

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 24 MARCH 2009

MINUTES of the Meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 24 March 2009 commencing at 10:30am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mrs Angela Fraser DL – Chairman
Mr Geoff Marlow – Vice-Chairman

Mr Victor Agarwal	Yvonna Lay
Mrs Mary Angell	Mr R A N Lowther
Mr Timothy Ashton	Mr Ernest Mallett
* Mr Cyril Baily	Mrs Sally Ann B Marks
Mr W D Barker OBE	Mr Peter Martin
Ian Beardsmore	Mrs Jan Mason
Mr Mike Bennison (left 3.05pm)	* Mrs D M Mitchell
Mr Laurie Burrell	Mrs Marsha J Moseley
Mr Fred Chipperfield	Mr D J Munro
Mrs Helyn Clack	Marian Myland
Mrs Carol Ann Coleman	* Mike Nevins
Mrs Elizabeth Compton	Tim Oliver
Mr Stephen Cooksey (left 3.30pm)	Eddie Owen
* Mr Andrew Crisp	Mr Alan Peirce (arrived 11.15am)
* Frank Davies	Mr Nigel Petrie MBE
Mr David Davis	Mr Tom Phelps-Penry
Sarah Di Caprio	Chris Pitt
Mr Terry Dicks	Dr Andrew Povey
Mr John Doran	Mr Kenneth Rimington
Mr John Farmer	Mr Tony Rooth
Mr Chris Frost	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Mrs Pat Frost	Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos
Mr David Goodwin (left 3.15pm)	Mrs Lavinia Sealy
Mr Michael Gosling	* Mrs Pauline Searle
Dr Lynne Hack	Mr N W Skellett CBE
Tim Hall	Chris Slyfield
Mrs K Hammond	Mrs Diana Smith
Mr Simon Harding	Mr James E Smith OBE
Mr David Harmer	Jean Smith
Mr Nick Harrison	* Mrs Christine Stevens
Ms Marisa Heath	Mr Shamas Tabrez
Mr Peter Hickman	Mr Roy Taylor
* Mrs M A Hicks	Mr Colin Taylor
Mr David Hodge	Mrs Val Tinney
Mr David Ivison	Denise Turner-Stewart
Mr Daniel Kee	Mrs Hazel V A Watson
Frances King	Mrs Fiona White (left 3.15pm)
Mr Ian R Lake	Mrs Elise S Whiteley
* Mr Peter Langham	

*absent

20/09 **MINUTES (ITEM 1)**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 10 February 2009 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

21/09 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Cyril Baily, Mr Andrew Crisp, Mr Frank Davies, Mrs Margaret Hicks, Mrs Dorothy Mitchell, Mr Mike Nevins, Mrs Pauline Searle and Mrs Christine Stevens.

22/09 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (ITEM 3)**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) An information pack had been made available to Members about the role of the Police Authority. Officers from Surrey Police Authority would be available to brief Members further during the lunch break.
- (ii) Members were encouraged to visit the information stand on the Corporate Area Assessment during the lunch break.
- (iii) Further to the suggestion at the last meeting of the Council, the Chairman had written to the Governor of Victoria, Australia to express the Council's sympathies and support for the people of Victoria with regard to the recent bush fires. A letter had been received from the Governor thanking the Council for its letter and its expressions of sympathy and support.
- (iv) The Chairman had hosted a 50th anniversary dinner for Surrey Wildlife Trust. The Trust had produced two fine oak benches from the Norbury Park Estate which had been on show in the Grand Hall. One of the benches would be taken to the Shabden Park Estate in the Banstead East Division which was managed by the Trust.
- (v) Members were encouraged to become Friends of the Watts Gallery, which was due to reopen in 2010. A leaflet detailing the scheme had been sent to all Members.
- (vi) The Chairman had attended a number of Duke of Edinburgh award ceremonies around the County and encouraged Members to support the scheme, possibly through their local allocations.

23/09 **DECLARATION OF PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS
(ITEM 4)**

- (i) Dr Povey declared a personal interest concerning social care matters in the general debate of the meeting because he was a director of a company that supplies social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council and Surrey Primary Care Trust.

