



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference:	ADA4482 Cuddington and Dinton Church of England Primary School, Buckinghamshire
Objector:	Buckinghamshire Council
Admission authority:	The Governing Body for Cuddington and Dinton Church of England Primary School
Date of decision:	24 November 2025

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 determined by the governing body for Cuddington and Dinton Church of England Primary School, Buckinghamshire for September 2026.

I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88I(5) and find there are other matters which do not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements in the ways set out in this determination.

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 unless an alternative timescale is specified by the adjudicator. In this case I determine that the arrangements must be revised by Friday 9 January 2026.

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 Buckinghamshire Council (the local authority (the LA), the objector), about the admission arrangements (the arrangements) for Cuddington and Dinton Church of England Primary School (the school), a voluntary aided school for children aged 4 to 11 for September 2026. The objection is to the catchment area which the school employs. The LA believes that the catchment area disadvantages children living in an area which is to the north of the village of Haddenham in Buckinghamshire.

2. The parties to the case are the governing body for the school, the LA and the school's designated faith body, the Diocese of Oxford (the Diocese).

Jurisdiction

3. These arrangements were determined under section 88C of the Act by the school's governing body on 22 January 2025. The objector submitted their objection to these determined arrangements on 9 May 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.

4. I have also used my power under section 88I of the Act to consider the arrangements as a whole.

Procedure

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

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

- a. a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the governing body at which the arrangements were determined;
- b. a copy of the determined arrangements;
- c. the objector's form of objection dated 9 May 2025 and supporting documents supplied with it;
- d. the school's and the Diocese's response to the objection;
- e. the local authority's composite prospectus for admissions to primary schools;
- f. maps of the area identifying relevant schools, and
- g. information supplied at my request by the LA, the school and the Diocese as detailed below.

7. I have been presented with large amounts of information by both the LA and the school. I shall make reference only to the material that has been directly relevant to my consideration of the objection and the other matters which I will identify below. Although the admission authority is the school's governing body, my correspondence has been with the school and I shall therefore refer to it in what follows.

The Objection

8. Having read the form of objection submitted by the LA, I wrote to the parties setting out what I understood that objection to be, in the following terms:

"Whether the arrangements cause unfair disadvantage to children living in the north of

the village of Haddenham because of the school's designated catchment area. The objector says that such disadvantage is contrary to the requirements of paragraph 1.8 of the Code which requires that oversubscription criteria do not "disadvantage unfairly, either directly or indirectly, a child from a particular social or racial group".

Paragraph 14 of the Code also says that:

".....admission authorities **must** ensure that the practices and the criteria used to decide the allocation of school places are fair....." and

Paragraph 1.14 of the Code says that "Catchment areas **must** be designed so that they are reasonable and clearly defined."

Other Matters

9. Having considered the arrangements as a whole it appeared to me that the following matters do not, or may not, conform with requirements:

(i) Paragraph 2.18 of the Code requires that:

"Admission authorities **must** make clear in their admission arrangements the process for requesting admission out of the normal age group."

The arrangements provide no such procedure, stating only that "It is recommended that parents discuss their wishes with the headteacher in advance of applying for a place."

(ii) Paragraph 2.15 of the Code requires that:

"Each admission authority **must** maintain a....waiting list...stating in their arrangements that each child added will require the list to be ranked again in line with the published oversubscription criteria."

The arrangements contain no such statement.

Background

10. The school is on two sites – the infant site is in the hamlet of Cuddington and the junior site in nearby Dinton, about 2 miles to the east. The Cuddington site is just less than 2 miles to the north of the village of Haddenham, which is approximately 3 miles from the town of Thame (in Oxfordshire, to the west) and 5 miles from Aylesbury in Buckinghamshire (to the east).

11. 600 new homes have been built in Haddenham over the last four years, and more are planned, possibly 300 homes over the next three years. This has put pressure on local school places, and the LA has explored with local schools the means for meeting this need. It refers in its documentation to three local schools which provide Year R places: Cuddington and Dinton Church of England Primary School, Haddenham Infant School and

Haddenham St Mary's Church of England Primary School. There is also a junior school in Haddenham.

