

CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR RICHMOND UPON THAMES COMMUNITY SCHOOLS 2013/2014

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

334 responses were received by the closing date of 13 January 2012 and they can be broken down as follows: -

Schools	10 – two secondary (both in-borough); and eight primary (of which five are in-borough, two in Kingston and one in Hounslow).
Local Authorities	1
Pressure-group	1
Sets of parents/residents	319

In the simplest terms, these responses can be further broken down as follows: -

Proposal 1, to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough: 2 for, 0 against.

Proposal 2, to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools: 2 for, 0 against.

Proposal 3, to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs: 3 for, 0 against.

Proposal 4, to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools: 100 for, 231 against, 3 neutral.

Proposal 5, to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls: 0 for, 4 against.

Responses in favour of the proposal are shaded as yellow in the first column; those opposed are shaded in lilac; and those that are broadly neutral are shaded in green. Some responses have been edited so that individual children and their addresses cannot be identified.

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Secondary school – Orleans Park			Yes: We are happy with the Year 7 admissions scheme. However, at some point in the near future we would like the opportunity to discuss our concerns about the in-year admissions process.	Re Proposal 4: Yes: We don't have strong views on the oversubscription criteria. The Governing Body at Orleans Park School is concerned that we must still maintain strong links with the local link primary schools. There were concerns over the impact it might have on St Stephen's School as many of the children leave north of the A316. However, we do think that all local children should not be discriminated against because of the primary school that they attended. We feel it is important that children from our local community all have equal access to Orleans Park.	
	Secondary school – Teddington	Re Proposal 4: I am confirming in writing that it is the view of the Governors of Teddington School that they are in favour of removing the link school system. This is based on the view that proximity to school as a criterion that replaced attendance at a link school, would be a fairer system for Richmond children.				
	Primary school – St James's	Re Proposal 4: We welcome the Borough's decision to seek consultation on the removal of the linked school admissions policies of the above schools. We support the removal of the linked school criterion and support its replacement with 'Home to School' distance as the criterion applied where a school is oversubscribed. The linked school criterion has been in place for many years and is largely based on historical transfers rather than reflecting the wishes of the local community today. The policy prevents children from St James's gaining a place at their closest community school and the distance criterion would seem to be a fairer method of allocating sought after school places.				
	Primary school – Fern Hill (Kingston)	Re Proposal 4: The Governing Body of Fern Hill Primary School support the removal of the linked school criteria as we believe it would potentially offer our pupils a choice of good local secondary schools to attend within the limited availability of school places available. As the number on roll at Fern Hill increases, so too will the catchment area thus causing more of our pupils to fall into the possible catchment area of Teddington School. Many pupils already choose to attend Grey Court School and we do not think that the removal of the linked school status will adversely affect this choice. Removing the link school status will mean it will not be necessary for parents to move their children in the later junior years to try to increase their chances of being offered a place at Teddington School. We believe this is not an ideal course of action for the pupil concerned or for their classmates and the school as a whole.				
	Headteacher, primary school (Darell)	Re Proposal 4: I am emailing in response to the consultation on the removal of our link with Grey Court. As you will know, approximately half of our children choose Grey Court as their secondary school after Darell and we have established links with the school. Although you did assure me that the admission with Grey Court may not be affected if this criterion was removed, I am, of course, concerned that there would be no guarantee of this. Being a school further away from Grey Court than many others, my concern would be that our children may not be able to get in there in the future if the link status was removed. I also have a duty to report the concerns of parents at my school. I have had several parents visit me and mention that they are unhappy with this proposal, including the Chair of Governors. As a school which is low on numbers				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		currently, I don't want any other matters to affect parents' choice. On parent tours I am often asked which is our secondary link school and the response is positive when I mention Grey Court. I hope that our link with Grey Court would remain.				
	Primary school (Darell)	Re Proposal 4: We want to express our concern about the plan to remove the link school criteria from the borough secondary admissions policy. Our link with Grey Court School has served Darell children well over past years with many children successfully moving on to Grey Court. Geographically, there is no school that obviously serves the Kew area and on a distance criteria, our children may not get access to their first choice of secondary school. We believe that the link with Grey Court is valued by the families at Darell School and a number of parents have reflected similar concerns in conversation with Laura Whateley, our headteacher.				
	Primary School – Latchmere (Kingston)	Re Proposal 4: As you know, Latchmere School currently enjoys 'linked' status with Grey Court School, and has done for a number of years. We are writing in response to the Consultation on removal of the 'linked school' criterion from Richmond schools' admission arrangements. According to your impact assessment on how allocation of places may be affected once distance from school becomes the main criterion for admission, there will be relatively little difference to the number of Kingston children offered a place at Grey Court. Your figures show that there may even be more places offered on this basis. However, any increase will be more than offset by the fact that a significant number of children from St Paul's who currently obtain a place at Teddington will lose out and may well choose instead to apply to Grey Court. We are, therefore, concerned that a number of Latchmere pupils who currently benefit from the 'linked school' status will not obtain a place once distance becomes the main criterion. This is particularly worrying given the current lack of alternatives for Kingston pupils for secondary transfer. Another factor we believe should be considered is the positive effect that the certainty of a place at Grey Court confers on our Year 6 pupils. The final year at primary school is an important year for both the school and pupils and can be challenging, both academically and emotionally. We have noticed that the pupils who know that they and their friends will be going to Grey Court from the outset are more relaxed and confident in their final year at Latchmere. They are able to enjoy Year 6 in a way that fellow pupils who do not have that certainty sometimes cannot. Overall this has a positive effect on the atmosphere of the year which although not quantifiable undeniably exists and assists in the whole transition to Secondary School process. To lose that certainty would be a definite disadvantage to the school and our Year 6 pupils. Finally, one of our Community Governors, who was a Parent and then Community Governor at Grey Court for many years, makes an important and relevant point: Latchmere pupils (who then formed a large part of each year's intake) were a significant element of the school's former success. She notes that the number of Latchmere pupils currently choosing Grey Court is once again approaching the numbers of its former peak. Clearly this increase is evidence of Grey Court's current success and the strength of its leadership team. However, these pupils will no doubt help to sustain and build on the school's success and we would urge the Authority to consider this factor in its decision making.				