- (ii) Mrs Moseley declared a personal interest in agenda item 11, Surrey's Admissions Arrangements for September 2010 for County and Voluntary Controlled Schools, because she was a governor of Walsh Memorial C of E Junior School.

- (iii) Mr Owen declared a personal interest concerning his Member question (agenda item 5, no.5) because he was a Trustee of Voluntary Action Surrey.

- (iii) Mrs di Caprio declared a personal interest in Members' Questions 5 and 11 respectively because she was a Trustee of Voluntary Action Surrey and a member of the Guildford PRU Management Committee.

- (iv) Mr Colin Taylor declared a personal interest in agenda item 11, Surrey's Admissions Arrangements for September 2010 for County and Voluntary Controlled Schools, because he was a governor of Southfield Park Primary School.

24/09 **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 5)**

Notice of 24 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix A.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below.

(N.B. The supplementary questions relating to questions 16 - 24 were taken at the end of the meeting):

(Q1) Mrs Coleman asked if the priority accorded to Church Road could be reviewed. The Executive Member for Transport advised that the points score against the criteria had been checked and that the priority given to Church Road was correct. The system did ensure that those roads in greatest need of repair were prioritised. He added that due to the lack of funding from central government a priority system was essential.

(Also, Q1) Mr Farmer stressed the dangers to motorcyclists caused by potholes and asked if the priority system took their needs into account. The Executive Member explained that all potholes

were assessed and those causing a particular danger would be dealt with by a special emergency procedure. He noted that defects at the side of the road were perhaps more dangerous than those in the middle of the road, particularly for cyclists and motorcyclists.

(Q2) Mrs White asked when and how the results of the survey would be published. The Executive Member for Transport reported that he could not give an exact date and as it was likely to be within the 'purdah' period prior to the election, care would have to be taken about how it was publicised. He added that the preliminary results showed a marked increase in satisfaction.

(Also, Q2) Mrs Turner-Stewart asked whether the rapid response arrangements for pothole repairs were still in place. The Executive Member stated that the rapid response arrangements would continue as they had proved extremely successful with productivity rates trebling. Although more potholes and defects were being repaired, more had appeared due to the recent adverse weather conditions. All Community Gangs had been allocated to pothole repairs in immediate response to the problems caused by the recent snow, but some staff were now back on their normal duties.

(Q3) Mr Cooksey sought an assurance that the areas which had been least effective as detailed in his question would be addressed in the forthcoming report.

(Also, Q3) Mr Beardsmore reported that some Borough and District staff, for example refuse collectors, had been unable to carry out their normal duties during the period, and asked if there had been dialogue with the Boroughs and Districts with regard to using these staff to do other work, for example road clearance, etc.

(Also, Q3) Mrs di Caprio asked if the prioritisation for salting of roads around schools would be included in the report.

The Executive Member for Safer and Stronger Communities outlined the response to the emergency and advised that the Emergency Centre co-ordinated services and partners well, and thanked all those organisations who had worked together over the period and provided a good combined response. She acknowledged that readiness could be improved in the future and advised that the aim was to be 60% ready by the end of year but hoped that this could be further improved. The report to the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee would consider these issues. Mr Hodge advised that the Transportation Select Committee would consider a report at its next meeting on the highways aspects.

(Also, Q3) Mr Phelps-Penry asked if householders who cleared snow and ice from the pavement in front of their property would be liable for any accidents. The Executive Member considered this to be a neighbourly action, but advised that care must be taken.

(Q5) Mr Owen sought and was given an assurance that the matter would be dealt with urgently.

(Q6) Mrs White considered the response to be unsatisfactory and asked if the Executive Member would delegate to the Guildford Local Committee the ability to review and reprioritise the maintenance programme for the area. The Executive Member for Transport stressed that Moorfield Road was included in the programme as detailed in the written response. He advised that Members would shortly be asked to inform the Highways Service of the three worst roads in their Division. These roads would then be scored against the criteria and Members informed of the results after the election, so new councillors could also be involved.

(Also, Q6) Mr Rooth agreed with Mrs White with regard to the poor condition of Moorfield Road, asked if it was appreciated that the road provided access to the waste disposal facility and asked if this factor could be taken into account when assessing its priority for repair. The Executive Member concurred in the condition of the road and acknowledged that the volume of heavy traffic using it did lead to its deterioration and undertook to look carefully at the programme.

