangements and understand easily how places for that school will be allocated. CBC helpfully provided the correct names of the feeder schools and the PANs for those schools for 2026; all admit children to the reception year (Year R) as the normal year of entry. That information, together with the age range of each school as shown on GIAS, is set out in table 1 below.

Table 1: The feeder schools, their age range (in years) and the PAN of each school for 2026

Name of feeder school	Age range	Year R PAN for 2026
Shefford Lower School	3-9	90
St Mary's VA CofE Lower School	2-9	30
Haynes Lower School	2-9	24
Southill Lower School	2-9	15
Wilstead Primary School	4-11	30
Stondon Lower School	5-9	30
Shillington Lower School	2-9	30
Campton Academy	5-9	26
Gravenhurst Academy	5-9	15
Total	n/a	290

16. CBC provided an explanation of the school system in its area:

“Central Bedfordshire Council operates both a three tier and two-tier system of education. This has come about as areas have been converted from three to two tier on a proposed and planned basis. . .

In the area where Robert Bloomfield Academy is located the area provides a three-tier system of education with lower schools, middle or middle combined secondary schools and an upper school.”

17. WPS is a foundation school in Wilstead, a village to the south of Bedford. It provides education for girls and boys aged four to eleven years and does not have a religious character. According to Google Maps, the shortest driving distance from WPS to RBA is 7.2 miles. WPS is the only feeder school for RBA which provides for pupils up to the end of Year 6; the other feeder schools provide education up until the end of Year 4. The objection explained that this has not always been the case and described the situation as follows:

“The precise circumstances in which Wilstead first became listed as a “feeder school” in RBA’s oversubscription criteria is unknown to the objector. However, it is known to date back to the time when Wilstead was a lower school, when its pupils needed to transfer to middle school education at the end of Year 4. . .

In September 2017, Bedford Borough transitioned from three-tier to two-tier, and Wilstead became a Primary School. The school has, since that date, provided education for its pupils up to the end of Year 6, at which time its pupils leave to attend secondary schools in the area.

Since September 2017, there has been no need for Wilstead Primary School pupils to “feed into” any middle school.”

18. BBC provided an explanation of the school system in its area:

“The majority of Bedford Borough Schools transitioned to a two-tier education system in 2017/18. We have one area (Villages of Wootton and Stewartby) of three-tier education which is currently going through the process to fully transition to two-tier by 2027/28. We have one remaining school that admits at Year 5; Marston Vale Middle School in Stewartby (PAN 150). However, Marston Vale Middle School will change age range to become a primary in 2027/28.”

Consideration of case

19. The objector has asserted that the arrangements, in naming WPS as a feeder school, are unreasonable and unfair and therefore contrary to paragraphs 1.15 and 1.8 of the Code.

20. I will first assess whether the selection of WPS as a feeder school is reasonable. If I find that it is unreasonable, the related oversubscription criterion would be non-compliant with paragraph 1.15 of the Code; consequently, the arrangements would also be contrary to paragraph 1.8 of the Code which requires that oversubscription criteria are reasonable. If I find that the selection of WPS as a feeder school is unreasonable and therefore contrary to the Code, I will not need to proceed to considering the matter of fairness; if I find it to be reasonable, I will consider whether the effect of the relevant criterion is fair.

21. The Code uses the term ‘reasonable’ but does not define it. It is the requirement of public bodies, including admission authorities, that they must act reasonably in adopting any policy or making any decision. The common law test for ‘unreasonableness’ in this context is that, for a decision to be considered unreasonable it would have to be a decision that no rational admission authority would have made having taken into account all relevant factors, placing sufficient weight upon each of those factors and disregarding any irrelevant factors.

22. There is no definition of the term “feeder school” in the Code. Where a term is not defined in legislation, it is taken to have its ordinary and everyday meaning. The Cambridge Dictionary defines “feeder” as an adjective “used to refer to something that leads to or supplies a larger thing of the same type”. My view is that, in the context of admission arrangements, a feeder school is simply a school which is named as such, and which is selected transparently on reasonable grounds.