	Primary school – St Mary's and St Peter's	Re Proposal 4: At their full governing body meeting on Thursday 1 st of December 2011 the governors discussed the implications of the above changes. They consider that on the whole the current "linked school" criterion has worked relatively successfully. Although it was coming under pressure because of the recent rise in pupil numbers, and although it no longer provided surety of a place at the linked secondary school, it still served its basic purposes, which are to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise the number of local children going to their local secondary school, in our case, Teddington School. 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide stable educational links between the school and Teddington School. • Provided continuity of friendship/peer groups, which have been build up at the school, during the difficult time of transfer to secondary school. <p>The governors were concerned that the proposals would result in a reduction in the number of children from St Mary's & St Peter's School receiving offers for Teddington School, especially from families who live north and west of the school. The analysis which is in section 3.5 of the report and based on the 2010 entry offers does not take into account the predicted increase in demand for secondary school places which will occur in a few years time and from changes in admission patterns which would result from the removal of the linked system.</p> <p>If the Linked school system was removed the Governors consider there would be an increase in demand from pupils living in the Kingston Town centre and Ham areas. Many parents in these areas do not currently apply for Teddington School, as only one Kingston primary has a link to Teddington.</p> <p>Recent expansion of primary numbers</p> <p>Teddington School currently has 7 'linked' primary schools, six in Richmond upon Thames and one in Kingston upon Thames. Four of these seven schools (St Mary's & St Peter's, Stanley, Hampton Wick/St John the Baptist and St Paul's Junior) have increased their intake in the last three years and a further one (Collis) increased its intake in September 2003 (a 25% increase in pupil number since 2007 and a 33% increase since 2003).</p> <p>The Governing Body noted the Council's plans to invest £25 million in building expansions at the five borough secondary schools to accommodate sixth forms. In the context of the above significant expansion of local primary pupil numbers, the governing body felt strongly that parents would expect Teddington School and the Council to prioritise expanding the school's year 7 intake over any ambition to create a new sixth form.</p> <p>Kingston</p> <p>The Kingston Town cluster of Primary Schools consists of seven schools. Three of these are closer to Teddington school than St Mary's & St Peter's school, and all are closer than Stanley Primary school. Recently, Kingston have had to expand their primary intake even more than Richmond, and from 2011 this cluster will have capacity for 20 Forms of Entry in each year group. The proposed new secondary school in North Kingston, which still has not yet received the financial go ahead, if built will meet some of this demand, but there will always be some parents who will wish to send their children to a well established highly successful school, such as Teddington, rather than a new school with no track record. Note, the new housing developments by Kingston Station are 80% closer to Teddington School than St Mary's & St Peter's school. Currently only one Kingston school is linked to Teddington. The removal of the linked system will provide more options for Kingston parents and</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		reduce the choice for Teddington parents.				
		<p>Ham and Petersham.</p> <p>The Meadlands school in Ham is 75% closer to Teddington School than St Mary's & St Peter's School. It is highly likely if the linked system is removed there will be some parents attracted by Teddington and its continued very successful exam results. Currently they do not apply for places as none of the Ham schools has a 'link'. An indication of the demand is that in the past Grey Court School has complained about pupils leaving the school to move to Teddington, when places become available at that school. Pupil numbers have been increasing in Ham and Petersham - the total number of children in the Ham and Petersham cluster of primary schools in 10/11 was 592 compared to 521 just four years earlier. Richmond Council is considering in the medium term the expansion of the Russell school. As the birth rate has continued to rise the future demand for places at Teddington will increase, so reducing the number of places available to children at St Mary's & St Peter's school. In the future, if places become available at Grey Court because some local children select to go to Teddington, it is highly likely that these places could be filled by Children from Kingston rather than Teddington, as they will live closer to the school. Again, removal of the linked system will provide more options for Kingston parents and reduce the choice for Teddington parents.</p> <p>2. Timing.</p> <p>It is proposed that these changes apply from 2013. The Governors opposed this date on two grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would apply to children currently in year 5. Parents have made decisions on school places and on schools for siblings based on the current system and the Governors consider that parents should be given much longer notice that a change is being considered. Although they understand that any decision taken now could not direct the outcome of a future consultation process, it could be used to indicate to parents that there was a strong possibility that a change might occur on a certain date, for example September 2018. • There are too many unknowns which will affect pupil transfer in the next few years that need to be resolved before a decision is taken about the future desirability of the linked schools policy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The location, size and type of new schools. The Council recent projects on secondary school places assumed that two free schools would be set up in the borough in the next few years, a 8FE academy would be built in north Kingston, a 5FE Catholic secondary school would be set up in Twickenham and a new 5FE academy would be built somewhere in the borough in 2016. ▪ The academic performance of the three academies is improving, they are obtaining new buildings and these factors will improve admission numbers, and take up patterns will therefore change. <p>The above changes make projections based on recent historic patterns unreliable. It would therefore be preferable to delay any change to the</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		system until the changes in admission patterns have stabilised. Hence an implementation date for any changes of around September 2018 would again seem desirable.				
