

LPLT Admission Consultation Full Report - Comments on Related Documents

Notes on redactions:

1. Personal data categories have been removed.
2. Personal data within all other response categories has been redacted and will appear as a white gap in the text.
3. Some redactions have been made due to the provision of the Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 (ISS Regulations). Where this is the case, the text has been removed and replaced with [Deleted due to the requirements of the ISS Regulations].

Form Submission ID	Related Documents. If you have any comments to make in relation to any of the proposed new admission related documents published with the proposed new Admission Policy for each school on their websites, please set this out below:
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	<p>The sibling rule should apply regardless of the child's gender. e.g. a girl attending LPSG would count as a sibling for her younger brother wanting to go to LPSB. In your consultation document when talking about current gender unfairness relating to children of staff, you state that;_x000D_"The Board of Trustees believe that this is necessary to avoid an unfair situation where a staff member's child does not receive priority because they are the wrong sex, for example, where they work at LPSG but their child is a boy, or where they work at LPSB and have a son who will have priority, and a daughter who will not."_x000D_I agree with this and therefore think the same principle should apply to the sibling rule too. It seems odd to not allow a sibling place to be offered just because their sibling is the wrong gender.</p>
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	<p>The principle of creating a feeder school through the trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole._x000D_Children need to go to a school in their local community for basic safety as the area is less safe and they shouldn't be further from home than necessary. Children from Trust schools staff should not take places of children who live in the catchment.</p>
29	
30	

31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	
67	
68	
69	
70	
71	
72	
73	
74	
75	
76	
77	
78	
79	
80	

81	
82	
83	
84	
85	
86	
87	
88	
89	
90	
91	
92	
93	
94	
95	
96	
97	
98	
99	
100	
101	
102	
103	
104	
105	
106	
107	
108	
109	
110	
111	
112	
113	
114	
115	
116	
117	
118	
119	
120	
121	
122	
123	
124	
125	
126	
127	

128	Please do not change the current arrangement for entry requirements. Langley should be accessible to all local children not just those at the specified primary schools this proposal is morally wrong and would be a disaster for local children and parents who are currently in the catchment and wanting their children to attend Langley but not at the above mentioned primary schools. Clearly all the parents at the above mentioned schools will know about this consultation and a large proportion of parents at other local schools will not, so the results will be heavily biased in favour of doing this and will not reflect the general voice of local people. I am so upset by this proposal..
129	
130	
131	
132	
133	
134	
135	
136	
137	
138	
139	
140	
141	
142	
143	
144	
145	
146	
147	
148	
149	
150	
151	
152	
153	
154	
155	
156	
157	
158	
159	
160	
161	
162	
163	
164	
165	
166	
167	
168	None
169	
170	
171	
172	
173	
174	

175	
176	
177	
178	
179	
180	
181	
182	
183	
184	
185	
186	
187	
188	
189	
190	
191	
192	
193	
194	
195	
196	
197	
198	
199	
200	
201	
202	
203	
204	
205	
206	
207	
208	
209	
210	
211	
212	
213	
214	
215	
216	
217	
218	
219	
220	
221	
222	
223	
224	

225	
226	
227	
228	
229	
230	
231	
232	
233	
234	
235	
236	
237	
238	
239	
240	
241	
242	
243	
244	
245	
246	
247	
248	
249	
250	
251	
252	
253	
254	
255	
256	
257	
258	
259	
260	
261	
262	
263	
264	
265	
266	
267	
268	
269	
270	
271	
272	
273	
274	

275	
276	
277	
278	
279	
280	
281	
282	
283	
284	
285	
286	
287	
288	
289	
290	
291	
292	
293	
294	
295	
296	
297	
298	
299	
300	
301	
302	
303	
304	
305	
306	
307	
308	
309	
310	
311	
312	
313	
314	
315	
316	
317	
318	
319	
320	
321	
322	
323	
324	

325	
326	
327	
328	
329	
330	
331	
332	
333	
334	
335	
336	
337	
338	
339	
340	
341	
342	
343	
344	
345	
346	
347	
348	
349	
350	
351	
352	
353	
354	
355	
356	
357	Both of proposed options A and B seem terrible to me. I disagree with the suggestion that any feeder schools should be given priority. I don't like option A calling Langley Primary as a feeder. Also I don't like option B which has (in my opinion) the ludicrous suggestion that Clare House and Hawes Down would be given places ahead of local residents with children at ; I suspect this aggressive suggestion has been made in order to make option A seem more palatable.
358	
359	
360	
361	
362	
363	
364	
365	
366	
367	
368	
369	n/a
370	
371	

372	
373	
374	
375	
376	
377	
378	
379	
380	
381	
382	
383	
384	
385	
386	
387	
388	
389	I don't think it's fair that these schools should get preference over other schools.I paid thousands of pounds extra on my house to move within the Langley catchment so my son can get into the school.It seems unfair that these schools should be able to cherry pick children,just because they choose to join a trust.The children local to Langley will not be able to get into the school.After all parents have paid thousands extra to move into the catchment area.I actually think the whole idea is nonsense!
390	
391	
392	
393	
394	
395	
396	
397	
398	
399	
400	
401	
402	
403	
404	
405	
406	
407	
408	
409	
410	
411	
412	
413	
414	
415	
416	
417	
418	
419	

420	
421	
422	
423	
424	
425	
426	
427	
428	
429	
430	
431	
432	
433	
434	
435	
436	
437	
438	
439	
440	
441	
442	
443	
444	
445	
446	
447	
448	
449	
450	
451	
452	
453	
454	
455	
456	
457	
458	
459	
460	
461	
462	
463	
464	
465	
466	
467	
468	
469	

470	
471	
472	
473	
474	
475	
476	
477	
478	
479	
480	
481	
482	
483	
484	
485	
486	
487	
488	
489	
490	
491	
492	
493	
494	
495	
496	
497	
498	
499	
500	
501	
502	
503	
504	
505	
506	
507	
508	
509	
510	
511	
512	
513	
514	
515	
516	
517	
518	
519	