12. The school's admission arrangements for 2026, in summary, provide the following:

- (i) The Published Admission Number (although not referred to as such) (the PAN) is 26.
- (ii) Oversubscription criteria are listed as:
 - a. Looked after and previously looked after children (as defined)
 - b. Those with an exceptional medical or social need that the child attends the school
 - c. Children living in the school's catchment area who have a sibling (as defined) at the school
 - d. Other children who live in the catchment area
 - e. Children living outside the catchment area with a sibling at the school
 - f. Other children living outside the catchment area
 - g. Children of staff at the school (as defined)
 - h. Other children.

Within each criterion, priority is given based on the proximity of the home to either of the school's two sites (with the nearer distance being used), followed by random allocation. The school's catchment area covers the rural areas to the north and east of Haddenham but does not include Haddenham itself.

13. In its objection, the LA said that in September 2024 all local children needing Year R places could be accommodated in the three schools, although both the "Haddenham" schools [those providing Year R places] were oversubscribed from within their catchment areas. In 2025, which the LA forecasts show as the expected peak in demand, Haddenham Infant School created a "bulge" class, doubling its PAN from 30 to 60. Without this bulge class, the LA said, a number of pupils "with a higher preference for a Haddenham school would not have been allocated a place in Haddenham (5 of which would have received no allocation at all)." By "higher preference" I understand the LA to mean that the parents of these children had sought one of the schools as one of their highest expressed preferences. However, I was unclear about the information about these children which the LA wished to convey, and so sought clarification from it. I shall refer to this clearer information below.

14. Also in its objection, the LA gave me information about the allocation of Year R places at Cuddington and Dinton Primary School for September 2025 (which included a number of children living outside its catchment area who were younger siblings of children

at the school). It told me about its proposal (which dated originally from 2023) that the school's catchment area should be amended to include the area of new housing north of the village of Haddenham. The LA said that an anticipated further housing development of 300 homes "would appear insufficient to justify/generate funding for a one form of entry expansion at a Haddenham school – it would be more efficient in the first instance to accommodate any over demand at C&D [the school] by expanding their catchment to incorporate new development in Haddenham (as this would provide [about] 0.5 FE [forms of entry] additional capacity through the displacement of out-catchment children) until such time as sufficient funding/demand justified the expansion of the Haddenham schools."

15. The LA referred also in its objection to the school's "previously expressed willingness to increase their class sizes from 26 to 30", noting that this would itself require capital investment. I note here that the school's PAN of 26 is that indicated by its net capacity assessment (which I have seen), which gives a net capacity of 182 for the school. Discussions about a potential expansion of the infant site which began in 2019 appear to have come to nothing, apparently because the LA came to the view that the capital investment involved would not be value for money, given the small number of additional places that would be provided.

16. In essence then, the LA has asked the school to change the area covered by its catchment area to include the new housing development (as a lower priority part of its catchment area) so that children living there would be allocated a place at the school instead of the out of catchment siblings and other children admitted under the arrangements as they are currently.

17. The LA had also requested the school (in 2024) to expand its catchment area to the north (following the closure of Westcott Church of England Primary School) to cover part of this area but the school decided instead to consult on including the whole of the former Westcott CE School catchment area as part of its catchment area for 2026 admissions. The determined arrangements have included this area and the governors have continued to decline to expand the catchment area to the south to include the area of housing north of Haddenham.

18. The objection of the LA is that this new catchment area "unfairly disadvantages children living in the north of Haddenham - in preference to other areas outside the school's catchment area which already have good access to other schools."

19. For the sake of completeness, I record here that the LA (as part of its objection) told me that it considered "relevant" a decision by the adjudicator in 2009 about the catchment area of a school in Buckinghamshire concerning which there had been an objection by parents who had a low likelihood of securing a place there. It also referred me to a more recent decision (in 2020) and to the reasoning used by the adjudicator in that case concerning catchment areas. It is important for me to state that while adjudicators are concerned to ensure consistency of approach in their decision-making, individual decisions taken by adjudicators do not form precedents, since each is taken in the light of the local context and circumstances, which can change even in the same location from one year to

another. It is also the case that adjudicators are required to consider whether admission arrangements comply with the School Admissions Code which is in force at the time they make their decision. There has been more than one revision of the Code since 2009, and one since 2020. However, I am grateful to the LA for expressing its view to me, which I have noted.