	Primary school – Stanley Primary	<p>Re Proposal 4: We understand why the Council would abolish the linked system, particularly as it is no longer entirely fit-for-purpose, and would appear to discriminate against certain children in the borough, i.e. those not attending linked schools. However, we will point out that, for Stanley, the bigger picture is disquieting. A girls-only school (Waldegrave) and the prospect of a Catholic-only secondary school at Clifden Rd mean that options for Stanley families (especially those with boys) are becoming very limited. Removing the link adds a third element, which would reduce our families’ choices still further. These three elements are connected for our school, and need to be considered together by us, despite the narrower remit of the consultation. Everyone wants our local academies to continue to improve their performance, and to fill up. Based on the Council’s recent (21st November) submission to the Education and Children’s Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Hampton Academy will be full by 2013, while Twickenham Academy is predicted to have between 15 and 30 spare places annually between now and 2020. Governors at Stanley don’t understand how this reflects the impact of the additional numbers coming through our and other local expanded primary schools. We can’t work out where our children will be schooled locally should the Council’s assumptions be even slightly awry. When you’re factoring in so many relative unknowns across the borough (free schools, out-borough demand, economic decline and secondary improvement combining to keep more children in the state sector, to name but three), we think a margin for error in our local area of 30 is too tight. Governors would appreciate your views on this, so that we can communicate clearly with parents. In our part of the borough, the Council would seem to be removing one discriminatory element from its secondary education planning, only to replace it with another (a faith school which excludes most of Stanley’s families) while continuing to maintain a third (which excludes half of them). In order for <i>our</i> families to have any choice in this borough, we suggest that, while the Council consults on removing the link system, logically, it should also be reviewing the girls-only policy at Waldegrave with a view to a change to co-education. We know that, practically, a change at this established school is unlikely, which makes it all the more important, that where there is an opportunity to do the right thing, the Council considers very carefully whether this is the right time to open a second exclusive school in the vicinity. While a plan exists to exclude many of our families from their two nearest schools, governors at Stanley are unable to support the proposal to discontinue the link system.</p>				
	Primary school – The Vineyard Primary	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to record The Vineyard School’s support for the proposed abolition of the link school policy, which we believe is inequitable and which has discriminated against our pupils and their families for several years. As you are aware, The Vineyard School does not currently have a link to a secondary school for a number of reasons, chiefly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vineyard has historically had an unusually high percentage of families who move into the private sector during, and at the end of KS2, due in part to socio-demographics of the catchment area. Of the children leaving Y6 over the last 4 years, 37% went into the private sector, leaving only an average of 26 pupils per year transferring to state secondary schools. This decision to transfer to the private sector is a self perpetuating problem that is due to more than just catchment area socio-demographic issues. There is considerable unease among the parent community at The Vineyard about its lack of state secondary school links, and it is this which prompts the parents of many children, particularly boys, to move their children into the private sector at the end of KS1 and throughout KS2, thereby further undermining our ability ever to establish a link with local state secondary schools. In the Y6 cohort that left The Vineyard in July 2011 for example, we lost 8 children at the beginning of, and during, KS2 to the private sector in addition to the 15 who went on to private schools after Y6. • Every year, we lose a number of our children in Y4 – 6, who would move onto state secondary schools, to other borough primary 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a schem primary the borou	Proposal 2: to retain the	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-o	Proposal 4: to introduce	Proposal 5: to retain the
		<p>schools, which have a link to borough secondary schools, primarily to Orleans Park. The reason given for this move has always been forward planning on the part of those families involved to ensure their child gets a place at their preferred secondary school. This is an issue particularly with those families living in East Twickenham, or sufficiently close to Orleans Park to feel sure of securing a place there once attending a link school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understandably, many of our parents would prefer to send their children to a school with outstanding status. As Orleans Park School is currently not a viable choice for our families, the parents of many girls at The Vineyard elect to send their daughters to the only outstanding school which is an option, Waldegrave, which is available as a choice due to its exemption from the LSP. This further reduces the number of Vineyard Y6 children seeking a state secondary place under the LSP by an average of 10 per year to 16. This number is reduced still further by any successful applicants to the Tiffin schools. <p>With these factors, it is highly unlikely that The Vineyard can ever reach a number of 15 children or 25% of the cohort transferring to any one state school in order to create and maintain a link, a situation which leaves those Vineyard families and children who are seeking a local state secondary place at an insurmountable disadvantage under the current LSP; unable to secure places at their closest and preferred schools, they are allocated places instead by the LA at the borough's less favoured schools often involving lengthy journeys. This situation seems indefensible:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LSP is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It is hard to understand therefore how it can be deemed fair and appropriate for it to take into account in its calculations of eligibility for places, historic data which includes those families who made the decision to leave the state sector, when the inclusion of this data is clearly to the detriment of other, unrelated families now seeking state secondary places. The abolition of the LSP would address this. 2. It is also clear that some parents have realised how to manipulate the LSP and, understandably, choose to do so to gain access for their child to their preferred secondary school, while others, who do not wish to uproot their child during KS2, pay the price later in forgoing access to their preferred school. This is not a choice parents should have to make and raises the question of why bother having an LSP if parents can circumvent it. The abolition of the LSP would address this. 3. The LSP has, to