



Office of
the Schools
Adjudicator

Determination

Case reference:	ADA4598
Objector:	A parent
Admission Authority:	The London Borough of Tower Hamlets for community primary schools in Tower Hamlets
Date of decision:	19 August 2026

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 2027/28 determined by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets for community primary schools in Tower Hamlets.

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 2027/28 for community primary schools in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (the Local Authority; the Admission Authority).
2. The Local Authority and the Objector are the parties to the objection.
3. The objection is to the use of catchment areas in the oversubscription criteria that give priority for a place at any community primary school within the borough. The catchment areas are alleged to be unjustifiable, and to operate to cause an unfairness to applicants residing in close proximity to a particular school, when their home addresses are outside of the designated catchment area for that school.

Jurisdiction

4. The Arrangements were determined under section 88C of the Act by the Local Authority, which is the Admission Authority for community primary schools in the borough.
5. The Objector submitted her objection to the Arrangements on 1 March 2026. I am satisfied that the objection has been properly referred to me in accordance with section 88H of the Act, and that it is within my jurisdiction.
6. In the interest of time, I have not considered the Arrangements as a whole under section 88I of the Act. The Admission Authority should not take the fact that I have not raised any other matters about the Arrangements as an endorsement of their compliance with the Code.

Procedure

7. In considering this matter I have had regard to all relevant legislation and the School Admissions Code (the Code).
8. The information I have considered in reaching my decision includes:
- the objection dated 1 March 2026;
 - a copy of the minutes of the meeting held by the Local Authority's Cabinet on 18 February 2026 when the Arrangements were determined;
 - the determined Arrangements for 2027/28;
 - the responses from the Local Authority and the Objector to my requests for further information;
 - maps, including Google Maps, and those identifying catchment area boundaries and schools; and
 - information available on the websites of gov.uk and the Local Authority.

Background

9. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is located to the east of central London. The Local Authority is the admission authority for around 35 community primary schools in its area. There are generic oversubscription criteria for these schools. The Arrangements set out that children with education, health and care plans which name a particular school will be admitted first. Then, in times when oversubscribed, children will be prioritised according to the oversubscription criteria. These can be summarised as follows (emphasis added):

- 1) looked after and previously looked after children;
 - 2) children who have a strong medical or social reason to attend the school applied to;
 - 3) children living **within the catchment area** who have a sibling attending the school;
 - 4) children of staff employed by the school concerned;
 - 5) children who live **within the catchment area** of the school and for whom the school applied for is their nearest community school within the catchment area;
 - 6) other children from **within the catchment area** of the school;
 - 7) children living **outside of the catchment area** with a sibling at the school; and
 - 8) children living **outside the catchment area**.
10. The tie-breaker is contained in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the Arrangements, as below:
- “3.2 In the event of oversubscription within any of the categories 2 to 8 above, priority will be given to children who live closest to the school by the shortest walking distance. A digitised ordnance survey map is used to measure the distance from the home address to the school’s designated official entrance.
- 3.3 Should two or more children live an equal distance from the school, including instances where more than one child lives in a multi-occupancy building, the offer of a place will be decided by random allocation.”
11. In Tower Hamlets, priority for places at any community primary school is neither based solely on distance from the school applied, nor do schools have individual catchment areas. Rather, the Local Authority has divided the entire borough into a total of six catchment areas. Residence within a particular catchment area gives an applicant priority for places, under the oversubscription criteria (3), (5) and (6) above, at all of the community schools within that catchment area. Within a catchment area, priority for a particular school is given, broadly speaking, on the basis of distance between the child’s home and the school for which the parents have expressed a preference. The numbers of community primary schools within catchment areas vary from three (Area 5 Wapping) to nine (Area 1 Stepney). Paragraph 4.1 of the Arrangements reads:

“The school catchment area is the defined area in which a school is located. It is generally bounded by major roads and/or railway/canal. The catchment area for each Tower Hamlets Community school is set by the Local Authority and is designed to

ensure that each address in the borough falls into the catchment area of a local school. Details of the community schools within the catchment area for a particular address can be viewed on the Local Authority's website:

<http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/equalchance>.”