Consideration of Case

20. The LA expressed its objection in terms of the wording of paragraph 1.8 of the Code, which I have quoted above, about the potential of there being unfair disadvantage caused by a set of admission arrangements to children from a particular social or racial group. As I have also said above, I have understood the objection to be an objection that the arrangements are unfair and contrary to paragraph 14 of the Code and that the catchment is unreasonable in nature, contrary to paragraph 1.14. Neither had been referred to directly by the LA.

Whether there is unfair disadvantage to a particular social or racial group

21. Initially, I am concerned with the objection in terms of paragraph 1.8 of the Code. For there to be unfair disadvantage to a child from a particular social or racial group, there must be such a group which is identifiable. The LA may have a view that the group of children it says are unfairly disadvantaged by the school's catchment area form such a group, but it has not said so or said what the nature of this group is, or provided me with any evidence at all on this point. As a result, I have no reason to form the view that any such identifiable social or racial group is involved, and I do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

Whether the arrangements (including the catchment area) are unfair

22. Schools must employ oversubscription criteria in order to decide which children are admitted when the school is oversubscribed. As a result of the use of oversubscription criteria, some children are not admitted and will therefore need to go to a different school. That is, oversubscription criteria (including catchment areas) provide an advantage to some children and a disadvantage to others, as they are intended to do. In order to determine whether or not there is unfairness as a result of this disadvantage, it is necessary to consider the relative effect on the two groups of children concerned (those advantaged and those disadvantaged).

23. The LA refers in its objection to two groups of pupils – those living in the area to the north of Haddenham, and those other pupils who do not live in the school's catchment area (who the LA says "already have good access to other schools") but who nevertheless have the higher priority for admission to the school under the school's oversubscription criteria.

24. I therefore need to examine what is likely to happen with respect to these groups under the school's admission arrangements for 2026 by considering both what has occurred in admissions to the school up to and including in 2025, and then what is likely to happen in 2026 in the light of all the available evidence (given also the change made by the

school to its catchment area since 2025). In order for the arrangements to be unfair, they would need to have an unfair effect and that unfair effect would need to outweigh the advantage to other children who gain a place at the school as a result of what the arrangements contain. An unfair effect could arise for those not admitted if some of these children could not secure a suitable school place at a reasonable distance from their home.

25. I asked the school to provide me with the number of Year R children it admitted in 2023, 2024 and 2025 and the allocation of those places against the school's oversubscription criteria for those years in which there was oversubscription. It told me that it had not been oversubscribed in any of these years, although there had been 26 admissions (that is, up to the PAN of 26) in 2023 and 2024. It gave me the oversubscription criteria which would have been relevant to each child, had the school been oversubscribed. I summarise this information in the following table:

Nominal relevant oversubscription criterion	September 2023 (number of children)	September 2024 (number of children)	September 2025 (number of children)
Living in catchment with sibling at school	5	5	6
Living in catchment	9	7	6
Living outside catchment with sibling at school	4	8	6
Living out of catchment	8	6	7
TOTAL	26	26	25

26. The points I have noted in particular from this information are that:

- (i) the school has not been oversubscribed in any year. There is currently one vacancy in the school's Year R;
- (ii) the number of children admitted who were living in the catchment area in the three years was 14, 12 and 12. The number admitted from outside the catchment area was 12, 14 and 13. In other words, there was an approximate balance;

- (iii) those living outside the catchment area who had a sibling at the school did not take up all the “out of catchment places” places. In two of the three years, these were less than half the “out of catchment” admissions; and
- (iv) had there been oversubscription, and assuming this would have been reached under the oversubscription criterion of “other out of catchment children”, places would have been prioritised on distance from the closer of the two school sites to the child’s home. I estimate that the distance from the nearest part of the area of new housing to the school’s infant site is 0.75 miles and to the furthest part 1.75 miles.

27. The school also told me that “On average over the last 10+ years there have been 7 pupils out of catchment who come to our school in each Reception intake. Pupils from Haddenham sometimes choose our school as first choice, they will be offered a place if they do [sic] as approximately a third of our school places go to out of catchment pupils.”

28. The LA confirmed this latter point in its own further submission to me which said that “While pupils living in north Haddenham may be successful in securing a place at [the school] – it is on condition that they express the school as a preference”. It went on to say that if the area were included in the school’s catchment area “it sets a clear expectation that parents should include the school as a preference” in line with the advice given to parents in the Council’s guidance to parents that admission to a catchment area school was not automatic. I cannot but observe that this is a somewhat circular argument. The area does not have to be in the school’s catchment area for parents to be advised that they need to use it as one of their expressed preferences, if they want their child to have a place there.