date, mainly been an issue for those of our families wishing to transfer to Orleans Park due to the increase in numbers of our families coming from East Twickenham that we have seen over recent years. Some of these have been allocated places at The Vineyard, rather than having selected the school. While this will happen at many schools when there is a shortage of primary places throughout the borough, it cannot be right that an arbitrary decision such as this, made by the LA when children are 4, is then automatically denying those children any chance of transferring to their local secondary school 7 years later due to the LSP being in place. The Vineyard currently has 2 bulge classes and has committed to maintain this level in the future, as well as being considered currently for expansion to three form entry. We anticipate that this increased provision will be filled mainly by families from East Twickenham, and their inability to transfer to Orleans Park will be an ever increasing problem, likely resulting again, post recession, in empty KS2 places at The Vineyard, impacting the school's financial stability and its funding negatively and thereby its capacity to perform to the best of its ability. The abolition of the LSP would address this. 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>4. Some of our families have to date been successful at securing places at Grey Court School despite The Vineyard not having a link to Grey Court. However, with Grey Court's increasing popularity, we do not envisage it being long before a similar situation arises here to the one at Orleans Park, where Grey Court becomes oversubscribed by applicants from its link schools and Vineyard pupils will no longer be allocated places there. For the vast majority of our families, Orleans Park and Grey Court are the closest, state, non faith schools, and many parents do not wish to pursue the option of a faith school such as Christ's. For all our pupils to be eligible only for places at Twickenham Academy, Hampton Academy or Richmond Park Academy instead of our closest schools, while other children from much further afield commute in to Grey Court and Orleans Park is environmentally irresponsible, would reduce community cohesion and would not be acceptable to our parent community. The abolition of the LSP would address this.</p> <p>5. The LSP allows significant numbers of children from neighbouring boroughs to gain places at Richmond secondary schools due to historic links formed, but there is no reciprocity on the same grounds from these boroughs - neither Kingston nor Hounslow have similar LSP arrangements which would permit Richmond children to take precedence over their own, in-borough children on any basis other than proximity of residence. The Greenwich judgement does not allow for a borough to favour its own in-borough children over out of borough children, but neither does it expect a borough to give priority to out of borough children, as effectively happens now in Richmond under the LSP. The abolition of the LSP would address this.</p> <p>6. One of our families, who live in Hartington Road Rd, 0.4 miles from Orleans Park was last year assigned a place at Twickenham Academy instead of Orleans Park, their first choice and closest school. The family mounted a successful appeal to have the allocation of their daughter's place overturned and eventually won a place at Orleans Park based on proximity. We hope this is an indication that the LA recognises the ridiculous situation the LSP has resulted in, as the appeal decision has surely set a precedent which will result in a huge increase in appeals by East Twickenham parents who will find themselves in the same position in March 2012. The abolition of the LSP would address this.</p> <p>7. Current statistics also show that the current secondary school admissions system in Richmond is not working as well as the systems in place in other London boroughs and nationally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 61% of children across the Richmond LA got their first choice secondary school for Sept 2011, against a London average of 66%, and a national average of 84.6%. Hounslow, at 67%, was able to offer first choice to a higher percentage of its children than the London average – in part due to many of its children gaining first choice places at Orleans Park courtesy of Richmond's LSP policy. Even allowing for the over optimistic inclusion by many parents of the Tiffin Schools as first choice this statistic does not look good, as Tiffin is backed up by many parents with Orleans Park as second choice, where they would be no more successful at securing a place. Other neighbouring boroughs would also have a high number of families putting Tiffin as first choice but they have still managed to achieve a higher % of first choice offers than Richmond. • In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form (against a London average of 6% and a national figure of only 2.8%). This puts Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co primary admi the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-o	Proposal 4: to introduce	Proposal 5: to retain the
		<p>nationally (only Southwark, Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea, and City of London performed worse). That statistic is not influenced by the Tiffin applications as most families attempting the Tiffin entrance exams then put other in-borough choices as their 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th choices. This statistic more than any other would appear to reflect the impact the LSP has on Richmond families' ability to secure places at their preferred schools; neighbouring Kingston and Hounslow only had 3% and 5.7% respectively of children who were not offered a place at any of their preferred schools. The abolition of the LSP would address this.</p> <p>To conclude, the LSP was introduced in 1991, as the number of applications from out-borough residents increased, to ensure that a large number of Y6 children would reap the benefits of educational continuity by transferring to secondary school with their peers. It was believed that the community at large would be more cohesive as a result. This clearly has not worked. Twenty one years on, the LSP has become divisive, unfair and discriminates against children at schools without links. Its validity is further undermined by the fact that parents are aware of how to manipulate the system by moving schools in the later years of KS2, and many choose to do so. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP, due to the difficulties of establishing a fair LSP system and the need to constantly review the policy. Harrow Council, who previously had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no legislative, logical or historic reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP. We understand that you cannot favour one school over another, but equally believe that the LA has a duty not to keep in place an LSP that discriminates against and disadvantages the pupils at one school above others in the borough. We therefore believe that the LSP should be abolished. This would ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all children have an equal opportunity to attend their closest secondary school, with their educational future uninfluenced by the decisions of unrelated families made in previous years - with today's emphasis on inclusion in education it is hard to justify keeping in place an LSP which effectively excludes one particular group of children from their preferred secondary schools because of the choices made previously by others. • out of borough children no longer receive preferential treatment over in borough children, but neither would they be discriminated against – with distance the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries will be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not <i>more</i> so. This does not therefore contravene the Greenwich judgement. • children would no longer be subject to the unnecessary emotional distress of an additional school move in Y5 or Y6, leaving their friendship groups and disrupting their educational progress simply to guarantee a place at a specific school. <p>We hope the LA will reach what we believe is the only fair and defensible decision and abolish the Link School Policy in LBRUT.</p>				