12. The relevant paragraphs of the Code read:

“Overall principles behind setting arrangements

14. 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.

Oversubscription criteria

1.6 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...

1.8 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.

1.10 This Code does not give a definitive list of acceptable oversubscription criteria. It is for admission authorities to decide which criteria would be most suitable to the school according to the local circumstances...

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.”

Consideration of Case

13. The Objector lives within the borough. Her residence is situated within catchment Area 6 (Bethnal Green), but is quite close to the boundary separating Area 6 and Area 1 (Stepney) to the east of her address. She stated in the objection form:

“I object to the oversubscription criterion which prioritises catchment area before distance from the school. Tower Hamlets operates a catchment-first model, under which children living within the designated catchment area of a school are prioritised ahead of children living outside the catchment, regardless of how close they live to the school. Distance is only applied after catchment priority has been exhausted.

This structure produces outcomes where a child living significantly closer to a school can be ranked behind a child living further away solely because of an administrative boundary. In my case, I live very close to Globe Primary School [in Area 1] but am treated as an out-of-catchment applicant because my address [in Area 6] lies just outside the planning boundary, while families living further away but within the boundary are prioritised.

This objection is not about an individual allocation decision. It concerns the structural fairness of the arrangements. I submit that the catchment-first structure, as designed and applied, conflicts with the School Admissions Code requirement that admission arrangements must be clear, fair and objective.

While catchment areas are not prohibited in principle, their operation must not produce unjustifiable inequity. In this case, the model creates disproportionate boundary effects in which two families living very close to each other can be treated materially differently even where one child lives closer to the school. Proximity, which is a clear and objective measure of accessibility, is overridden by administrative zoning.

The local authority has stated that catchment areas align with pupil place planning zones and are therefore fixed. However, no evidence has been provided that prioritising boundary membership over proximity is necessary to achieve legitimate planning objectives or that alternative, less distortive models were considered.

Many London boroughs allocate community primary school places primarily by distance after statutory priority categories. This demonstrates that prioritising proximity is workable and compatible with effective place planning.

I respectfully request that the Adjudicator consider whether prioritising catchment before distance in this way is consistent with the fairness and objectivity principles of the School Admissions Code, and whether the boundary effects produced by this structure are proportionate and justified.

I am not seeking individual preferential treatment. I am seeking independent review of whether the admission arrangements produce unjustifiable inequity for families living near catchment boundaries.”

14. I will consider, in turn, whether the Arrangements comply with the requirements relating to catchment areas under the relevant paragraphs of the Code above in the following aspects:

- (a) whether the catchment areas are '**clearly defined**';
- (b) whether the catchment areas are designed so that they are '**reasonable**'; and
- (c) whether the overall effect of the catchment areas specified in the Arrangements is '**fair**'.

Clarity

15. The Arrangements must be clear. The Objector does not claim that the catchment areas for these community schools are unclear. In considering the requirements of paragraphs 1.14 and 14 of the Code, I find that the catchment areas are described clearly. There is a map published alongside the Arrangements to show which areas are within and which are outside a catchment area. The Arrangements contain a hyperlink to the Local Authority's website which is an interactive map from where any member of the public can type in a post code in the borough to tell whether an address is inside or outside of a particular catchment area.

16. The Arrangements meet the Code's requirements that catchment areas must be clearly defined.

Whether the Arrangements are reasonable

17. The Arrangements must be reasonable. The Code does not define reasonableness, and the test I have adopted is that the Arrangements cannot be such that no reasonable admission authority taking into account all relevant factors would have determined the Arrangements which have been determined. To be unreasonable, arrangements must be arbitrary or irrational. This is a high threshold. In considering the reasonableness of the schools' catchment areas within the borough, I have looked at the reasons for them having been drawn as they are and their effects. The Local Authority has provided a helpful explanation of why the catchment areas have been drawn as they are. The Local Authority stated in its letter reply of 15 May 2026 to my request for further information:

"Tower Hamlets seeks to operate an admissions system for primary schools that provides equal and fair opportunities to all applicants. This includes having due regard to children living in areas where there are limited options in applying for a local primary school place and reducing the possibility of a family having to undertake an unreasonable journey to school.