29. I asked the LA to clarify what it had told me about the effect which there would have been on children if the 2025 bulge class had not been created. It said that eight children from north Haddenham would not have been admitted in that case to any of the three local schools. Of these, five would have been allocated “any one of their preferences”, and that there may have been places available at primary schools in Thame, which is in Oxfordshire (by my estimation about three miles away). Two of the eight would have been allocated the primary school at Longwick, about 4 miles away to the south, and the eighth to St Joseph RC Primary School, which is also in Thame. The LA told me that the creation of the bulge class for 2025 had “effectively enabled the schools [in particular Haddenham Infant School] to admit more out of area children”. The total number of Year R admissions to the three schools in 2025 was 135, against the figure forecast prior to the creation of a bulge class of 127 admissions. The bulge class has not been fully filled and contains 20 children.

30. The LA helpfully appended a paper as part of its objection giving its projection (made in April 2025) of the need for Year R places in Haddenham village including Cuddington and Dinton. The projection for 2026 is a need for 120 places and for 2027 for 125 places. My understanding is that these figures include any effect of the area to the north of the school which was added to its catchment area in 2026 as described above. The combined PANs of the three schools is 116, or 146 if a further bulge class is created at Haddenham

Infant School. The LA has stated, in response to my request, that it “would wish to avoid providing another bulge class for September 2026.”

31. When asked to provide its estimate of the number of Year R children living in the north Haddenham area that it considers are likely to be without a Year R place at one of the three local schools, the LA explained that it could not provide this accurately but gave me the number of children living there and attending a primary school from the January 2025 school census. This showed that from Reception to Year 6 there was an average of 28 such children per year group, with the highest number for any year being 45 and the lowest 18. Even though that information is helpful, it does not provide an answer to the question which I had asked. I imagined the LA would have been able to provide at least an estimate of the number of children it considered would be involved, given that it had been able to tell me about the eight children discussed above and given that the existence of such a group of children forms the basis of its objection.

32. I am left, then, with the following:

- (i) the projection of the total Year R need for the three schools in 2026 indicates a probable shortfall of perhaps 4 places (the projection of 120 against the existing total PAN of 116) across the entire area;
- (ii) some children living in the area of north Haddenham are already admitted to the school, although this is not part of its catchment area;
- (iii) children living in that area in 2026 will have a good chance of securing any available places for out of catchment children at Cuddington and Dinton Church of England School (even if it is oversubscribed) under the school’s existing arrangements because of the proximity of the area to the school’s infant site, if they apply for a place there. Children with older siblings would be prioritised over those without, and
- (iv) the LA cannot say how many children living in the north Haddenham area are likely to suffer any unfair disadvantage if the school’s catchment area remains as it is.

33. I explained above the basis on which any judgement of unfair disadvantage would need to be made. The LA believes that the area of north Haddenham should be part of the school catchment area and that if it were, children living there would secure a place at the school under its oversubscription criteria at the expense of the children who would then remain outside the school’s catchment area. I have given above the possible number of Year R children who might be living in the area north of Haddenham. This has been an average of 28 in recent years. I have been given the admissions data for the school in the last three years, and it is clear that if even something like half this number of children were added to the those currently with catchment area priority, then there would be insufficient places at the school for the admission of children living outside the school’s catchment area who had a sibling at the school.

34. So, as the LA had said, the two groups of children I must examine the effect on for my consideration of the fairness of the arrangements are:

- (i) the children living in north Haddenham who might not secure a local school place if the catchment area remains as at present, and
- (ii) the group living outside the catchment area who are currently able to access the school but who would not be able to obtain a place if the catchment area were to include the north Haddenham area, who I can now see are more than likely to include younger siblings of children at the school.

35. I point out here that the adjudicator has no power to determine a school's admission arrangements. The LA has made its objection in terms of the effect of the school's arrangements as determined in relation to the existence of a particular area of housing which is not included in the school's catchment area. Even if I were to find that there was an unfair effect for children living in that area as the LA contends, the school's governing body would be under no direct obligation to remedy such a situation by making the area part of the school's catchment area, since there could be other remedies. This is not my province, however.