	School (Worple Primary)	<p>Re Proposal 4: Worple has enjoyed a link with Orleans Park for many years. Pupils here have chosen Orleans consistently over other schools, with the vast majority each year travelling across the borough boundary. As a result this has led to our two schools working together on a number of fronts (for example, Worple pupils attending Maths classes for more able students at Orleans Park). The two schools have a very similar ethos – they are mixed-gender, non-denominational state schools with particular pride in their inclusive approach. For Orleans to lose an intake from Worple would be to cut itself off from one of the few like-minded schools in the area. Equally it would be extremely unfortunate for Worple's pupils to lose the ability to attend their nearest mixed-sex secular school so aligned with its own founding principles. We feel that</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>breaking the link would be detrimental to both schools. Few children would be able to travel to the school of their choice and the special relationship that exists to the educational benefit of the children would be gone. I appreciate the current dilemma the local authority faces on this matter but I would urge you to take into consideration the successful, well-established link between Worple and Orleans Park. Many of the parents who choose to send their children to our primary school in the first place do so knowing that they will progress on to Orleans at the end of their time here. It would be a great shame to have that choice taken from them.</p>				
	Local Authority (Kingston upon Thames – Principal Admissions & Governance Officer)	<p>RBK's main issue is with the removal of the linked schools criterion for Grey Court and Teddington Schools. The pattern of admissions from RBK residents to these schools shows that a significant number of applicants from St Paul's Junior School rely on a place at Teddington School under the linked schools' criterion, 21 in 2010 and 33 in 2011. For Grey Court the figures have been 131 and 132 for the past 2 years. Clearly this proposed change will present a significant problem for Kingston parents whose children attend a linked primary school and have relied on the linked status as a means of securing a place at their preferred secondary school from September 2013. Whilst I appreciate Richmond's reasons for removing the link, in the absence of sufficient alternative provision in the area from 2013, families living in north Kingston who live closer to Richmond schools than relevant Kingston schools, who will apply using the home to school distance criterion, will lose out if this proposal is implemented from 2013.</p>				
	Pressure-group (Richmond Inclusive Schools Campaign)	<p>Re Proposal 4: [Our] view on Linked Schools was given in the leaflet we issued in August 2011: "Parents of children at local Catholic primaries who would be happy to send them to good local secondaries find they are effectively barred, because all but one of the Catholic primaries are outside the Council's system linking primaries with specific secondaries. That doesn't seem fair. If inclusive capacity were increased to the right level, the system should be reformed so that Catholics have the same access as everyone else."</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have lived in Richmond for most of my life, and was educated in the area. I now have 3 children attending primary school here too. It has been clear for some time that the standard of primary schools is extremely high, while the secondary schools fall a long way short of both expectations and the LEA averages. Many people who would prefer to send their children to state secondary schools have the difficult choice of constrained finances and private schooling or allowing their children to attend second rate secondary schools. Or finally leaving the borough altogether. I cannot understand the Council's woeful inability to address this secondary school issue. It's been apparent for many, many years. More particularly, the 'linked schools' criterion is an abhorrent practice. Why should secondary school selection begin at the age of 5 and acceptance into a primary school that may be miles from 'local' secondary schools pre-determine that selection? It's a farce when children who live close to a secondary school cannot attend the local school. The Council needs to end this practice with immediate effect.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of a child who attends St James's school in Twickenham and I am writing to support the removal of the linked schools criterion as laid out in the consultation document. I am pleased to see that the Council is at last consulting on this issue as I believe it is long overdue. As you know St James's does not have a link to either of these schools, so its pupils are excluded from any chance of gaining a place at Orleans Park or Teddington even though they may live on the doorstep. I think most people will agree it's a pretty unfair system for St James's children and for other children who attend primary schools without links. There is something very unjust about the fact that children from Hounslow and Kingston boroughs who attend "linked schools" outside the borough, currently have priority over local children for these schools. Currently the majority of children from St James's end up in schools outside the borough which means that they lose contact with their local communities. Furthermore the Catholic schools which have traditionally offered places to St James's pupils are becoming increasingly oversubscribed and every year it becomes harder to find a suitable secondary school place. Whilst some parents will still opt for a Catholic school outside the borough, there are many who would like their children attend a local school, even if it is not Catholic. At present we are not able to do that, and our children have to face long, sometimes complicated journeys to Fulham, Hammersmith, Wimbledon, Brentford,</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		Hounslow or Sunbury.