To achieve this, we have had catchment areas as part of the admission arrangements since 2013/14. A school catchment area is a geographically defined boundary used to help provide local children with fairer access to a local school and ensure all schools in an area have an equal share of local children.

The decision to apply catchment areas to the admission arrangements was data informed and iterative and included significant stakeholder input. The Local Authority, therefore, asserts that these arrangements are a lawful and proportionate means to achieve equal and fair access to local primary schools and have been determined correctly.”

18. The Local Authority has drawn my attention to a published paper put to its Cabinet for discussion and decision on 8 June 2011 when the current catchment system was adopted. The paper contained the policy background and the rationale for the current design of ‘catchment areas’ in Tower Hamlets, as quoted below:

“Catchment Areas: The first proposed change to primary admissions arrangements was whether or not the Council should introduce a catchment area system for admission to community primary schools. This would mean assigning each community primary school to one of seven catchment areas with families being given priority consideration for the primary schools within their catchment area, but not a guaranteed place. Although the catchment areas [have] been designed so that the number of pupils within them closely matches the number of places available, for legal reasons the Council cannot guarantee that a place will be offered at a school within the catchment area. This is because in some years there could be more children applying from within the area than the Council previously anticipated. A report to inform Cabinet on the outcome of the primary school catchment area modelling exercise together with a map detailing the proposed catchment areas is attached ... The areas are designed to achieve the Council’s objective of ensuring that every Tower Hamlets family is able to have realistic access to a nearby school place.

77% percent of the 107 respondents were in favour of the principle of establishing a catchment area system. The School Admission Forum, which was also in favour, highlighted the need for the catchment areas to be based on criteria such as ease of access and geographical barriers, but also to have sufficient flexibility to be adjusted to reflect both the population and mobility data for these areas. It was also acknowledged that four main variables will impact on what, effectively, will be a ‘closed’ system:

- the number of children within each priority area requiring school places;
- the capacity of the schools within these priority areas;
- the number of children who would have a sibling link; and
- the right of parents to apply for up to six primary schools across London.

Although there are risks associated with each of the above factors the majority of respondents were in favour of a catchment area system that can be viewed with simplicity and some degree of predictability. Families will know the primary school or schools that their children would be likely to attend and, by giving greater opportunity for the majority of families to access their local school or schools, the system will sustain the more positive aspects of the existing school admissions trends.”

19. While I shall not discuss them in detail, I have seen published papers of the Local Authority’s decision-making processes in 2012 and 2014 on how the boundaries and numbers of catchment areas were modified or refined to suit the then planning assumptions. From another official paper of the Local Authority’s Cabinet meeting held on 17 December 2025 (open to public access), I was given to understand that the catchment area system had been reviewed or revisited from time to time in view of the changing demographics, demand for and supply of school places over the years, the evolution of planning assumptions, and other relevant policy considerations within Tower Hamlets.

20. The Objector argued in her response of 30 May 2026 to my request for further reasons:

“My concern is not with the existence of catchment areas as such, but with the specific boundary configuration and its continuing justification. The authority's historic reports explain that catchment areas were introduced during a period of increasing pupil numbers and pressure on school places. By contrast, the council's most recent Planning for School Places 2025/26 Review identifies declining pupil numbers, increasing surplus capacity and significant projected surplus reception places in a number of wards and planning areas. The report indicates that managing falling demand and maintaining sustainable school provision are now key challenges for the borough.

In those circumstances, I respectfully submit that it is unclear whether the current planning-area boundaries continue to be necessary and proportionate in their present form.

In my particular case, Globe Primary School is geographically close to my home and forms part of the local area in which my family lives and travels. Nevertheless, children living substantially further away may receive a higher admissions priority solely because they fall within a different planning-area designation. While any boundary will create some anomalies, the authority has not demonstrated why this particular boundary remains justified in light of the significant demographic changes identified in its own recent planning documents.”