(Also, Q6) Mr Beardsmore asked why Members were asked to submit their worst three roads if some of the roads were not then considered, as had been the case for him in the previous year. The Executive Member stressed that the input of local Members was extremely helpful as was that of the Local Committees. However, the major criterion was an engineering assessment so roads which scored highly under this criteria would most likely be accorded the highest priority. All roads suggested by Members were scored fairly against the criteria system. He encouraged Members to challenge the final list if their roads did not appear in it in order to ascertain why. He confirmed that there would be a process for responding to Member queries in respect of their three worst roads.

(Q7) Mrs Diana Smith stated that she was aware of a number of cases where service had not been adequately provided and asked if the report to the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee would address such cases and the lessons to be learned. The Executive Member for Adults and Community Care stated that it was essential that the Council learnt from every experience, and asked Mrs Smith to provide her with details of what hadn't worked. She advised the Council of the heroic efforts made

by staff to respond to the needs of vulnerable people and read out a letter from a carer thanking the Council for its response.

(Q8) Mr Colin Taylor expressed his grave concern at the situation and asked that a resolution be pursued with vigour. The Executive Member for Environment understood the concerns of Members and the consequent reduction in pitch numbers on other sites and confirmed that a great deal of activity was going on to resolve the issue, although the legal process was slow. He would continue to press officers to move things forward.

(Q9) Mrs di Caprio asked when the review of speed limit policies would take place in light of the concerns of a number of communities. The Executive Member for Transport recognised the local concerns regarding speed limits, but advised that there were other considerations, i.e. a degree of consistency across the County was required, and the co-operation of the Police as the enforcement agents was required. He hoped that the review could be undertaken as soon as possible, but was unable to give an exact timetable.

(Also, Q9) Mr Goodwin asked why there had been such a delay in responding to the decision of the Local Committee and was advised that the Executive Member would consider the procedures. However, a full review was required before any new policies could be agreed.

(Q10) Mr Hall asked for a timescale for the review and was advised by the Executive Member for Transport that as the review required resources he could not guarantee when it would take place.

(Q11) Mrs White asked when the teaching and non-teaching staff of the PRUs would be notified of their position. The Executive Member for Schools, Children and Youth Services reported that staff would be advised following consideration of proposals in respect of staffing levels by the Head of Schools and Learning within the next few weeks.

(Q12) Mr Cooksey asked the Executive Member to clarify whether his response indicated that the statement of Mr Justice Collins was incorrect.

(Also, Q12) Mr Beardsmore explained that the decision was related to the way in which the Public Inquiry had been carried out and that PPS12 had been ruled as wrong in law, and asked if the Executive Member still considered the Surrey Waste Plan to be sound.

The Executive Member for Environment confirmed that the Government had now accepted PPS12 as wrong and had changed

it, and, therefore, if the Council were developing its Waste Plan again, it would be managed differently. He confirmed that any of the Council's plans developed in accordance with PPS12 could be challenged if challenge were still permissible within the timescale. The matter was currently being reviewed with Counsel and advice being sought with regard to proceeding without a Waste Plan. He confirmed that the Plan would not be amended on the specific grounds raised by Mr Cooksey, but could be amended on the grounds raised by Mr Beardsmore.

(Also, Q12) Mr Doran asked that Members be given a comprehensive briefing on this issue. The Executive Member stated that Officers would bring a report to the Executive in due course outlining the way forward and briefings for Members would be arranged at that time.

(Q14) Mr Beardsmore expressed surprise that the information requested was not routinely collated and asked that an answer be provided by the Executive Member within the next week. He also sought clarification of the apparent anomalies regarding staff and hours of provision in the response. The Executive Member reported that open and closed hours were not routinely measured. The bulk of work undertaken was in respect of targeted youth work, both open and closed. He advised caution in making correlations between the information contained within the two tables in the response as the hours were worked over a period of time whilst the vacancy rate was measured at a specific point in time. The hours shown only included County Council activity and did not include youth activity provided by other sectors.

(Q16) Mr Phelps-Penry asked if it were not possible to seal potholes. The Executive Member for Transport advised that potholes were sealed, but not in an obvious way.