23. In order for the grounds for the selection of a feeder school to be reasonable, an admission authority should be able to give reasons for the selection. I asked the Trust for a full explanation of its rationale for the use of feeder schools for RBA, including why the Trust has chosen to name feeder schools and the rationale for the choice of feeder schools (that is, why each of the schools has been named). The Trust provided the following response:

“The Trust has carefully considered the inclusion of feeder schools in its admission arrangements in line with the School Admissions Code and in the best interests of ensuring a fair, consistent and community-focused admissions process. The Trust has named feeder schools in its admission arrangements for RBA to:

- Support continuity of education
- Strengthening ties with local schools
- Reflect historical links – consistent and longstanding flows of pupils, and established patterns of transfer
- Parental preference patterns – parents have consistently chosen to apply to RBA over a sustained period of time
- Ensure clarity and transparency for families – naming feeder schools provides parents and carers with a clearer understanding of the likelihood of admission, allowing them to make informed decisions during the application process.

WPS families have consistently chosen to continue their education at RBA over a sustained period of time spanning decades. Historically WPS was a lower school and transitioned to a primary more recently. The local plan was for all of the schools in Central Bedfordshire to transition to two tier education (from three tier). However, this has been continually delayed and postponed by the Local Authority with very little clarity or local agreement. The LA partially delivered this plan in the area but paused mid-way through the process. This has caused considerable disruption in the local area.

The other schools named as feeder schools to RBA have all also consistently sent children to the school over a sustained period of time. These schools again all have a historic relationship with the school.”

24. The Trust states that, “Historically WPS was a lower school and transitioned to a primary more recently.” WPS became a primary school in September 2017, some eight years ago; I do not regard that as a recent change. I have noted the matter of transition from a two-tier system of education to a three-tier system and understand that this may present challenges for the School. However, I must determine whether or not the selection of WPS as a feeder school for RBA is reasonable within the system that, as far as is known, will be in place in the academic year 2026/27, the year to which the arrangements apply and for which I have jurisdiction. I make it clear that I do not regard potential plans for reorganisation to be relevant to the objection: WPS provides for children aged four to

eleven years and RBS for those aged nine to thirteen years, and that is the context in which the objection must be considered.

25. The Trust's rationale for including feeder schools in the arrangements for RBA may be summarised as follows:

- 25.1. Supporting continuity of education.
- 25.2. Strengthening ties with local schools.
- 25.3. Reflecting historical links.
- 25.4. Parental preference patterns.
- 25.5. Ensuring clarity and transparency for families.

26. In my view the Trust's rationale is reasonable. To put it another way, I am satisfied that selecting a school as a feeder school on the basis of that rationale would be a reasonable decision. I will now consider whether the selection of WPS as a feeder school falls within the stated grounds for selection. If not, this would be a failure in logic which could render the selection of WPS as a feeder school unreasonable.

27. I will consider, in turn, each part of the Trust's rationale, beginning with whether the naming of WPS as a feeder school supports continuity of education.

28. WPS provides for children up until the end of Year 6; RBA admits children at the beginning of Year 5. In order to join RBA at the normal point of entry a child from WPS would need to leave that school two years before they otherwise would, mid-way through Key Stage 2. I find it unlikely that such a move would contribute to continuity of education and indeed find it likely that a child changing schools in this manner may experience some disruption. The objector stated:

"We consider the very fact that Wilstead is a Primary School to be reason enough to regard RBA's oversubscription criteria as unreasonable. Wilstead Primary School provides education for its pupils up to the end of Year 6 and has no need for its pupils to transfer to a middle school."

29. According to GIAS (which uses straight line distances), within five miles of the postcode of the address of WPS there are eight secondary schools which admit children to Year 7 as the normal year of entry; three of these are within three miles. I have considered whether the relationship between RBA and WPS is such that continuity of education is assured for children from WPS who join RBA at the start of Year 5, perhaps by shared practices or through curriculum organisation. The objector stated:

"Wilstead Primary School has no links at all with RBA. There is no sharing of the curriculum or resources, no transition arrangements in place and no other form of collaboration between the two schools."