520	
521	
522	
523	How in any way is this thinking of the community of a whole. These proposals are outrageous
524	
525	
526	
527	
528	
529	
530	
531	<p>Riddlesdown Collegiate are currently in consultation to REMOVE their feeder schools because IT HAS RESULTED IN CHILDREN WHO LIVE CLOSE BY NOT BEING OFFERED A PLACE BECAUSE SO MANY PLACES ARE BEING OFFERED TO CHILDREN WHO LIVE FURTHER AWAY. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>This is what needs to be avoided in that LPLT case. Children in year 6 from other close by schools will be discriminated against because of the school the local authority selected for them at age 4. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>Letter from Riddlesdown below:_x000D_</p> <p>4th November 2019_x000D_</p> <p>Dear Parents, Carers & Neighbours_x000D_</p> <p>Consultation on changes to admissions criteria for entry to Riddlesdown Collegiate in September 2021_x000D_</p> <p>As you may recall, the admissions criteria for entry to Riddlesdown Collegiate includes giving preference to children who attend five named feeder primary schools - Atwood, Gresham, Greenvale, Harris Primary Academy Kenley and Selsdon. The current admissions criteria have not significantly changed for over fifteen years. In that time, standards at the Collegiate have continued to improve and, consequently, our reputation with parents is strong and we are increasingly oversubscribed each year. For the 328 places we have in current Year 7, we received almost 1500 applications, but only a very small number of these places were offered to children who live close to the Collegiate but who did not meet any of the earlier criteria. The pattern of applications in recent years has now meant that many children who live very close to the Collegiate are not being offered a place because so many places are being offered to children who attend our named feeder primary schools but who may live much further away. At the same time, we remain a partially selective school and so, whilst this accounts for a much smaller number, very local children are being further displaced by those being offered a place based on their score in the ability test._x000D_</p> <p>Therefore, in order to give more local children a greater chance of being offered a place at the Collegiate, our admissions authority, the Board of Directors of The Collegiate Trust, has decided to consult on changes to our admissions criteria for entry in September 2021 (which would affect current Year 5 and below). The consultation begins today and proposes the removal of feeder schools and the ability test from the admissions criteria, which would lead to a greater number of children who live close to the Collegiate being offered a place at Riddlesdown Collegiate. This would enable us to better serve our local community and would also bring fringe benefits, such as more students being able to walk to school and consequently less congestion in the neighbourhood._x000D_</p> <p>I hope that you will see this as good news and that you will be keen to respond positively to the consultation by completing the questionnaire at http://tctorg.uk/admission-criteria which includes the opportunity to add your own comments. If you do not let us know what you think, we will not be able to take your views into consideration &ndash; so, if you think this would be a good idea, please tell us! The consultation will end on 16th December 2019 and the Board of Directors will then review all responses before publishing any decisions about changes to the admissions criteria in February 2020._x000D_</p> <p>Thank you for your engagement with this process. Yours sincerely_x000D_</p> <p>Mr S Dey Principal_x000D_</p> <p>A: Honister Heights Purley Surrey CR8 1EX T: 020 8668 5136_x000D_</p> <p>F: 020 8660 9025_x000D_</p> <p>E: admin@riddlesdown.org_x000D_</p> <p>W: www.riddlesdown.org_x000D_</p> <p>Principal: Mr S Dey BSc (Hons), NPQH_x000D_</p> <p>Riddlesdown Collegiate is part of The Collegiate Trust, a company limited by guarantee & registered in England and Wales No. 8058921</p>
532	
533	
534	
535	
536	
537	
538	
539	
540	
541	
542	

543	It is not fair that children who live further from the secondary school will get places over children that live in the area. It will also cause disruption to all the local primary schools particularly Oak Lodge, Unicorn and Marian Vian. It is an unfair system - it cannot go ahead.
544	
545	
546	
547	
548	
549	
550	
551	
552	
553	
554	
555	
556	
557	
558	
559	Our children go to _____ and I'm sure Langley boys and girls has a high intake from _____, it is a good school with high performance and in a good area and you are suggesting these children won't be getting in as others schools will take priority.
560	
561	
562	
563	
564	None
565	
566	
567	
568	
569	
570	
571	
572	
573	
574	
575	
576	
577	
578	
579	
580	
581	
582	
583	
584	
585	
586	
587	
588	
589	
590	

591	
592	
593	
594	
595	Bromley schools are over subscribed especially secondary. If we except feeder schools before local catchment area we are putting added pressure on the surrounded secondary schools such as Hayes Secondary that is already completely gone we subscribed. If you want to go to these school move witching catchment like everyone has been doing for years. You pay a premium to live in theses area because of the schools. How is it fair for a child that lives in walking distance to the schools to have to travel to get to another school when someone who lives further away takes their place based on feeder schools. It’s doesn’t feel ethically correct or environmentally you’re possibly making two children travel bar car/bus to get to schools further away rather than giving them both their local school.
596	
597	
598	
599	
600	
601	
602	
603	
604	
605	
606	
607	
608	
609	
610	
611	
612	
613	
614	
615	
616	
617	
618	
619	
620	
621	
622	
623	
624	
625	
626	
627	
628	
629	
630	
631	
632	
633	
634	
635	
636	
637	

638	
639	
640	
641	
642	
643	
644	
645	
646	
647	
648	
649	
650	
651	
652	
653	
654	
655	
656	
657	
658	
659	
660	
661	
662	-
663	
664	
665	
666	
667	
668	
669	
670	
671	
672	
673	
674	
675	
676	
677	
678	
679	
680	
681	
682	
683	
684	
685	
686	
687	

688	
689	
690	
691	
692	Under the new proposal staff at the primary schools will get priority to the secondary places over staff at the secondary school (as they will become feeder schools) this seems unfair as they have already had priority for the primary places.
693	
694	
695	
696	
697	
698	
699	
700	It should be based on distance from school. Those children will be further and they will put pressure on the area at school times with parents dropping off.
701	
702	
703	
704	
705	
706	
707	
708	
709	
710	
711	
712	
713	
714	
715	
716	
717	
718	
719	
720	
721	
722	
723	
724	
725	
726	
727	
728	
729	
730	
731	
732	
733	
734	
735	
736	I think it is unfair for children living in close proximity not be able to get into their nearest school especially if they live in the Bromley borough.