(Also, Q16) Mr Roy Taylor asked that the current practice of bonding be reviewed as it was not sealing potholes effectively. The Executive Member undertook to try to assuage Member concerns in this area.

(Q17) Mrs Sealy referred to the proposed governance arrangements and asked why they had not been put in writing. The Executive Member for Schools, Children and Youth Services undertook to meet with Mrs Sealy and officers from Legal and Audit Services to discuss this matter.

(Q19) Mr Colin Taylor pointed out that the total deficit was approximately one year's worth of Council Tax and asked the Executive Member if he considered this to be sustainable. The Executive Member for Resources agreed that it was concerning, but

stated that it was not possible to take a view regarding the long term future because of the unpredictability of the stock market.

(Q22) Mr Mallett noted that places had been offered in excess of the Published Admission Number (PAN) and asked if this were permissible. The Executive Member for Schools, Children and Youth Services reported that it was not allowed for Reception classes where a maximum of 30 was stipulated, but that secondary schools were allowed more discretion. He added that over-offering was often done in light of the large number of pupils in Surrey who were educated in the private sector, and was confident that numbers would reduce accordingly.

(Also, Q22) Mr Harding referred to the demountable classrooms which were being used to house additional pupils, and sought assurance which was given by the Executive Member that the Council was lobbying for additional funding to build the required permanent classrooms/new schools.

(Q23) Mrs Diana Smith asked why Members had not been briefed as soon as the application for judicial review had come into the public domain. The Leader stated that a press release in respect of this matter had been issued.

(Also, Q23) Mrs Watson asked why Members had not been informed of the decision to pursue a judicial review in February. The Leader advised that the reasons had been given in his written response. He stated that the fact that the Council was challenging Ofsted had been referred to at meetings of both the Executive and Council in January.

25/09 **SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 6)**

One question had been received for the Surrey Police Authority. The question and reply is attached as Appendix A. The Vice-Chairman of the Police Authority undertook to provide further detail to Mr Taylor outside of the meeting.

26/09 **REPORT OF THE SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 7)**

A written statement on the work of the Surrey Police Authority had been included in the agenda.

The Chairman undertook, on behalf of the Council, to write to Mark Rowley to congratulate him on his appointment as Chief Constable.

27/09 **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS (ITEM 8)**

There were 5 statements from Members:

- Mr James Smith made a statement on School Admissions.
- Mrs Fiona White made a statement on Kings College for the Arts & Technology
- Mrs Elise Whiteley made a statement as Member Champion for Disabilities and a local Member statement in respect of the Youth Motorcycle trials group in Runnymede.
- Ms Marisa Heath made a statement as Member Champion for Looked After Children.

The statements are attached as Appendix B.

28/09 **ORIGINAL MOTIONS (ITEM 9(i))**

Under Standing Order 11.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 10, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion standing in her name, which was formally seconded by Mrs Fiona White, as follows:

‘This Council regrets that following twelve years of a majority Conservative administration, the County Council has been awarded the lowest one star rating by the Audit Commission.

This Council agrees to desist its judicial review action against Ofsted to challenge the assessment of the Council’s Children’s Service as,

- i it will be much more productive to address the issues raised in the report than to challenge the overall findings on a technicality,
- ii money saved through not incurring legal bills could be spent on enhancing the service, and
- iii management time could be spent on improving the service and not on briefing lawyers which does not improve the front-line service.’

After the debate on the motion, in which 17 Members spoke, it was put to the vote.

Mrs Watson requested a recorded vote. 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted for:

Mr Agarwal, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Cooksey, Mrs di Caprio, Mr Doran, Mr Frost, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Lowther, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mr Owen, Mr Phelps-Penry, Mr Slyfield, Mrs Diana Smith, Mrs Jean Smith, Mr Colin Taylor, Mrs Watson and Mrs White.