“The schools do not collaborate on curriculum or extra curricular activities. Wilstead has been contacted by one MFL [modern foreign languages] teacher to carry out some outreach support, but works far more collaboratively with the secondary schools in the catchment, including Wixams Academy.”

30. It is not clear what is meant by schools “in the catchment”; I take it to mean secondary schools more local to WPS or in its catchment area. In any case, nothing has been presented by the Trust to seek to disprove WPS’s statement that there are no links between it and RBA, and no party has suggested that there are any educational links between the two schools other than some potential work on languages.

31. Consequently, I find that the rationale that WPS has been selected as a feeder school in order to support continuity of education is a failure in logic which could render that selection unreasonable.

32. I will now consider whether the naming of WPS as a feeder school strengthens ties with local schools.

33. According to GIAS, RBA and WPS are approximately 5.45 miles apart. Within five miles of the postcode of RBA, GIAS shows that there are 21 primary schools (some of which are lower schools); within five miles of WPS there are ten secondary schools and two middle schools. Whilst the definition of ‘local’ may be subjective, it is not obvious why WPS would be chosen as a feeder school for RBA on the basis of locality. In any case, as noted above there is little or no relationship between WPS and RBA and so there are not any ties that the two schools have established and therefore may seek to strengthen.

34. Consequently, I find that the rationale that WPS has been selected as a feeder school in order to strengthen ties with local schools is a failure in logic which could render that selection unreasonable.

35. I turn now to consideration of two, similar aspects of the Trust’s rationale: whether the naming of WPS as a feeder school reflects historical links and “consistent and longstanding flows of pupils, and established patterns of transfer”; and parental preference patterns and whether “parents have consistently chosen to apply to RBA over a sustained period of time”.

36. I do not consider it reasonable for WPS be named as a feeder school simply because this has previously been the case. In order to select a feeder school on the basis of historical links then, in my view, some links must remain. The Trust told me:

“The admission consultation records held by BEST date back to the September 2016 (consultation held December 2014) and within these records, WPS was listed as a feeder. It is our understanding that this longstanding relationship was in place for a significant number of years prior to 2016.”

37. The Trust refers to a “longstanding relationship”. A relationship is generally defined as a state of connection. As I have set out above, no party has presented any evidence that there is an ongoing connection of any nature between WPS and RBA.

38. I have considered the flow of pupils from WPS to RBA and whether this may be described as consistent and an established pattern of transfer; and whether parents have consistently chosen to apply to RBA over a sustained period of time.

39. Children from the named feeder schools are prioritised for entry to RBA under the fifth oversubscription criterion. The Trust provided data for admissions in 2022, 2023 and 2024 and for offers for 2025. This shows the number of children with EHCPs admitted or offered a place at the School and the numbers of children admitted or offered a place under each of the oversubscription criteria and is set out in table 2, below.

Table 2: The number of children with EHCPs admitted or offered a place at the School, and the numbers admitted or offered a place under each of the oversubscription criteria, from 2022 to 2025

Numbers admitted / offered into Year 5	2022	2023	2024	2025
EHCP	10	10	7	6
1. Looked after and previously looked after children	2	2	4	0
2. Children of staff	2	3	6	6
3. Siblings	70	55	67	63
4. Catchment area	122	125	141	141
5. Feeder schools	23	33	15	24
6. Other children	19	12	0	0
PAN	240	240	240	240

40. RBA is an oversubscribed school. The Trust told me that for admission in 2024 it received 252 first preference applications; for 2025 the figure was 246. I note that the arrangements prioritise many applicants before those afforded priority on the basis of attendance at one of the feeder schools. In 2024, 225 children were admitted before the application of the fifth oversubscription criterion; for 2025, this figure was 216 children.