21. The Local Authority's position is that:

"The Local Authority continues to support schools with falling pupil rolls and resulting increases to surplus places, school organisational change and financial viability and sustainability using a local planning area approach. These planning areas align consistently with the catchment areas. Whilst the trend for falling pupil numbers is borough wide, there is significant variation across the catchment areas and consequently variation in the increase in surplus places. The Local Authority maintains this localized approach remains the best model for school [organisation] and pupil place planning. Further, it would not be appropriate to have differing geographical area models for school admissions and school organisation, these would misalign and impact the accuracy of informing projections."

22. Whilst many parents will make decisions about where to live based upon the local schools in the area, others are not afforded such a choice. Regardless, living outside the catchment area for a particular school does not render that school's catchment unreasonable simply because the person's address does not fall within it. Setting out reasons why an area might or might not be included in the catchment for a school is entirely different to setting out reasons why a school's catchment area as it stands is unreasonable. While alleging that the falling number of pupil admissions might give rise to a case of revisiting the established boundaries of the catchment area system within the borough, I do not see that the Objector has given any substantive geographical, planning, surveying, or other technical evidence to prove why she thought the relevant catchment boundaries or configuration (particularly those adjacent to her current address) were so unreasonably designed.

23. On any basis, I find that the catchment area system in Tower Hamlets has been drawn as it is for a host of logical policy reasons, by the Local Authority having taken into account all relevant factors. The demographics of the borough would have changed over time, as in any other places in England. This may warrant review or even modification from time to time (though not necessarily every year), and the Local Authority has provided me with evidence to show how it had recently revisited or reconsidered the matters in the Council's decision-making process.

24. In her reply of 27 April 2026 to my request for further reasons, the Objector said:

"Many other London boroughs prioritise distance after statutory categories without creating these same boundary effects. This demonstrates that prioritising proximity is both workable and consistent with effective place planning."

25. Paragraph 1.10 of the Code says that "[it] is for admission authorities to decide which criteria would be most suitable to the school according to the local circumstances". My consideration of this objection is not about whether a slightly different set of arrangements

may be reasonable, or more reasonable; it is about whether the Arrangements for these community primary schools are reasonable as they are.

26. My conclusion for this aspect of the objection is that the Local Authority has provided a convincing explanation of the reasons it introduced the catchment area system into its Arrangements. The Local Authority has also confirmed that those reasons still apply. The catchment area system, and the analysis that underpins it, is designed to ensure that no child is seriously disadvantaged if they cannot obtain a place at a school within a reasonable distance from home within the borough, as they might be under a system in which individual schools have different catchment areas or in which there is no catchment area for schools at all. The six different catchment areas for those community schools covered in this objection do not have features such that no reasonable admission authority could have selected them. As I have said, there is a high threshold to meet in establishing unreasonableness, and it is not met here. Therefore, I do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

Whether the arrangements are fair

27. The requirements in the Code are that the practices and criteria used to allocate places must operate fairly, and that arrangements must not disadvantage unfairly any identifiable group. The essential difference between reasonableness and fairness is that reasonableness is judged from an objective basis, whereas a determination of what is fair will involve a subjective value judgment. It is possible that an objectively reasonable set of arrangements may operate unfairly to an identifiable group. There will often be a group of applicants who could be said to be disadvantaged by the operation of the oversubscription criteria because they are afforded a lower priority than other applicants, but in order not to comply with the Code any disadvantage must also be unfair.

28. In considering fairness, the focus of the consideration will be exclusively upon the effect or the practical application on any relevant group. It is necessary to weigh the advantage said to accrue to children who would be offered places at relevant schools in consequence of the Arrangements against any disadvantage caused to any other relevant group of children who would not be offered places. A key question for an adjudicator to ask is, to whom might this be unfair and why?

29. In her reply of 2 June 2026, the Objector stated that she “understand[s] and accept[s] that catchment areas can be used as a legitimate admissions tool”. It appears that she accepts that the effect of having a catchment area is that it will advantage some but disadvantage others. Indeed, the purpose of designing a catchment area system is specifically to offer priority to some at the expense of others. It has this in common with all oversubscription criteria whatever they may be. The operation of a catchment area means inevitably that any applicant who does not live within it will have lower priority than an applicant who does.