The following Members voted against:

Mrs Angell, Mr Ashton, Mr Barker, Mr Bennison, Mr Burrell, Mr Chipperfield, Mrs Clack, Mrs Compton, Mr Davis, Mr Dicks, Mrs Fraser, Mr Gosling, Dr Hack, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harding, Mr Harmer, Ms Heath, Mr Hodge, Mr Ivison, Mr Kee, Mrs King, Mr Lake, Mrs Lay, Mrs Marks, Mr Marlow, Mr Martin, Mrs Moseley, Mr Munro, Mrs Myland, Mr Oliver, Mr Peirce, Mr Petrie, Dr Povey, Mr Rimington, Mr Rooth, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mrs Sealy, Mr Skellett, Mr Smith, Mr Tabrez, Mrs Tinney, Mrs Turner-Stewart and Mrs Whiteley.

The following Members abstained:

Mrs Coleman, Mr Farmer, Mr Pitt and Mr Roy Taylor.

Therefore, the motion was LOST.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1.05pm and resumed at 2.15pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mr Agarwal, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Burrell, Mr Chipperfield, Mr Dicks, Ms Heath, Mr Ivison, Mr Kee, Mrs Moseley, Mr Peirce, Mr Rimington, Mr Rooth and Mrs Tinney.

29/09

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE (ITEM 10)

Mr Skellett presented the report of the Executive's meetings held on 20 January, 5 and 17 February, 3 and 17 March 2009.

(1) Statements/updates from Members

- The Leader made a statement regarding Icelandic Bank deposits.
- The Executive Member for Safer and Stronger Communities made a statement in respect of the Youth Engagement Scheme.
- The Executive Member for Policy and Performance made a statement on the Member Development Steering Group.
- The Executive Member for Adults and Community Care made a statement on the visit from Mr David Behan, the Director General for Social Care, Local Government and Care Partnerships at the Department of Health.

The statements are attached as Appendix C.

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

(a) Children and Young People's Plan 2009/10

RESOLVED:

That the Interim Children & Young People's Plan 2009-10, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted, be approved, subject to confirmation of the budget by the Executive and agreement by the Primary Care Trust.

(b) Local Area Agreement 2008 – 2011: Refresh 2009

Following the Executive's meeting on 17 March 2009, a supplementary report setting out its recommendations was circulated to all Members on 19 March 2009.

RESOLVED:

That the 2009 refresh of the Local Area Agreement 2008-11, attached at Appendix 2 to the report submitted be adopted.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following report was received and noted:

- Sustainable Communities Act: Response to Original Motion

(4) Minutes of the meetings of the Executive

Minute 77/09 – Capital Funding to meet the need for Additional Primary Places in September 2009

Mr Hickman asked what provision had been made to provide classrooms for future years where double demountable classrooms were being installed for the 2009 intake. The Executive Member confirmed that demountables were a short-term solution and advised that the School Organisation Plan considered future need.

Mr Mallett questioned the increase in the number of places offered at Rydens School and the entry numbers for Esher High school. The Executive Member confirmed that the PAN at Esher High school was unchanged. Additional places had been offered at Rydens School as it was able to absorb increased numbers. It was expected that there would be an outflow of pupils to the private sector thereby freeing up places for pupils on the waiting list. He stated that numbers were likely to settle down for the 2009 entry, but that it would

be necessary to review secondary provision in the area for future years.

Minute 58/09 – Report from the Audit and Governance Committee: Annual Governance Statement - Management Action Plan Progress Report

Mr Harrison asked what steps had been taken with regard to the areas of weakness set out in the action plan and whether the Executive Member considered that satisfactory progress had been made. The Executive Member for Resources reported that, following his response to the Executive on 17 February, he had referred the matters raised by the Audit and Governance Committee to the County Council Management Team (CCMT) who had discussed the issues at their meeting on 19 February. The CCMT had fully accepted responsibility for ensuring that the improvements identified in the action plan were progressed as quickly as possible and had asked relevant officers to give these matters their utmost priority. The draft Annual Governance Statement for 2008/09 would be presented to the Audit and Governance Committee on 27 April and would contain detailed information in respect of the issues raised by Mr Harrison.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Executive held on 20 January, 5 and 17 February, 3 and 17 March 2009 be adopted.

30/09

SURREY'S ADMISSIONS ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2010 FOR COUNTY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS (ITEM 11)

The views and recommendations of the Executive on Surrey's Admission Arrangements for September 2010, for County and Voluntary Controlled Schools, arising from its meeting on 17 March 2009 were emailed and circulated to Members as a supplementary report on 19 March 2009.