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to support the current proposal to remove the “linked schools” criterion as a method of allocating secondary places in the Borough. As parents of 2 children at a non-linked school (The Vineyard) we would absolutely welcome the choice to be able to send our children to the nearest school (Orleans Park). Currently there is virtually no chance of Vineyard children going to the school as the places are allocated to linked schools – many outside the borough. This is leading to two things that seem crazy to me:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Were my daughter to attend Orleans Park – as a physically disabled child with a statement she would have some chance of getting a place there – and I understand that the provision is good for physically disabled children – she would be the only child from her school to go. As a child who is potentially already socially vulnerable this does not seem like a good solution. Sending her to a school further afield raises issues with transport (I know there is provision – but if she were at the local secondary it wouldn’t be necessary – and why should she have to take a special mini bus on her own rather than wheeling herself home with her friends who live locally (as she can currently do). 2) Children are being transported miles from Hounslow to East Twickenham and from East Twickenham to Ham because of the linked schools criterion. I think if you ask most parents what they want it is for their children to attend a good local school. This is partly why the Vineyard is so successful – it is at the heart of the local community – because the children attending it are local. This sense of a local school for a local community is destroyed by linking to schools which are several miles away. <p>I therefore absolutely support the proposal to remove the linked schools criterion. I believe that it is distorting the social cohesion of the local community – and at The Vineyard it is the source of a lot of angst and stress for parents.</p>				
	Parent (whose views were subsequently supported or reiterated by six other sets of parents also)	<p>Re Proposal 4: I think the Linked Schools admission criterion is inherently unfair and discriminatory towards local school children. The reasons for my opinion are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Linked system has meant that at my children's primary school the children have no secondary school to attend. Therefore, the parents' options to attend a state secondary school are very limited. So parents have had to move their children to alternative state schools that are Linked to get their children into a state secondary school, which is disruptive to the child's education both academically and socially. It has also had an effect on that primary school in terms of numbers attending the school at Y5 & Y6, and as a result funding. The only other course of action is to move your child to private school, which is not an acceptable or fair choice for local parents who pay their taxes. 2) Paying for a service I cannot use: I pay my local council tax and in return I expect to be provided with local council services which include education. I am in effect being excluded from a state secondary school option by the linking process as my school does not have a link. 3) Linking schools means it is nearly impossible for schools without linked secondary schools to get a link, perpetuating the issues. Also it means that schools that are linked are increasing the potential number of sibling criterion admissions and those two criteria combined means there is even less chance of improving my child's chances to get into a state secondary school, when we are not at a linked primary school. 4) In practice children in very close proximity to a local secondary school do not have a fair opportunity to attend their local secondary school as 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>in practice Linking primary to secondary schools means that only linked school children have a realistic opportunity to get into that school. Therefore, there is no point me applying to those secondary schools as so few a number of children have been placed at those schools on the basis of distance to school.</p> <p>5) Parents' choices and Council school allocations at primary school level in effect determine what, if any, secondary school their children can attend, which does not seem a fair an equitable approach to local children's education. As a parent I had no idea I was limiting my children's educational future by not sending them to a linked primary school. Also other parents in linked schools may not have wanted their children to attend the linked Secondary school.</p> <p>I think it is fundamentally wrong in principle to restrict a child's educational choice at 11-16 based on the school they attend when they are 4 years old.</p> <p>6) Boys effect - In our borough we do have a state single sex school for girls, Waldegrave, which does not have a linked criterion. However, for boys there are no single sex options that allow you to circumvent the linked system and therefore would allow me to get my son into a state secondary school, as my primary school has no linked secondary school. Therefore, boys in the borough have even less chance of being able to attend a state secondary school than girls which I believe to be discriminatory.</p> <p>7) Mix of children - One of the arguments for keeping a linked system is to ensure Y6 would reap the benefits of educational continuity by transferring with their peers. However, with there being 5 or 6 schools linked to Orleans Park there will inevitably be a mix of children and also even linked schools have not been able to offer all children places. I believe that having a mix of children from different schools to be a good thing as that is how life is.</p> <p>8) Primary schools' admissions are not linked so if this criterion is not in place for primary schools, where our borough's performance tops the National League tables of results, it should not be in place for secondary schools.</p> <p>As you will have gathered I feel very strongly on this issue.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have children at The Vineyard School and live in the East Twickenham area, where local state secondary school options are very limited if your children attend an un-linked primary school. The Linked School system is inherently unfair and discriminates against our children.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I want to let you know that the secondary school admissions must be changed. Although my children go to The Vineyard Primary School, as we don't live in the close catchment area, we do not get any advantage from the linked school policy. In fact, it disadvantages us completely. We are not given any of our choices of secondary school and are pushed towards Twickenham Academy as the only state option. There is no parental choice involved, it is not an easy school to travel and it is not the school I feel is best suited to my child. Does this therefore meet the criteria advised when selecting the right school for your child? By abolishing the link system, a fairer and more democratic allocation of places should take place, also freeing up local schools for local children and lead to some true parental input and choice.