737	
738	
739	The documents are missing many pieces of key information to support the proposals - what are envisages benefits? how many children are envisaged using the sibling rules, the staff rules? what will the new child distribution areas look like based on the feeder suggestion? What is the environmenal impact of these proposals.
740	
741	
742	
743	
744	
745	
746	
747	
748	
749	
750	
751	
752	
753	
754	
755	
756	
757	
758	
759	
760	
761	
762	
763	
764	
765	
766	
767	
768	
769	
770	
771	
772	
773	
774	
775	
776	
777	
778	
779	
780	
781	
782	
783	
784	
785	

786	
787	
788	N/A
789	
790	
791	
792	
793	
794	
795	
796	
797	
798	
799	
800	I think it is unfortunate that you have chosen to launch this consultation in the run up to/over Christmas when people are busy/away. A cynic may suggest reasons for this. _x000D_ _x000D_ Similarly, although affected, we were not made aware of this consultation by the Trust.
801	
802	
803	
804	
805	
806	
807	
808	
809	
810	
811	
812	
813	
814	
815	
816	
817	
818	
819	
820	
821	
822	
823	
824	
825	
826	
827	
828	
829	
830	
831	
832	
833	

834	
835	
836	
837	
838	
839	
840	
841	
842	
843	
844	
845	
846	
847	
848	
849	
850	
851	
852	
853	
854	
855	
856	
857	
858	
859	
860	
861	
862	
863	
864	
865	
866	
867	
868	
869	
870	
871	
872	
873	
874	
875	
876	
877	
878	
879	
880	
881	
882	
883	

884	
885	
886	I think this new proposal does not make sense, is not in the benefit of the wider community and is hugely unfair.
887	
888	THERE IS A TOTAL ABSENCE OF DOCUMENTS WHICH ADDRESS THE IMPACT OF THESE CHANGES.
889	N/A
890	
891	
892	
893	
894	
895	
896	
897	
898	
899	
900	
901	
902	
903	
904	
905	
906	
907	
908	
909	
910	
911	
912	
913	It should be a hard and fast rule, only children who are not linked by guardian employment, siblings and are eligible by (proven) permanent residence can apply for the school
914	
915	
916	
917	
918	
919	
920	
921	
922	
923	
924	
925	
926	
927	
928	
929	
930	
931	
932	
933	

934	
935	
936	
937	
938	
939	
940	
941	
942	
943	
944	
945	
946	
947	
948	
949	
950	
951	
952	
953	
954	
955	
956	
957	
958	
959	
960	
961	
962	
963	
964	
965	
966	
967	
968	
969	
970	
971	
972	
973	
974	
975	
976	
977	
978	
979	
980	
981	
982	
983	

984	
985	
986	
987	
988	
989	
990	
991	
992	
993	<p>The admission code defined by the Schools Adjudicator is clear that any change to a schools admission criteria needs to be of educational benefit. The documents submitted for the consultation do not show a clear positive educational impact for all local children. Most of the reasons given are generic working practices across all schools and will not result in a significant educational benefit to pupils. _x000D_ Any change in the admission procedure will limit the choice of secondary education for any child that does not attend a designated primary school and live locally. _x000D_ The suggested changes will set a precedent for other MATs to also alter their admission criteria resulting in an admission procedure that that will increasingly ignore parental choice and introduce a selective education system ignoring the spirit in which local schools traditionally have been working together.</p>
994	
995	
996	
997	
998	
999	
1000	
1001	
1002	
1003	
1004	
1005	
1006	
1007	
1008	
1009	
1010	
1011	
1012	
1013	
1014	
1015	
1016	
1017	
1018	
1019	
1020	
1021	
1022	
1023	<p>Please publish a link to the Board of Governor&rsquo;s meeting minutes (with all your proposal communications) where the reasons why these changes were proposed and related discussion to ensure total transparency</p>
1024	
1025	
1026	
1027	
1028	
1029	

1030	
1031	
1032	
1033	
1034	
1035	
1036	
1037	
1038	
1039	
1040	
1041	
1042	
1043	
1044	
1045	
1046	
1047	
1048	
1049	
1050	
1051	
1052	
1053	
1054	
1055	
1056	
1057	
1058	
1059	
1060	
1061	
1062	
1063	
1064	
1065	
1066	
1067	
1068	
1069	
1070	
1071	
1072	
1073	
1074	
1075	
1076	
1077	
1078	
1079	

1080	
1081	
1082	
1083	
1084	
1085	
1086	
1087	
1088	
1089	
1090	
1091	
1092	
1093	
1094	
1095	
1096	
1097	
1098	
1099	
1100	
1101	
1102	
1103	
1104	
1105	
1106	
1107	
1108	
1109	
1110	
1111	
1112	
1113	
1114	
1115	
1116	
1117	
1118	
1119	
1120	
1121	
1122	
1123	
1124	
1125	
1126	
1127	
1128	
1129	

1130	
1131	
1132	
1133	
1134	
1135	
1136	
1137	
1138	
1139	
1140	
1141	
1142	
1143	
1144	
1145	
1146	
1147	
1148	
1149	
1150	
1151	
1152	
1153	
1154	
1155	
1156	
1157	
1158	
1159	
1160	
1161	
1162	
1163	
1164	
1165	
1166	
1167	
1168	
1169	
1170	
1171	
1172	I am very concerned about the increase in traffic in the area
1173	
1174	
1175	
1176	
1177	
1178	
1179	

1180	
1181	
1182	
1183	
1184	
1185	
1186	
1187	
1188	
1189	
1190	
1191	
1192	
1193	
1194	
1195	
1196	
1197	
1198	
1199	
1200	
1201	
1202	
1203	
1204	
1205	
1206	
1207	
1208	
1209	
1210	
1211	
1212	
1213	
1214	
1215	
1216	
1217	
1218	
1219	
1220	
1221	
1222	
1223	
1224	
1225	
1226	
1227	
1228	
1229	

1230	
1231	
1232	
1233	
1234	
1235	
1236	
1237	
1238	
1239	
1240	
1241	
1242	
1243	
1244	
1245	
1246	
1247	
1248	
1249	
1250	
1251	
1252	
1253	
1254	
1255	
1256	
1257	
1258	
1259	
1260	
1261	
1262	
1263	
1264	
1265	
1266	
1267	
1268	
1269	In your consultation document you propose an Option A and an Option B with regard to changing the priority admissions arrangements for the LPLT primary schools. It is not clear to me how those responding to the consultation are able to express a preference for one of these options over the other as the questions asked above do not quite match. For example - it is not possible for me to tick a box to say that I prefer Option B over Option A - this is only possible via the comments box. I wonder if this will make it different for you to interpret the responses that you receive?
1270	
1271	
1272	
1273	
1274	
1275	
1276	
1277	

1278	Published document is largely about the wonders of LPLT, long lists of what is being done but little about what is being achieved! Effects of giving priority to 3 primary schools very short, figures of numbers in LPSB from CHPS/HDPS using entry figures for Sept. 2019 no indication of future effect of proposed changes which must increase number of students entering under a priority criteria to disadvantage of existing numbers of pupils who gain access from proximity criteria and who live nearer to LPBS. Info. supplied by the Bromley School Admissions Team shows front door of CHPS is 1.0 mile from LPSB and that of HDPS is 0.96 miles. Pupils coming in from beyond these distances must reduce numbers coming in from LPSB were proximity distance in recent years has been no more than 1.1 miles.
1279	
1280	
1281	
1282	
1283	
1284	
1285	
1286	
1287	
1288	
1289	
1290	
1291	
1292	
1293	
1294	
1295	
1296	
1297	
1298	
1299	
1300	
1301	
1302	
1303	
1304	
1305	
1306	
1307	
1308	
1309	
1310	
1311	
1312	
1313	
1314	
1315	
1316	
1317	
1318	
1319	
1320	
1321	
1322	
1323	
1324	