30. In order to come to a conclusion as to whether the Arrangements are unfair in their effect, I consider that there are two questions I need to answer:

- (a) Is it an effect of the Arrangements that some residents are unable to obtain a place at **any school** that is within a reasonable distance of their home?
- (b) Is it an effect of the Arrangements that some residents have no realistic chance of obtaining a place at **some schools** close to their home because those living significantly further away have a higher priority?

It is in my view that if the answer to the first question is 'yes', the Arrangements would almost certainly be unfair. If the answer to the second question is 'yes', a further consideration of whether this is an unfair outcome will be required.

31. To the first question, I have not been made aware, by any party to this objection, of any case where the effect of the Arrangements has made it impossible for a school place to be obtained within a reasonable distance of an applicant's home. The Local Authority provided me with the following contextual information and data:

"To date, the Local Authority has not been made aware of any formal challenge to the use and application of catchment areas in our admission arrangements. In fact, these admission arrangements have supported the intended aims of equal access and fair opportunity as evidenced by published national offer day outcomes for the last 5 years."

Table 1: Comparing percentage of Tower Hamlets children securing a place at one of their top three preferences of primary school to the London average

School years	% of Tower Hamlets children securing a place at one of their top three preferences of primary school	London Average
2026/27	97.8%	97%
2025/26	97.7%	96.6%
2024/25	98.1%	97%
2023/24	97.7%	97%
2022/23	96.7%	97%

32. Although the Objector reiterates that she is not seeking individual preferential treatment, I have looked further to the Objector's specific address. There are seven primary

schools, within one mile of her home, in the catchment for her address. Simply not being able to obtain a place at a nearest school, or a nearest favourite school (within or outside the catchment), particularly in an urban area where there are large numbers of schools in relatively close proximity, is not of itself unfair. Indeed, I do not see any evidence to point to any effect of the Arrangements resulting in some residents not being able to obtain a place at any school that is within a reasonable distance of their home in the borough. I conclude that the answer to my first question is ‘no’.

33. To the second question, I asked the Local Authority to give me data in the admission round of 2026 about the most overly-subscribed school within each catchment area. I wanted to get a sense of the furthest distance between the home of the final applicant offered a place and the relevant school, and the equivalent distance for the first candidate declined within and outside of the catchment area. The information is set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Comparing the distance between home to school, for the last applicant on the list of priority order offered a place, and the first applicant declined a place on the same order, for admission round of September 2026

Most overly-subscribed schools	PAN	Furthest distance offered (final applicant) [metres]	First declined place distance (in catchment) [metres]	First declined place distance (outside of catchment) [metres]
Catchment area 1 Bangabandhu	30	898	1018	1438
Catchment area 2 Bonner	30	551	635	825
Catchment area 3 Mayflower	52	515	563	2204
Catchment area 4 Wood Wharf	60	518	None declined	646
Catchment area 5 Bigland Green	60	351	355	369
Catchment area 6 Thomas Buxton	60	1107	1923	1419

34. Table 2 shows that the most overly-subscribed primary schools in five (out of these six) catchment areas had filled up with in-catchment applicants leaving very few places (if not none) available to those out-of-catchment applicants and lower on the priority. Only Wood

Wharf School in Area 4 had no in-catchment applicant being declined, meaning the possibility of some available places allocated to applicants whose home addresses were from outside of the catchment area but close to that school.

35. This information indicates that there are examples within Tower Hamlets where the effect of the Arrangements is such that the answer to my second question can be 'yes'. However, this does not, in my view, necessarily lead to a conclusion that the Arrangements breach the Code's requirements for unfairness, and it is to this consideration that I now turn.