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I believe the linked school system to be an unfair admission criterion, and can cite my own experience as an example. We bought a house in Ellesmere Road in September 2004, the year our eldest son was due to start school. Prior to buying the house I had spoken to the secretary at Orleans Infant school to enquire about a place for our son. At this time we had not completed our house purchase and I was asked to provide proof of purchase. Our solicitors provided legal evidence that contracts had been exchanged. We were then told that this was not good enough, and we had to complete the transaction, before being considered for a place at the school. We completed earlier than we wanted to - and subsequently had to run two mortgages - and passed this evidence to the school. Still, there was no offer of a place, and no guarantee that we would be offered a place at any time soon. Our son in fact did not start at school that September, and was eventually offered a place at The Vineyard, which we accepted. At no time in this process did anyone explain to us that should we not go to Orleans Infant and St Stephen's, he would not be able to attend Orleans Park School due to the link school status. It was only when we started to research secondary schools for him that we found this out. So we are now in a situation of living less than a mile from our local secondary school and have been told he would not be offered a place next September. There are many children in our street who now attend Orleans Park having been to St Stephen's. This is our closest mixed community school, yet our son currently has no chance of being offered a place. I note for 2011 entry to the school, 27 children will travel from Hounslow to Orleans Park. This cannot surely be considered to be their local community school, neither is it even in the same borough. It is for these reasons that I believe the linked school status to be unfair and would recommend it be discontinued.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My two children are currently at The Vineyard School in Richmond. This school has an outstanding Ofsted report as do many other schools in the borough such as Marshgate and yet both schools do not have any linked schools. Therefore, most parents are forced to move their children to another state primary that has a linked school or go privately. This is frankly unacceptable. As we have no linked school, we can never send enough children to any school in order to get linked school status, so we are stuck in a chicken & egg situation. This is, I'm sure you will agree, completely unfair. I would really like the link school system reversed in order for every child to have a fairer and more equal chance of getting into their desired secondary school.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I support the abolition of the link criteria for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) The link school policy has created 'black holes' where pupils risk having no option of a local school. Part of the catchment area of The Vineyard School is in East Twickenham where pupils are excluded from the nearest secondary, Orleans Park, due to lack of a link. They risk being excluded from Grey Court because of the proportion of linked school pupils and their siblings from Kingston. They miss out on the catchment areas both for Christ's open places and Waldegrave; and are a long way even from less popular new academies and out-of-borough schools. This is unfair.</p> <p>(2) The link school policy has a disruptive effect on pupil numbers and in Years 5 and 6 of primary schools in Richmond and consequently on school budgets. The adverse effect of this policy on The Vineyard, was particularly pronounced before the improvements at Grey Court School started to filter through to parents. Several parents moved their children to other schools in Year 6, and numbers dropped dramatically, which affected the school's budget. Some of these parents had moved their children to link schools with Orleans Park. A nervousness spread among parents: why was this happening? Many parents were completely unaware that the link policy was the main driver. Yet The Vineyard was awarded Outstanding status by Ofsted, and as a parent of a Year 4 child I can confirm what a consistently wonderful school it is. I remain convinced that the link policy had a disruptive effect not just on The Vineyard, but possibly also on Grey Court, due to the ripple effect of gossip.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>Anyone defending the link policy on the grounds of community cohesion should remember this downside.</p> <p>(3) The link school policy restricts choice, encouraging flight to the private sector, noticeably in Richmond, Kew and East Sheen. It is no coincidence that at The Vineyard, Marshgate and Kew Riverside, excluded from the link system for several years, 40-50% of their pupils transfer to private schools each year which must be well above the borough average. The council must not be complacent about this. The national average is 7% - it is a complete anomaly and divisive.</p> <p>(4) The link school policy favours out-of-borough pupils over Richmond children in our schools which is both unfair and poor value. As Richmond residents we pay a relatively high council tax. Yet this restrictive admissions policy prioritises Hounslow and Kingston pupils over our own children even when we live nearer to the school. Why?</p> <p>(5) The link policy is illogical. Many Church of England schools have a link to the three community schools. Christ's foundation places are rumoured to be undersubscribed. Yet three Richmond non-faith primary schools (150 pupils) don't have a link. Links are formed or lost on the basis of parents' choices years ago but are almost impossible to re-establish when a school is popular. Many Richmond primary school parents are unaware of the link system when they make their initial choices, especially those from other countries who are completely baffled by the school admissions system.</p> <p>If the link system is abolished, borough-resident pupils from nearby primary schools will still get accepted on proximity and it will be much simpler for everyone.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: The [linked schools] system is clearly inequitable. I made the application for my children to attend the Vineyard in complete ignorance that there was such a thing as a linked school system. My criteria for applying for primary schools at the time was walking distance from home, which, in my view, should be the criteria for all schools once special needs and sibling places have been taken into account. This would result in a much fairer system and avoid the plainly ridiculous situation where children cannot get into their nearest local secondary school because they are not at a linked school. I am aware of parents whose children failed to get into linked primaries because of oversubscription, meaning that they then sent their children to The Vineyard. They are now being penalised through no fault of their own.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I think the linked schools admission criterion is inherently unfair and discriminatory towards local school children. Last year our family moved to the borough and we were fortunate to gain a place at The Vineyard School. Ten months later we bought a home in St Margarets. We erroneously thought living so close to Orleans Park School would guarantee us a spot at the local school. We have been told our best option is to move our twins to St Stephen's or St. Mary's if we want to go to gain entry into Orleans Park. We feel this would be disruptive to our children's education both academically and socially. It also will have an effect on The Vineyard School in terms of numbers attending the school at Y5 and Y6. In practice, children in very close proximity to a local secondary school do not have a fair opportunity to attend their local secondary school and only linked school children have a realistic opportunity to get into that school. I pay my local council tax and in return I expect to be provided with local council services which includes education. I am in effect being excluded from a state secondary school option by the linking process as my school does not have a link.