1325	
1326	
1327	
1328	
1329	
1330	
1331	
1332	
1333	
1334	
1335	
1336	
1337	
1338	
1339	
1340	
1341	
1342	
1343	
1344	
1345	
1346	
1347	
1348	
1349	
1350	
1351	
1352	
1353	
1354	
1355	
1356	
1357	
1358	
1359	
1360	
1361	
1362	
1363	
1364	Think Carbon print! Local children travelling out and children in the out of area travelling in! Protect local community!
1365	
1366	
1367	
1368	allocation should be as normal LBB criteria eg proximity to school
1369	
1370	
1371	
1372	
1373	
1374	

1375	
1376	
1377	Priority should be given to near by homes as it has always been the case. The roads are already at full capacity around Beckenham (due to non stop building) so it will not be problematic to have more people travelling to the school everyday plus the Chinese roundabout is becoming a massive problem with the new Tesco due to open soon. We have to live around here!
1378	
1379	
1380	
1381	
1382	
1383	
1384	
1385	
1386	
1387	
1388	
1389	
1390	
1391	
1392	
1393	
1394	
1395	
1396	
1397	
1398	
1399	
1400	
1401	
1402	
1403	
1404	
1405	
1406	
1407	
1408	
1409	
1410	
1411	
1412	
1413	
1414	
1415	
1416	
1417	
1418	
1419	
1420	
1421	
1422	
1423	

1424	
1425	
1426	
1427	
1428	
1429	
1430	
1431	
1432	
1433	
1434	
1435	
1436	
1437	
1438	
1439	
1440	
1441	
1442	
1443	
1444	
1445	
1446	
1447	
1448	
1449	
1450	
1451	
1452	
1453	
1454	
1455	
1456	
1457	The consultation does not - within the points raised in the document - give a reason for feeder schools and why they would be beneficial for the schools. The document refers only to the benefits of a MAT.
1458	
1459	
1460	
1461	
1462	
1463	
1464	
1465	
1466	
1467	
1468	
1469	
1470	
1471	
1472	
1473	

1474	
1475	
1476	
1477	
1478	
1479	
1480	
1481	
1482	
1483	
1484	
1485	
1486	
1487	
1488	
1489	
1490	
1491	
1492	
1493	
1494	
1495	
1496	
1497	
1498	
1499	
1500	
1501	
1502	
1503	
1504	
1505	
1506	None of this seems like a good idea. Something doesn't seem right about Park Langley not working more closely and having the working relationship with local schools as it suggests it does with feeder schools. Proximities to the borough schools will be relentlessly squeezed if this proposal was to go ahead. The word 'feeder' has insidious connotations.
1507	
1508	
1509	
1510	
1511	
1512	
1513	
1514	
1515	
1516	
1517	
1518	
1519	
1520	
1521	
1522	

1523	
1524	
1525	
1526	
1527	
1528	
1529	
1530	
1531	
1532	
1533	<p>The adoption of feeder primary schools will disadvantage children living in close proximity to the secondary schools if they do not attend one of the trust's existing schools. Not only does this go against the principle that local schools should be for local children, the speed at which this change is proposed to take place means that families have not had the opportunity to make an informed choice about which primary schools to send their children to or where to live.</p> <p>This will have significant knock-on effects well beyond the immediacy of the trust and its schools. Children will be expected to travel further to school, with pupils from further away travelling in and local pupils have to travel further away to other schools. There is a significant proportion of residents who do not live within the catchment of another local school and would have to travel a very significant distance.</p> <p>Furthermore, parents will inevitably compete to gain entry to the school, pushing up house prices both around the feeder schools and the secondary schools, restricting access to those less able to afford to move to these areas. It is disturbing to note that the local primary schools most likely to be effected have a higher rate of pupils eligible for free school meals. Taken together, this gives the worrying impression that the trust is looking to reduce the number of places open to pupils from poorer backgrounds.</p> <p>The impact will also be felt at other schools in the area. Local secondaries will most likely follow suit and look to name primary schools in their trust as feeder schools which will obviously impact those pupils whose primary schools is not within a trust with a secondary school.</p> <p>There will be an adverse impact on the environment. The data from Bromley Council makes clear that a significant number of children that live a long distance from the school will get admission priority over children living much closer to the school. It is highly likely that this will lead to a higher number of pupils arriving by car and will increase both the average distance and length of time for journeys taken to the school. This will increase congestion, and create more traffic and noise pollution. It also clearly contradicts both the London Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Bromley Council Local Air Quality Action Plan.</p> <p>The "compelling" educational rationale for the change is extremely thin. There is very little that cannot be accomplished within the existing arrangements or indeed shared working practices with other schools outside of the trust.</p> <p>Both the admissions code and case history from the Office of the Schools Adjudicator are clear that there needs to be clear educational benefit for the changes proposed and that a group or groups of children must not be unfairly disadvantaged as a result of the arrangements. As I said above, the educational reasons for this change set out by the trust fall some way short of establishing a clear educational benefit and, given the significant increase in secondary school applications that are expected in Bromley for 2021, it is impossible to argue that there will not be children – likely a large number of them – unfairly disadvantaged. The need for places across the authority is increasing and this will make matters considerably worse.</p>
1534	
1535	
1536	
1537	
1538	
1539	
1540	
1541	
1542	
1543	
1544	
1545	
1546	
1547	
1548	
1549	

1550	
1551	
1552	
1553	
1554	
1555	
1556	
1557	as above.
1558	
1559	
1560	
1561	
1562	
1563	
1564	
1565	
1566	<p>The whole of Bromley borough schools admission (and indeed the majority of the rest of the country) operates on a proximity to school system. This creates a fair system where children are on the whole travelling to schools local to them. This avoids extra traffic, so more environmentally friendly, and also allows children to live and attend school in the same local community, thus fostering a cohesive learning/life environment. To upend this throws families into chaos. _x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>This type of system will lead to increased travel time for many families, causing congestion at peak hours, and children having to travel across borough to schools not in their local area. By giving priority to these schools in your Trust you are essentially locking out many local families who have attended and anticipated attending the Langley schools for years. Also many other local primary schools are in trusts with no secondary schools attached to them, so the implementation of a feeder system is to their detriment even more.</p>
1567	
1568	
1569	
1570	
1571	
1572	
1573	
1574	
1575	
1576	
1577	Consultation on changes must last for a minimum of 6 weeks between 1st October and 31st January; although the LPLT consultation will have run for at least 6 weeks in the consultation period, only 5 of these weeks are during term time, which I consider to be unreasonable.
1578	
1579	
1580	
1581	
1582	
1583	
1584	
1585	
1586	
1587	
1588	
1589	
1590	
1591	
1592	