36. I have asked the LA to list for me the primary schools in Buckinghamshire, other than the school, which are within five miles of the centre of the housing development north of Haddenham as referred to in its objection, together with their PAN, the number of Year R admissions in 2024 and 2025, and the latest forecast of the need for Year R places in 2026 and 2027. I also asked it to provide any information it had easily to hand about nearby primary schools in Thame. I am grateful to it for its speedy and comprehensive response.

37. The LA's list shows three schools in Buckinghamshire and three in Thame, in Oxfordshire. Of the former, Stone Church of England Primary School is to the east between Haddenham and Aylesbury, Longwick Church of England Primary School is between Haddenham and Princes Risborough to the south and Long Crendon Primary School is west of Haddenham and north of Thame. All three schools are less than 5 miles from the centre of the housing development as the crow flies. The LA told me that it does not generally make forecasts for individual schools, and those it gave were based on catchment births and "patterns of parental choice within the area". It told me that schools in the areas of Stone and Longwick "are expected to fill from out-of-area children living in Aylesbury town and Princes Risborough respectively", and its informal projections for these two schools showed this. Its projection for Long Crendon Primary School (4.9 miles away by the LA's "routed distance" (i.e. not as the crow flies, which would be a shorter distance) showed a projected Year R intake in 2026 of 24 against the school's PAN of 30.

38. The three schools listed in Thame, all of which are less than five miles away by "routed distance", did not fill to their PAN in 2024 but two did so in 2025. No individual school projections for these schools are available to the LA. However, it helpfully provided pupil projections for the wider planning area of Thame, Chinnor and the surrounding villages (in Oxfordshire) which it had obtained from the relevant GOV.UK website. This

showed a Reception place need projection of 27 below total PAN for 2026, although this figure must obviously be treated with some caution as not all the schools covered by this forecast are relevant here.

39. The LA said that if its objection is not upheld, it anticipated that it could provide Year R places in 2026 for pupils from north Haddenham at Long Crendon School and also possibly at St Joseph's RC school in Thame, adding that this "may result in significant parental dissatisfaction". It also said that if the objection is upheld, it would expect "catchment children displaced from Cuddington and Dinton to reduce Aylesbury town preferences" (at Stone CE Primary School), and that at the school children from north Haddenham "would displace any out-catchment preferences from Stone and Aylesbury".

40. I do not argue with these observations, but I think it equally the case that if I do not uphold the objection, children from the north Haddenham area may displace Aylesbury preferences from Stone CE Primary School (and so provide a further alternative school) although this would depend on the distances involved.

36. Taking this all together, I am of the view that the former group of children identified above, which it seems to me is likely only to be small, would have suitable alternative schools available within a reasonable travelling distance from where they live. Long Crendon Primary School was last inspected in November 2024 and rated as "Good" in three categories and "Outstanding" in the three remaining categories by Ofsted inspectors. St Joseph's RC Primary School in Thame was last inspected in January 2025 when Ofsted inspectors judged it to be "Good" in all five Ofsted categories. While it may cause dissatisfaction if any child would have to travel further than their parent would wish, as the LA has said, this is not the same as the child suffering any actual unfairness. There are good alternative schools within a reasonable distance.

41. As I have said above, it seems to me likely that, should the north Haddenham area be included in the school's catchment area, children living there would be able to access places as residents in the school's catchment area and so displace children who do not reside there, including (for the reasons I have given) in all probability any children who have an older sibling already at the school. Having children at more than one primary school, even if these are geographically not distant from each other, must cause disruption and expense that would otherwise be unnecessary, and is also very likely to impact on the lives of all concerned including the children themselves, especially for this age group. If that were to be brought about without there being good reason, that may in itself be considered an unfairness. It seems to me that the needs of this second group are not outweighed by the needs of the group living in north Haddenham that I have just discussed. For this reason, I do not consider that the arrangements, including the school's catchment area, are unfair.

Whether the school's catchment area complies with the Code's requirements

42. I have set out above the dual requirements of clarity and reasonableness which the Code makes in paragraph 1.14 concerning a school's catchment area. The arrangements

contain both a written description of the catchment area and a map which clearly shows its boundaries. There is no doubt that it is clearly described in the arrangements themselves.