36. Where catchment areas are used for individual or a group of schools, this sort of outcome is not unusual. Catchment areas are almost always reflecting the pattern of roads or other geographical features in the locality. As a result, children living further away from a school may sometimes have a higher priority for a place than those who live closer, if the former live within a catchment area. In Tower Hamlets, the catchment area is for a group of schools. This may, to a certain extent, magnify the disparity in distances from a school between in-catchment applicants who have priority and those out-catchment who do not. It may, at first glance, seem somewhat peculiar that an applicant such as the Objector from a corner of a catchment area should have a lower priority for a school in the opposite corner at the adjacent catchment area, despite the short home-school distance.

37. That a set of admission arrangements produces some unusual effects does not necessarily require a conclusion to be drawn that they are unfair. As I said, in order to find unfairness, it is necessary to identify a group that is unfairly treated by the Arrangements. The Objector believes that some residents within her catchment who live close to a school across the boundary, hence in a different catchment area, are unfairly disadvantaged by the Arrangements. It might well be possible for a similar claim to be made by another resident in the neighbouring catchment area who lives close to a school within the Objector's catchment and is unable to obtain places at that relatively nearby school; but none except the Objector has made an objection to the Arrangements. Indeed, any disadvantage for access to a nearby school in another catchment area may well be offset by the advantage the Objector (or any other resident in the same catchment) is enjoying in relation to the access to a school within her catchment. If the Objector is saying that she is disadvantaged unfairly because she did not live within the catchment of a particular school for which she wishes to express a preference, I would ask why is this more unfair to her than to anyone else who does not live within the catchment but who would like to go to the same school?

38. The Local Authority reiterated in its reply of 15 May 2026 to me:

"The application of catchment areas to the admission arrangements apply to all Tower Hamlets community primary schools and a number of academy and free primary schools across all six planning areas ... This facilitates greater consistency across admissions arrangements for primary schools and families.

The catchment areas do not prevent any parent, resident or out of borough, from expressing a preference for any Tower Hamlets primary school in any catchment area. Each application is considered and prioritised for a place according to the published admission arrangements. Offers are made using the equal preference system, resulting in the highest preference offer possible.

As parental choice is a key factor in the application process, there are occasions where preference offers are further than the statutory 'reasonable distance'. However, allocations are made to the nearest school to the family home with a vacancy, which is within a 'reasonable distance'. This also includes VA schools and could result in an out of catchment allocation if this is nearest. It is not an effect of the arrangements that some residents are unable to obtain a place at any school that is within a reasonable distance of their home."

39. I acknowledge that the Objector has eloquently raised an issue of relative disadvantage which might be potentially experienced by herself, or any resident, who wishes to express a preference, among all possible choices, for a school in proximity to their addresses but finds that school to be in a different catchment area. However, in my judgment, this disadvantage if at all does not by itself make the Arrangements unfair. Catchment areas will, by their very nature, produce advantage and disadvantage as a result of where people live. So too will criteria solely based on distance, as the Objector favours. In Tower Hamlets, any such disadvantage needs to be balanced by the fact that the designation of catchment areas for a group of schools aims to ensure that all children with the borough can be allocated a place relatively close to their home, as the Local Authority asserts above. An alternative to having a separate catchment area for each school, or removing the entire catchment area system, for this borough, may run the risk of creating greater disadvantage for children and their parents, if it is not possible to guarantee a place for all children at a school within a reasonable distance of their home. Table 1 above displays a high level of confidence in the effective functioning of the catchment area system in the borough.

40. I do not consider the borough's catchment area system operates to disadvantage any identifiable sector of its population unfairly, as the Local Authority's evidence points to the fact that almost everyone in the borough has reasonable access to local primary schools covered by the respective catchment areas. The existing catchment area system applies to relevant schools and residents in an objective and transparent manner. It was decided by the Local Authority as a most suitable system to its schools according to the borough's own local circumstances. Overall, I do not find from the evidence given by either party that the Arrangements are unfair in their effect, and as I have also found that they comply with the requirements of the Code relating to catchment areas, I do not uphold this aspect of the objection.

Determination

41. 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 2027/28 determined by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets for community primary schools in Tower Hamlets.

Dated: 19 August 2026

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Jackie Liu