1593	
1594	
1595	
1596	
1597	
1598	
1599	
1600	
1601	
1602	
1603	
1604	
1605	
1606	
1607	
1608	
1609	
1610	
1611	
1612	
1613	
1614	
1615	
1616	
1617	
1618	
1619	
1620	
1621	
1622	
1623	
1624	I think this would improve the school level
1625	
1626	
1627	
1628	
1629	
1630	
1631	
1632	
1633	
1634	
1635	
1636	
1637	
1638	
1639	
1640	
1641	
1642	

1643	
1644	
1645	
1646	
1647	
1648	
1649	
1650	
1651	
1652	The consultation does not - within the points raised in the document - give a reason for feeder schools and why they would be beneficial for the schools. The document refers only to the benefits of a MAT.
1653	
1654	
1655	
1656	
1657	
1658	
1659	
1660	
1661	
1662	
1663	
1664	
1665	
1666	
1667	
1668	
1669	
1670	If this goes ahead it will open up all schools to do the same. Inevitably all Schools will be selective which goes completely against comprehensive education. There is no evidence to suggest that this will improve the quality of any of the Schools listed and as a local parent with proximity of the secondary schools am outraged that this is being considered
1671	
1672	
1673	
1674	
1675	
1676	
1677	
1678	
1679	
1680	
1681	
1682	
1683	
1684	
1685	
1686	
1687	
1688	
1689	
1690	
1691	

1692	
1693	
1694	
1695	
1696	
1697	
1698	
1699	As above
1700	
1701	
1702	
1703	
1704	
1705	
1706	
1707	
1708	
1709	
1710	
1711	
1712	
1713	
1714	
1715	
1716	
1717	
1718	
1719	
1720	
1721	
1722	
1723	
1724	
1725	
1726	
1727	
1728	
1729	
1730	
1731	
1732	
1733	
1734	
1735	
1736	
1737	
1738	
1739	
1740	
1741	

1742	
1743	
1744	
1745	
1746	
1747	
1748	
1749	
1750	
1751	
1752	
1753	
1754	
1755	
1756	
1757	
1758	
1759	
1760	
1761	
1762	
1763	
1764	
1765	
1766	
1767	
1768	
1769	
1770	
1771	
1772	
1773	
1774	
1775	
1776	
1777	
1778	
1779	
1780	
1781	
1782	
1783	
1784	
1785	
1786	
1787	
1788	
1789	
1790	
1791	

1792	
1793	
1794	
1795	
1796	
1797	
1798	
1799	
1800	
1801	
1802	
1803	
1804	
1805	
1806	
1807	Local schools for local children_x000D_ To encourage community enterprises as school is just one part of the community_x000D_ This should not be dictated by business and administration which is what trusts are
1808	
1809	
1810	
1811	
1812	
1813	
1814	
1815	
1816	
1817	
1818	
1819	
1820	
1821	
1822	
1823	
1824	
1825	
1826	
1827	
1828	
1829	
1830	
1831	
1832	
1833	
1834	
1835	
1836	
1837	
1838	
1839	

1840	
1841	
1842	
1843	
1844	
1845	
1846	
1847	
1848	
1849	
1850	
1851	
1852	
1853	
1854	
1855	
1856	
1857	
1858	
1859	
1860	
1861	
1862	
1863	No comment.
1864	
1865	
1866	hopefully be offered places in 2021 due to the sibling policy, however if the proposed changes come into place all of their friends will not get in which will be very upsetting for them. I feel it's only fair to give equal opportunity to everybody by basing the admissions policy on 1. Special needs 2. Sibling 3. Catchment.
1867	No comment.
1868	
1869	
1870	
1871	
1872	
1873	
1874	
1875	
1876	
1877	
1878	
1879	
1880	
1881	
1882	
1883	
1884	
1885	
1886	
1887	
1888	

1889	
1890	
1891	
1892	
1893	
1894	
1895	
1896	
1897	
1898	
1899	
1900	
1901	
1902	
1903	
1904	
1905	
1906	
1907	
1908	
1909	
1910	
1911	
1912	
1913	
1914	
1915	
1916	
1917	There is no information on how sibling intake will effect the proposed number of places available to children outside of the trust schools. Again, this will have a further effect on the shrinking cathment area.
1918	
1919	
1920	
1921	
1922	
1923	
1924	
1925	
1926	
1927	
1928	
1929	
1930	
1931	
1932	
1933	
1934	
1935	
1936	
1937	
1938	

1939	
1940	
1941	
1942	
1943	
1944	
1945	
1946	
1947	
1948	
1949	
1950	
1951	
1952	
1953	
1954	
1955	
1956	
1957	
1958	
1959	
1960	
1961	
1962	
1963	
1964	
1965	
1966	
1967	
1968	
1969	
1970	
1971	
1972	
1973	
1974	
1975	
1976	
1977	
1978	
1979	
1980	
1981	
1982	
1983	
1984	
1985	
1986	
1987	
1988	

1989	
1990	
1991	
1992	
1993	
1994	
1995	
1996	
1997	
1998	
1999	
2000	
2001	
2002	
2003	
2004	
2005	
2006	
2007	N/a
2008	
2009	
2010	
2011	
2012	
2013	
2014	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
2024	
2025	
2026	
2027	
2028	
2029	
2030	
2031	
2032	
2033	
2034	
2035	
2036	
2037	
2038	

2039	
2040	
2041	
2042	
2043	
2044	
2045	
2046	
2047	
2048	
2049	
2050	
2051	
2052	
2053	
2054	
2055	
2056	
2057	
2058	
2059	
2060	
2061	
2062	
2063	
2064	
2065	
2066	
2067	
2068	
2069	
2070	
2071	
2072	
2073	
2074	
2075	
2076	
2077	
2078	
2079	
2080	
2081	
2082	
2083	
2084	
2085	
2086	
2087	
2088	