43. I have referred above to the fact that for 2026 the school has consulted on and determined a revised catchment area so that it includes the area which was the catchment area for the former school at Westcott (which closed in August 2024). In its admission arrangements the school explained that the reason for it wishing to go beyond the request of the LA, and therefore to include the whole of this area in its revised catchment area, was “to offer all primary aged children in the wider catchment area the same opportunity to be educated at a Church school as they had previously enjoyed while ensuring a long term sustainable future for our school.” The Diocese told me that the proposed expansion had been discussed with the school and that the Diocese had given its approval. The school has told me that there are currently seven children on roll who live in this area. The LA said in its objection that other schools (including Church of England schools) had already added parts of the former Westcott catchment area to their own, and I asked the Diocese for its comments on this, but it did not provide any.

44. When the school commented on the objection, it referred to the history of the exchanges between itself and the LA concerning the capacity of the school and the designation of its catchment area. As recently as October 2024 the latter was discussed by the school’s governors, who reaffirmed their previous unwillingness to include the area north of Haddenham in the school’s catchment area. The school told me that “One of the reasons being that if [the school] takes Haddenham pupils at the Infant site, they are very likely to change schools for Haddenham Junior at the start of Y3, meaning our places drop and we are at a financial disadvantage.” It said that two children [from Haddenham] had also left the school’s Reception class in October 2023 for places at Haddenham Infant school “once they became available”.

45. I am mindful of the “high bar” which applies to the matter of reasonableness, and to the need for the admission authority to be seen to have made a decision, the rationale for which is untenable, if I am to find the arrangements unreasonable. The governors have given their rationale for the extension of their catchment area, and I do not think this is made untenable in nature if other schools have done the same thing (or have done so partially). Similarly, the governors have given a clear reason for not wishing to admit children to Year R from an area where parents may prefer to send their children to a different school in Year 3, preferring to be able to offer places to children living in areas where this option is not available to parents. There has been a clear and tenable rationale for each decision.

46. I do not find that the school’s catchment area is unreasonable in its definition.

Other matters

47. Although I asked both the school and the Diocese for their comments on the additional matters which I had brought to their attention as possible breaches of what the Code requires, only the Diocese responded. It quoted the sections of the arrangements

which deal with the admission of children outside their normal age group and with waiting lists, commenting on both.

48. In spite of what the Diocese said to me, neither section contains the information required by the relevant paragraphs of the Code. My understanding of the requirement of paragraph 2.18 is that a description of the “process” required to request admission outside a child’s normal year group must consist of more than a suggestion that the matter is discussed with the school’s headteacher. What is required is a description of how and when the application itself should be made, whether in writing, who it should be addressed to and what information and supporting evidence would be relevant, as a minimum. The arrangements contain no such description and fail to comply with what the Code requires.

49. The Diocese accepted that the arrangements do not contain the wording concerning waiting lists which is mandated by paragraph 2.15 of the Code. The arrangements fail to comply with what the Code requires.

50. The Diocese supplied me with a copy of the guidance which it issues to schools concerning their admission arrangements. It may wish to consider the contents of this guidance, and in particular the model admission arrangements which they contain, in the light of these findings.

Summary of Findings

51. I have explained above the reasons why I do not uphold the objection. It is my view that the arrangements do not cause disadvantage to children from a particular social or racial group and so do not breach paragraph 1.8 of the Code, are not unfair (and so do not breach paragraph 14 of the Code) and do not contain a catchment area which is either unclear or which has not been reasonably defined (and so do not breach paragraph 1.14 of the Code).

52. I have explained why the arrangements fail to comply with paragraphs 2.18 and 2.15 of the Code.

53. Since the deadline for applications for primary school places in September 2026 is 15 January 2026, I shall stipulate that the arrangements must be revised in line with these findings no later than Friday 9 January 2026.

Determination

54. 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 governing body for Cuddington and Dinton Church of England Primary School, Buckinghamshire for September 2026.

55. I have also considered the arrangements in accordance with section 88I(5) and find there are other matters which do not conform with the requirements relating to admission arrangements in the ways set out in this determination.

56. 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 unless an alternative timescale is specified by the adjudicator. In this case I determine that the arrangements must be revised by Friday 9 January 2026.

Dated: 24 November 2025

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Dr Bryan Slater