The Executive Member for Schools, Children and Youth Services introduced the report.

Mr James Smith proposed an amendment, standing in his name and formally seconded by Mr Hall, which was as follows:

That in recommendation (4) The Royal Kent be deleted from the list of partner / feeder schools.

After the debate on the amendment, in which 5 Members spoke, the amendment was put to the vote, with 9 Members voting for it and 15 against. There were 25 abstentions. The amendment was LOST.

Returning to the main debate, 1 further Member spoke.

At the end of the debate the recommendations were taken separately and it was:

RESOLVED:

That the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2010 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools be agreed:

- (1) That the admission arrangements remain unchanged for the majority of Surrey's community and voluntary controlled schools, as follows:
 1. **First priority: looked after children**
Children who are registered as being in the care of a Local Authority (LA) (for example, fostered or living in a children's home).
 2. **Second priority: exceptional arrangements**
Occasionally there will be a very small number of children for whom exceptional arrangements will apply. These exceptional arrangements may override other admissions priorities and the LA may apply them when they first offer places. The LA may also ask schools to admit over their Published Admission Number at other times under this category.
 3. **Third priority: brothers and sisters (siblings)**
After 'exceptional arrangements', places are then offered to siblings. A sibling is a child who will have an older brother or sister still at the school concerned at the time of the younger sibling's admission. (So, a younger sibling will be given priority for admission only if the older sibling will still be at the school in September 2010.)
Please note that this does not apply if the older brother or sister joined the school at sixth-form level.
 4. **Fourth priority: children for whom the school is the nearest to their home**
Currently the nearest school is defined as the school closest to the home address admitting pupils of the appropriate age-range, as measured by a straight line. The distance is measured from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey, to the nearest school gate available for pupils to use. Parents should note that if they apply for free transport different

criteria apply and the distance from home to school will be measured using a different route.

The nearest school may be either inside or outside the county boundary.

5. **Fifth priority: any other applicant**

Distance as measured by a straight line from Home to School will apply within each category as a means of prioritising places. If there are two applicants from the same block of flats the applicant with the lowest door number will be given priority.

(2) That the local admission arrangements as set out below be agreed for September 2010:

i) Brockham Primary School

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings of existing pupils who will be attending the school at the time of admission and for whom the school is the nearest community, voluntary controlled or foundation school
4. Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest community, voluntary controlled or foundation school
5. Siblings for whom the school is not the nearest school
6. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed, within any category, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

ii) Warlingham School

1. Looked after children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children who live within the fixed catchment area (Annex 8 to the report submitted)
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

iii) Local Admission Arrangements in Waverley

1. Looked after children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children attending a named partner school. In alphabetical order these are:

Hale Primary School

Folly Hill Infant
Weybourne Infant

Potter's Gate Primary

St Andrew's Infant

South Farnham Junior School

All Saints CofE (Aided) Infant
The Bourne Community Infant
St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant
St John's CofE (Aided) Infant
St Mary's CofE (Aided) Infant

William Cobbett Junior

Badshot Lea Infant
Folly Hill Infant
Weybourne Infant

Farnham Heath End School

Potter's Gate Primary
St Michael's CE Junior (Hampshire)
The Hale Primary
William Cobbett Junior

Woolmer Hill School

Beacon Hill Community Primary
St Bartholomew's Church of England (Aided) Primary
St Mary's Church of England (Aided) Primary
Shottermill Junior

5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
6. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed, within any category, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

(3) That the arrangements for Southfield Park Primary School as follows be unchanged for September 2010:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children living in the defined catchment area (Annex 9 to the report submitted) of the school. If the number of applicants in the defined catchment area is greater than the number of places available at the school, places will be offered to those living the furthest distance from the school, measured in a straight line.
5. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category, other than 4. above, we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

(4) That the admission arrangements for The Howard of Effingham School be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Those children who both live in the catchment area, and who attend one of the following partner / feeder schools:

Oakfield,
Eastwick,
St Lawrence,
The Raleigh,
The Dawnay
The Royal Kent

5. Those children who live in the catchment area (Annex 10 to the report submitted) but do not attend one of the partner/feeder schools named in 4. above.
6. Any other applicant