2089	
2090	
2091	
2092	
2093	
2094	
2095	
2096	Any Admissions Policies that discriminate (or exclude) children who would ordinarily have been considered under the existing criteria (which have evolved over time and been considered as best practice and non-discriminatory and inclusive) must be rejected.
2097	
2098	
2099	
2100	
2101	
2102	
2103	
2104	
2105	
2106	
2107	
2108	
2109	
2110	Please ask Bromley council to look and prove when we purchased our home and when we moved to this. ONLY BECAUSE there was NOT a year 4 at Langley when we moved our children from a different borough to this.
2111	
2112	
2113	
2114	
2115	
2116	
2117	
2118	
2119	
2120	
2121	
2122	
2123	
2124	
2125	
2126	
2127	
2128	
2129	
2130	
2131	
2132	
2133	
2134	
2135	
2136	

2137	
2138	
2139	Please see comments above with respect to the inaccurate and misleading figures stated in the consultation document with respect to PAN and places.
2140	
2141	
2142	
2143	
2144	
2145	
2146	I'd like to make the point that I currently do not live in the catchment for Langley secondaries therefore you could say this doesn't really effect me so why should I care? I care because it seems very unfair. You are claiming that your trust works in such a way that it's beneficial for these primary school age children to follow through to your secondaries. All schools follow the same curriculum so what is it that you have that makes it so special that you wish to select the children you take? What are you trying to say about other primaries in the area? _x000D_ How is it fair that children WILL - there is no doubt about this ! Have to travel further to a secondary school probably walk or be bussed or travel via car past their local one because there is no longer enough spaces? _x000D_ It's wrong on so many levels and to change it at this stage is extremely worrying to local people who have planned their lives around schooling to be told you will no longer get in.
2147	
2148	
2149	
2150	
2151	
2152	
2153	
2154	
2155	
2156	The new proposals disrupt the geographic logic of admission. I very much value the role of schools in their community: their connection to local residents and businesses, the ability to walk to school rather than drive (reducing school-run traffic), the positive overlap between school community and neighbourhood community and so on. The new proposals will have clear negative impact on all these. Additionally, economic profile of children in the schools discussed indicate that whether intended or not, the proposals will increase segregation between higher and lower income families in the area which is a depressing prospect. Having experienced similar consultations with an education academy in a different borough before, I am once again struck by the sense of a lack of transparency and the presence of internal interests with disregard for any impact on the wider community. To think this is the case here too is beyond just sad, it's quite infuriating.
2157	
2158	
2159	
2160	
2161	
2162	
2163	
2164	
2165	
2166	
2167	
2168	
2169	
2170	
2171	
2172	
2173	
2174	
2175	
2176	
2177	
2178	

2179	
2180	
2181	
2182	
2183	
2184	
2185	
2186	
2187	
2188	
2189	
2190	
2191	
2192	
2193	
2194	
2195	
2196	
2197	
2198	
2199	
2200	
2201	
2202	
2203	
2204	
2205	
2206	
2207	
2208	
2209	
2210	
2211	
2212	
2213	
2214	
2215	I believe having children joining the Langley secondary school from different local primary schools is a strength as every child is unique with their own different skill set and their own primary school experience that will share will everyone at school. This will add diversity that will be shared within the community. But excluding these children will bring stress to the families, children and cause a severe disruption to the community.
2216	
2217	
2218	
2219	
2220	
2221	
2222	
2223	
2224	
2225	
2226	
2227	

2228	
2229	
2230	
2231	
2232	
2233	
2234	
2235	
2236	
2237	
2238	
2239	
2240	
2241	
2242	
2243	
2244	
2245	
2246	
2247	
2248	
2249	
2250	
2251	
2252	
2253	
2254	
2255	
2256	
2257	I strongly disagree with the option of feeder schools, especially as i think it disenfranchises families who live near the schools and attend other primary schools such as Pickhurst, Marian Vine, Unicorn, Oak Lodge and Balgowan. All of which are close by. I would be really concerned if they were not able to apply based on address.
2258	
2259	
2260	
2261	
2262	
2263	
2264	
2265	
2266	
2267	
2268	
2269	
2270	
2271	
2272	
2273	
2274	
2275	

2276	
2277	
2278	
2279	
2280	
2281	
2282	
2283	
2284	
2285	
2286	
2287	
2288	
2289	
2290	
2291	
2292	
2293	
2294	
2295	
2296	
2297	
2298	
2299	
2300	
2301	
2302	
2303	
2304	
2305	
2306	
2307	
2308	
2309	
2310	
2311	
2312	
2313	
2314	
2315	
2316	
2317	
2318	
2319	
2320	
2321	
2322	
2323	
2324	
2325	

2326	
2327	The trust has not answered the most frequently asked questions in its frequently asked questions.
2328	
2329	
2330	
2331	
2332	
2333	
2334	
2335	
2336	
2337	
2338	
2339	
2340	
2341	
2342	
2343	
2344	
2345	
2346	
2347	
2348	Local schools should be for local children._x000D_ It is outrageous to give Hawesdown & Clare House priority over Unicorn Primary, which educates truly local children
2349	
2350	
2351	
2352	
2353	
2354	
2355	
2356	
2357	
2358	
2359	
2360	
2361	
2362	
2363	
2364	
2365	
2366	
2367	
2368	
2369	
2370	
2371	
2372	
2373	
2374	

2375	
2376	
2377	
2378	
2379	
2380	
2381	
2382	
2383	
2384	
2385	
2386	
2387	
2388	
2389	
2390	
2391	
2392	
2393	
2394	
2395	
2396	
2397	
2398	
2399	
2400	
2401	
2402	
2403	The reasons given in the consultation document do not make the case for feeder school status. They all speak to the benefits of being in a MAT but do not explain what the Trust wishes to achieve that cannot be achieved with the existing pupils. It has also failed to explain how the pupils who come to the Trust from other primaries will not be disadvantaged by the new system.
2404	
2405	
2406	
2407	
2408	
2409	
2410	
2411	
2412	
2413	
2414	
2415	
2416	
2417	
2418	
2419	
2420	
2421	
2422	
2423	

2424	
2425	
2426	
2427	
2428	
2429	
2430	
2431	
2432	Some aspects are not included or unclear e.g. the admission figures from different schools and criteria for these pupils' securing of a place are not given.
2433	
2434	
2435	
2436	
2437	
2438	
2439	
2440	
2441	
2442	
2443	
2444	
2445	
2446	
2447	
2448	
2449	
2450	
2451	
2452	
2453	
2454	
2455	
2456	
2457	
2458	
2459	
2460	
2461	
2462	
2463	
2464	
2465	
2466	
2467	
2468	
2469	
2470	
2471	
2472	
2473	