41. In 2024, the number of children admitted due to the application of the fifth oversubscription criterion was 15; in 2025, 24 children were offered places under that criterion. In other words, children prioritised for admission due to their attendance at a feeder school formed a small proportion of all those admitted or offered places: 6.3 per cent of all those admitted in 2024 and ten per cent of those offered places in 2025.

42. As shown in table 1, the sum of the PANs of the feeder schools is 290. When, in 2024, 15 children were admitted under the feeder school criterion, this represented 5.2 per cent of the sum of the PANs of the feeder schools. The 24 children offered places in 2025 equates to 8.3 per cent of the sum of the PANs of the feeder schools. To put it another way, a small minority of children from the feeder schools are prioritised for admission to RBA on the basis of their attendance at those schools.

43. The Trust provided, on 2 May 2025, data showing the number of children from WPS admitted to or offered a place at RBA in recent years. This is set out in table 3, below; the figure of eight pupils offered places in 2025 was provided by WPS on 25 June 2025 and is higher than that of six pupils stated by the Trust, as it includes two children who secured places following appeal.

Table 3: the number of children from WPS admitted to or offered a place at RBA in 2022-2025

Year	2022	2023	2024	2025
Number admitted / offered a place	2	9	5	8
Proportion of RBA PAN (per cent)	0.8	3.8	2.1	3.3
Proportion of WPS PAN (per cent)	6.7	30	16.7	26.7

44. Those children from WPS who have been admitted to, or offered a place at, RBA form a very small proportion of the RBA intake. On average, over the four years shown, six children have moved from WPS to RBA each year. Although the data show what may be described as a consistent pattern, this pattern is that few children transfer from WPA to RBA each year.

45. The Trust stated, in its rationale, “WPS families have consistently chosen to continue their education at RBA over a sustained period of time spanning decades”. I am not persuaded that what may or may not have happened over decades is relevant; any patterns of transfer prior to 2017 reflect a time when children had to leave WPS at the end of Year 4. Neither am I persuaded that this statement by the Trust is true. Most families of children at WPS do not, and have not in recent years, consistently chosen to continue their education at RBA. This is a choice made by a minority.

46. Consequently, I find that the rationale that WPS has been selected as a feeder school to reflect “historical links, consistent and longstanding flows of pupils, and established patterns of transfer” is a failure in logic which could render that selection unreasonable.

47. I also find that the rationale that WPS has been selected as a feeder school to reflect parental preference patterns and that “parents have consistently chosen to apply to RBA

over a sustained period of time” is a failure in logic which could render that selection unreasonable.

48. The final part of the Trust’s rationale for naming WPS as a feeder school is that this is to “Ensure clarity and transparency for families – naming feeder schools provides parents and carers with a clearer understanding of the likelihood of admission, allowing them to make informed decisions during the application process.”

49. The admission of any applicant (other than a child with an EHCP which names the School) cannot be guaranteed. However, parents may look at the arrangements and assess the likelihood of their child gaining admittance to RBA based on the oversubscription criteria therein.

50. The Trust told me:

“BEST have [sic] given consideration to not giving WPS pupils an advantage over catchment by placing feeders lower in the oversubscription criteria. However, BEST still wished to maintain the historical link by retaining WPS as a named feeder. This ensured a fair system to the local children whilst retaining the historical link in an area that has a mix of all phases of education.”

51. I find this to be unclear. WPS pupils are not prioritised above those living in the catchment area of RBA; it seems that the Trust has considered removing an advantage that does not exist and to the extent that priority is afforded, it appears to be only taken advantage of by a very small number of families.

52. Children from WPS are afforded, under the fifth oversubscription criterion, priority over other some applicants: the “any other children” prioritised under the sixth criterion (none of whom were admitted or offered places in 2024 or 2025). Some parents may appreciate this advantage, however small. As I have set out above, most of the children admitted to the School gain their places before the application of the fifth criterion.

53. I have considered carefully the argument of the Trust that including WPS as a feeder school provides parents “with a clearer understanding of the likelihood of admission”. Data in table 3 show that, on average over the past four years, 2.5 per cent of the intake to RBA has been children from WPS. I find, on balance, that neither the order of the oversubscription criteria nor the available data support the Trust’s argument.