If there is oversubscription from applicants within the catchment area, priority will be given to children who live furthest from their nearest alternative school as measured by straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

If the school is oversubscribed from applicants living outside the catchment area we will offer places, after all other criteria have been satisfied, according to distance from the permanent home address to the school. Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

- (5) That the admissions arrangements for Auriol Junior School, Wallace Fields Junior School and Eastwick Junior School for September 2010 do not give priority for admission to children attending the infant schools on the shared / adjoining sites, and the admission arrangements for these schools remain unchanged from those arrangements for September 2009.
- (6) That priority be given for admissions to the junior school on shared / adjoining sites for the following schools:
 - i) Warren Mead Junior School – children attending Warren Mead Infant School
 - ii) New Haw Community Junior School - Children attending The Grange Community Infant School
 - iii) Ottershaw Junior School - Children attending Ottershaw CofE Infant School
 - iv) Spelthorne Junior Schools – Children attending Spelthorne Infant School
 - v) Hammond Community Junior School – Children attending Lightwater Village Infant School
 - vi) Crawley Ridge Junior School – children attending Crawley Ridge Infant School
 - vii) Hamsey Green Junior School – children attending Hamsey Green Infant School
 - viii) Shottermill Junior School – children attending Shottermill Infant School
 - ix) The Hermitage Junior School – children attending The Oaktree Infant School

- x) West Byfleet Junior School – children attending the West Byfleet Infant School
- (7) That the Published Admission Number of Knaphill Junior School be increased from 81 to 90 and that priority for admissions to the school be given to those children attending Knaphill Lower School.
- (8) That the admissions arrangements for Walsh Memorial C of E Junior School be as follows:
 - 1. Looked After Children
 - 2. Exceptional arrangements
 - 3. Children attending Walsh Memorial Church of England (Controlled) Infant School
 - 4. Siblings not admitted under 3. above
 - 5. Children attending St Paul's Church of England Infant School (Tongham)
 - 6. Any other applicant

If the school is over-subscribed within any category we will offer places according to distance from the permanent home address to the school.

Home to school distance will be measured by a straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

- (9) That the proposed change to the sibling rule for Oxted School be not agreed. The admissions arrangements for the School would therefore remain unchanged for September 2010 and be as follows:
 - 1. Looked After Children
 - 2. Exceptional arrangements
 - 3. Siblings
 - 4. Applicants who both live in the catchment area (Annex 11 to the submitted report) and who attend one of the following partner/feeder schools:
 - Crockham Hill (Kent),
 - Dormansland,
 - Godstone,
 - Holland,
 - Lingfield,
 - St Catherine's,
 - St John's,
 - St Mary's,
 - St Stephen's,

Tatsfield and Woodlea

5. Those children who live in the catchment area but do not attend one of the partner/feeder schools named above
6. Any other applicant

If there is oversubscription within any criteria, priority will be given to children who live furthest from their nearest alternative school as measured by straight line from the address point of the pupil's house, as set by Ordnance Survey, to the nearest school gate for pupils to use.

- (10) That the amendments to the Published Admissions Numbers for primary and secondary schools as outlined in Annex 5 to the report submitted, and those changes to PANs for the Dorking Community Primary Schools in Mole Valley resulting from the decision in respect of item 7 (Minute 87/09), be approved.
- (11) That the coordinated schemes for primary and secondary schools (Annexes 3 and 4 to the submitted report) be approved to include further statutory changes outlined in the New Code of Practice on School Admissions. In the case of the Primary Scheme paragraph 1.75 of the new Code of Practice states "Schools must not require parents to attend the school in person in order to collect an application form and must not require parents to return the completed application form to the school. This being the case it is proposed that all applications for Year R children are sent to the Local Authority and not to the school of the parents' first ranked preference. There will be further required changes to both the primary and secondary coordinated schemes for 2011 and beyond. These changes will include national closing dates for applications.
- (12) That Surrey's Relevant Area be approved as outlined in Annex 6 to the submitted report.
- (13) That parents be given the opportunity to state three preferences on their application forms.

[The meeting ended at 3.46pm]

Chairman