2474	
2475	
2476	
2477	All schools in the trust should be treated equally. Either all in or out of the feeder school status on equal terms (no priority to any one of the trust schools)._x000D_ _x000D_ Additionally there has been no requirement to change from the status quo in the community.
2478	
2479	
2480	
2481	
2482	
2483	
2484	
2485	
2486	
2487	
2488	
2489	
2490	
2491	
2492	
2493	
2494	I object to the proposal as like many who have no doubt objected before, I think it's unfair that you are making it more difficult for local children to be able to attend their local schools. Grandparent to 4 children who would be negatively impacted by the feeder school admissions policy.
2495	
2496	Strongly object to the feeder schools idea. You will severely limit the choice and access to local secondary schools for many local children. Grandparent to children who will be affected by this change.
2497	
2498	
2499	
2500	
2501	
2502	
2503	
2504	
2505	
2506	
2507	
2508	
2509	
2510	
2511	
2512	
2513	
2514	
2515	
2516	
2517	
2518	
2519	

2520	
2521	
2522	
2523	
2524	
2525	
2526	
2527	
2528	
2529	
2530	
2531	
2532	
2533	
2534	Local schools should be for local people in the community. The environmental impact will of the proposed changes to prevent local children attending the schools will be damaging to the local environment.
2535	
2536	
2537	
2538	
2539	
2540	
2541	
2542	
2543	
2544	
2545	
2546	
2547	

2548	<p>Riddlesdown Collegiate are under going consultation to do away with feeders. Below is their communication</p> <p>4th November 2019 Dear Parents, Carers & Neighbours Consultation on changes to admissions criteria for entry to Riddlesdown Collegiate in September 2021 As you may recall, the admissions criteria for entry to Riddlesdown Collegiate includes giving preference to children who attend five named feeder primary schools - Atwood, Gresham, Greenvale, Harris Primary Academy Kenley and Selsdon. The current admissions criteria have not significantly changed for over fifteen years. In that time, standards at the Collegiate have continued to improve and, consequently, our reputation with parents is strong and we are increasingly oversubscribed each year. For the 328 places we have in current Year 7, we received almost 1500 applications, but only a very small number of these places were offered to children who live close to the Collegiate but who did not meet any of the earlier criteria. The pattern of applications in recent years has now meant that many children who live very close to the Collegiate are not being offered a place because so many places are being offered to children who attend our named feeder primary schools but who may live much further away. At the same time, we remain a partially selective school and so, whilst this accounts for a much smaller number, very local children are being further displaced by those being offered a place based on their score in the ability test. Therefore, in order to give more local children a greater chance of being offered a place at the Collegiate, our admissions authority, the Board of Directors of The Collegiate Trust, has decided to consult on changes to our admissions criteria for entry in September 2021 (which would affect current Year 5 and below). The consultation begins today and proposes the removal of feeder schools and the ability test from the admissions criteria, which would lead to a greater number of children who live close to the Collegiate being offered a place at Riddlesdown Collegiate. This would enable us to better serve our local community and would also bring fringe benefits, such as more students being able to walk to school and consequently less congestion in the neighbourhood. I hope that you will see this as good news and that you will be keen to respond positively to the consultation by completing the questionnaire at http://tctorg.uk/admission-criteria which includes the opportunity to add your own comments. If you do not let us know what you think, we will not be able to take your views into consideration &ndash; so, if you think this would be a good idea, please tell us! The consultation will end on 16th December 2019 and the Board of Directors will then review all responses before publishing any decisions about changes to the admissions criteria in February 2020. Thank you for your engagement with this process. Yours sincerely</p>
2549	
2550	
2551	
2552	
2553	
2554	
2555	
2556	
2557	
2558	
2559	
2560	
2561	
2562	
2563	
2564	
2565	See all comments above. It is outrageous and elitist. Based on nothing other than the ability to gain entrance to a primary school age 4 or a parents career choice. Allocation of school places should be based on children living in the local area, looked after children and siblings.
2566	
2567	
2568	
2569	

2570	
2571	
2572	
2573	
2574	
2575	
2576	
2577	
2578	
2579	
2580	
2581	
2582	
2583	
2584	
2585	
2586	
2587	
2588	
2589	
2590	
2591	
2592	
2593	
2594	
2595	
2596	
2597	
2598	
2599	
2600	
2601	
2602	
2603	
2604	
2605	
2606	
2607	
2608	
2609	
2610	
2611	
2612	
2613	
2614	
2615	
2616	
2617	
2618	
2619	

2620	
2621	
2622	
2623	
2624	
2625	
2626	
2627	
2628	
2629	
2630	
2631	
2632	
2633	
2634	
2635	
2636	
2637	
2638	
2639	
2640	
2641	
2642	
2643	
2644	
2645	
2646	
2647	
2648	
2649	
2650	
2651	
2652	
2653	
2654	
2655	
2656	
2657	
2658	
2659	
2660	
2661	
2662	
2663	
2664	
2665	
2666	
2667	
2668	
2669	

2670	
2671	
2672	
2673	
2674	
2675	
2676	
2677	
2678	
2679	
2680	
2681	
2682	
2683	
2684	
2685	
2686	
2687	
2688	
2689	
2690	
2691	
2692	
2693	
2694	
2695	
2696	
2697	The principle of creating a feeder school through this trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole. It fragments the whole school system. I disagree to it all.
2698	
2699	
2700	
2701	
2702	
2703	
2704	
2705	
2706	
2707	
2708	
2709	
2710	
2711	
2712	

2713	
2714	
2715	
2716	
2717	
2718	
2719	
2720	
2721	
2722	
2723	
2724	
2725	
2726	
2727	
2728	
2729	
2730	
2731	
2732	
2733	
2734	
2735	
2736	
2737	
2738	
2739	
2740	
2741	
2742	
2743	
2744	
2745	
2746	
2747	
2748	
2749	
2750	
2751	
2752	
2753	
2754	
2755	
2756	
2757	
2758	
2759	
2760	
2761	
2762	

2763	
2764	
2765	
2766	
2767	
2768	
2769	
2770	
2771	
2772	
2773	
2774	
2775	
2776	
2777	
2778	
2779	
2780	
2781	
2782	
2783	
2784	
2785	
2786	
2787	
2788	
2789	
2790	
2791	
2792	
2793	
2794	
2795	
2796	
2797	
2798	
2799	
2800	
2801	
2802	
2803	
2804	
2805	
2806	
2807	
2808	
2809	
2810	
2811	