54. Consequently, I find that the rationale that WPS has been selected as a feeder school to “ensure clarity and transparency for families – naming feeder schools provides parents and carers with a clearer understanding of the likelihood of admission, allowing them to make informed decisions during the application process” is a failure in logic which could render that selection unreasonable.

55. For the sake of completeness, I asked the Trust for a full explanation as to why it regards the inclusion of a primary school as a feeder school for RBA to be appropriate, given that the usual year of entry at RBA is Year 5. I requested that the Trust make it clear

what consideration, if any, has been given to removing WPS as a feeder school since it became a primary school. The Trust responded:

“the Trust believe [sic] that RBA has a long-standing relationship with the Wilstead area. The school borders the Central Bedfordshire area and is in close proximity to other RBA feeder schools. The school has been left in a vulnerable position by the Local Authority and has had to fight incredibly hard to maintain standards, retain staff and therefore protect the flow of pupils and essentially financial situation. Within the area, there is a variety of transition points in many schools which means pupil flows are not guaranteed and sometimes unknown.

There is also an established bus service for the Bedford children (including Wilstead). If numbers were to dwindle from the area, this service might not be viable in the long-term and cause a threat for those pupils”.

56. The Trust refers to a long-standing relationship with the Wilstead area; this seems to be related to where children live, not to whether or not they attend WPS. The Trust has presented no argument or evidence of any relationship with WPS. Whilst I am sympathetic to difficulties that RBA may be experiencing with regard to finances and the other issues raised, the Trust has not explained how these have informed the selection of WPS as a feeder school. As I have discussed, the arrangements do not afford high priority to applicants on the basis of their attendance at a feeder school; a small number of children from WPS move to RBS each year. It is not clear therefore how the selection of WPS as a feeder school would “protect the flow of pupils.” Neither is such a consideration part of the Trust’s stated rationale for its use of feeder schools. I have not considered the matter of bus services; in my view this has no bearing on this case.

57. I have considered the Trust’s grounds for continuing to adopt WPS as a feeder school which I have set out in paragraph 25. For the reasons I have explained, I find the Trust’s rationale for selecting WPS as a feeder school on these grounds to be a failure in logic. This failure applies to all the stated grounds for selection. I therefore conclude that the selection of WPS as a feeder school for RBS is unreasonable and contrary to paragraph 1.15 of the Code. Consequently, the arrangements also do not conform with paragraph 1.8 of the Code, which requires that oversubscription criteria are reasonable.

58. I have also concluded that the admission arrangements for the School as determined for entry in September 2026 are unlawful because they are unreasonable. Since the arrangements are in breach of the mandatory requirements in paragraphs 1.15 and 1.8 of the Code, I uphold the first part of the objection. I find that the other grounds of the objection do not fall to be considered by me because I am bound to uphold an objection where a set of arrangements is unlawful. Where this is the case, it is not for me to consider whether those same provisions in the arrangements are fair or in breach of the Code for other reasons. Therefore, I do not uphold the other parts of the objection.

59. I partially uphold the objection for the reasons given above.

Summary of findings

60. I have assessed whether the selection of WPS as a feeder school for RBA is reasonable and found that it is unreasonable. Consequently, the relevant oversubscription criterion is non-compliant with paragraph 1.15 of the Code. The arrangements are also contrary to paragraph 1.8 of the Code which requires that oversubscription criteria are reasonable.

Determination

61. In accordance with section 88H(4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I partially uphold the objection to the admission arrangements for September 2026 determined by Bedfordshire Schools Trust Limited for Robert Bloomfield Academy, which is in the local authority area of Central Bedfordshire.

62. By virtue of section 88K(2) the adjudicator's decision is binding on the admission authority. The School Admissions Code requires the admission authority to revise its admission arrangements within two months of the date of the determination.

Dated: 5 September 2025

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Jennifer Gamble