2812	I do not agree with any changes to be made to the admissions policy for LPSB or LPSG other than allowing the children of teachers and headteachers to attend the schools (not all staff).I do not want the schools in the MAT to be made feeder schools, we raised this with you at the initial consultation meeting for the MAT and was categorically told that this was not what you intended to do. I raised the question of the primary schools having “node points” re the admissions policy and you assured us that this was not your intention. I feel that LPSB and LPSG should be for local children who live close to the schools, who can ideally walk to school. I do not think it is fair that children who live a good distance from the schools should have priority over children who live within the Langley catchment, with the exception of the children of teachers or headteachers who work at the Boys or Girls Schools.
2813	
2814	Changes to secondary school admission should reflect the local community and not for the ease of admission for schools that are in the same trust.Resources for the trust can be pooled but I have failed to see the benefit of these proposals.You have not provided sufficient time for the changes to come into effect and in order to provide parent a choice to consider their options and it will be too late for children already in primary school education to prepare for these changes, particularly those from year 4 and above.This is particularly relevant for those children where it will be too late for them to prepare for grammar or private school places.The proposals are ill thought through, have been made with a narrow lens and which do not consider the wider consequences.
2815	
2816	Making the proposed changes will set an extremely dangerous precedent which could result in complete chaos for the school admission system.
2817	
2818	
2819	
2820	
2821	
2822	
2823	
2824	
2825	
2826	
2827	
2828	
2829	
2830	
2831	
2832	
2833	
2834	
2835	
2836	
2837	
2838	
2839	
2840	
2841	
2842	
2843	
2844	
2845	
2846	
2847	
2848	
2849	
2850	
2851	
2852	
2853	
2854	

2855	
2856	
2857	
2858	
2859	
2860	
2861	
2862	
2863	
2864	
2865	
2866	
2867	
2868	
2869	
2870	
2871	
2872	
2873	
2874	
2875	
2876	
2877	
2878	
2879	
2880	
2881	
2882	
2883	
2884	
2885	
2886	
2887	
2888	
2889	
2890	
2891	
2892	
2893	
2894	
2895	
2896	
2897	
2898	
2899	
2900	I support Option A of the proposed new admissins criteria as it fulfills the promise made to LPPS families on admission and will meet future parent's expectations. Option A also benefits the staff and in-turn the children at all the LPLT.
2901	
2902	
2903	

2904	
2905	
2906	
2907	
2908	
2909	
2910	
2911	
2912	
2913	
2914	
2915	
2916	
2917	
2918	
2919	
2920	
2921	
2922	
2923	
2924	
2925	
2926	
2927	
2928	
2929	
2930	
2931	
2932	
2933	
2934	
2935	
2936	
2937	
2938	
2939	
2940	
2941	
2942	
2943	
2944	
2945	
2946	
2947	
2948	
2949	
2950	
2951	
2952	
2953	

2954	
2955	
2956	
2957	
2958	
2959	
2960	
2961	
2962	
2963	
2964	
2965	
2966	
2967	
2968	
2969	
2970	
2971	
2972	
2973	
2974	
2975	
2976	
2977	
2978	
2979	
2980	
2981	
2982	
2983	
2984	
2985	
2986	
2987	
2988	
2989	
2990	
2991	
2992	
2993	
2994	
2995	
2996	
2997	
2998	
2999	
3000	
3001	
3002	
3003	

3004	
3005	
3006	
3007	
3008	
3009	
3010	
3011	
3012	
3013	
3014	
3015	
3016	
3017	
3018	
3019	
3020	
3021	<p>Please see my comments above in opposition to these proposals above. I would also like to make some more general comments on the Trust's proposals:</p> <p>, we had no previous ties with the area. We were attracted by the reputation of the Langley Park secondaries and bought our home specifically because it is located well within all of the historical Langley Park catchment zones. We worked hard, made sacrifices and saved for well over a decade to get a deposit together and paid a premium to be within the catchment zone. Since then we have invested our lives in the area and become part of what we have always found to be a very tight knit community. However, if the proposed changes to the admissions criteria are pushed through, it is very likely our children will miss out on a place at the Langley Park secondaries and everything we have worked towards for so long will be taken away.</p> <p>This process has already started to divide the community and is causing untold reputational damage to the LPLT. I cannot put into words the sense of injustice I feel and am truly baffled by the Trust's decision. The alleged benefits of the feeders are tenuous at best and far outweighed by the harm that is being done. It is simply not fair for local children to miss out on a place at their local school and I urge you to rethink this decision.</p>
3022	
3023	
3024	
3025	

3026	<p>Please see my comments above in opposition to these proposals above. I would also like to make some more general comments on the Trust's proposals:</p> <p>, we had no previous ties with the area. We were attracted by the reputation of the Langley Park secondaries and bought our home specifically because it is located well within all of the historical Langley Park catchment zones. We worked hard, made sacrifices and saved for well over a decade to get a deposit together and paid a premium to be within the catchment zone. Since then we have invested our lives in the area and become part of what we have always found to be a very tight knit community. However, if the proposed changes to the admissions criteria are pushed through, it is very likely our children will miss out on a place at the Langley Park secondaries and everything we have worked towards for so long will be taken away.</p> <p>This process has already started to divide the community and is causing untold reputational damage to the LPLT. I cannot put into words the sense of injustice I feel and am truly baffled by the Trust's decision. The alleged benefits of the feeders are tenuous at best and far outweighed by the harm that is being done. It is simply not fair for local children to miss out on a place at their local school and I urge you to rethink this decision.</p>
3027	
3028	
3029	
3030	
3031	
3032	
3033	
3034	
3035	
3036	<p>Selection.! An!attempt!to!prevent!opportunities!to!students!nearest!their!local!school!just!because!they!and!their! parents!do!not!fit!your!remit.! Schools!should!be!under!the!care!of!their!local!authorities.! I!dread!to!think! how!long!it!has!taken!to!come!up!with!this!proposal!and!the!salaries!of!those!involved.! This!has!merely!created!a!job!for!someone!rather!than!the!money!being!better!spent!actually!educating! local!children.!</p>
3037	
3038	
3039	
3040	
3041	
3042	
3043	
3044	
3045	
3046	

3047	
3048	
3049	
3050	
3051	
3052	
3053	
3054	
3055	
3056	
3057	
3058	
3059	
3060	
3061	
3062	
3063	
3064	
3065	
3066	
3067	
3068	
3069	
3070	
3071	
3072	
3073	
3074	
3075	

Parent of
child at
one of the
Trust's
secondary
schools

Parent of
child aged
2+ years
who has
not yet
started
school