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the proposal for [St Mary's and St Peter's] school link status to Teddington to be dropped.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>I recently moved with my family to Hampton Hill in the knowledge that in previous years, a primary school pupil living at our address and attending SMSP would have been admitted to Teddington School, which is our preferred choice for our two children at SMSP now. The link status gives children continuity so that many people from the same school can move on to the same secondary school. It would seem unfair on both counts to withdraw this link, without giving enough notice for children already in the school to pass through to the linked school.</p> <p>Regarding points in the shorter document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Using 'home to school distance' as the principal criterion would be more straightforward and easier for parents to understand, in accordance with the underlying principles of the Schools Admissions Code. <p>It is fairly ridiculous to suggest that parents can't understand the existing linked school priority system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Basing children's chances of admission on preferences made by the parents of previous Year 6 children is unfair. <p>I assume this relates to whether a school manages to maintain linked status or not. This seems a spurious point; parents can make a decision on how strong a link is when they apply for a primary school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Although the criterion enables a degree of continuity for cohorts of children transferring from a good number of the linked schools, the original purpose of the LSP – to guarantee that children from particular primary schools could obtain places at particular secondary schools – no longer pertains, as not all 'linked school' children are able to obtain places at Orleans Park or Teddington. <p>Just because the link status doesn't guarantee entry, it still has a good degree of the benefit of continuity for cohorts; no doubt the majority of SMSP pupils wanting to go to Teddington have been successful in previous years, considering the distance boundary has reached beyond Hampton Hill cross-roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Regardless of which primary school they attend, children should stand a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest mixed community secondary school. <p>That argument existed when linked schools were set up, so must have lost out over the benefits of linked schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 10 (29%) of the 35 junior and primary schools in the borough do not have a linked secondary school. <p>Again, this doesn't mean that linked schools are a bad idea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Modelling of how the 2011 intakes would have looked had the LSP not been in place indicated that a net total of 33 in-borough children – 29 more for Orleans Park, 16 more for Teddington, but 12 fewer for Grey Court – would have obtained places at the three schools; albeit that 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>parents may have made different preferences, or ranked them differently, and that some parents whose children did not attend linked primary schools and who therefore hadn't applied may have done so, had 'distance' been the main criterion.</p> <p>I think a comparison can only be made with the additional factors mentioned being taken into consideration.</p> <p>> The LSP can make parents whose children attend linked primary schools feel that places at the linked secondary are guaranteed, which can make it difficult for them to accept subsequent refusal and places that are allocated at the academies.</p> <p>Spurious point! Some of these points are so weak that it would be good to get down to what really motivates this proposal.</p> <p>> All three mixed community schools were consulting on converting to academy status and would, if they became academies, be able to set their own admissions arrangements for 2014/2015 onwards; so this could be the last opportunity for the local authority to propose a coordinated abolition of the LSP – albeit that it was highly probable that the schools would continue to set their admission arrangements in close consultation and cooperation with the local authority.</p> <p>Well let's hope academies do consult with local authorities....and parents.</p> <p>> Removing the criterion could lead to a more natural geographical distribution of the borough's children at entry to Year 7. □ Whether the LSP were to be in place or not, there would be 'winners' and losers' and not all parents could be satisfied until all the Secondary schools and academies in the borough were graded by Ofsted, and in parents' eyes, as 'good' or 'outstanding'.</p> <p>This seems like almost the only sensible point for the change, but is perhaps outweighed by the benefit of cohesion of pupils coming in via linked schools.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have read the consultation papers and, as a parent of children at Orleans Park School, I agree with the change in admissions criteria, it seems fairer that parents living in e.g. East Twickenham should have access to their closest secondary, which is not the case under the link system.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I think the linked schools admission criterion is unfair and discriminatory towards local school children that attend "non-linked" schools. As I understand it, there is no barrier to a child at a "linked primary school" applying to a different secondary school and if they meet the proximity requirement may be offered a place there. However, children at "non-linked schools" are effectively unable to get places, regardless of the distance to the school, as places are allocated to siblings and linked school children. If all primary schools were linked, then parents could make their choice of primary school knowing the path their children would take throughout the educational system. But having some linked and some not results in an inequality in the system. I look forward to hearing a recommendation that the linking system is to be abolished in the Richmond Borough, I think children deserve the chance to apply to their closest secondary school (if they wish to) and not be excluded due to the choice of primary school.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I just wanted to write to say that I am opposed to the linked school ties being cut between Latchmere school and Grey Court in favour of the new proposed criteria. My son is currently at Grey Court and I am very happy with the education he is getting there so I would also like my daughter to follow him in a couple of years' time. Unfortunately he will leave the year she would start so would not even be eligible for the sibling rule under your new guidelines. Taking Grey Court out of the equation leaves those in Kingston Borough woefully lacking in any sort of choice when it comes to Secondary School unless you are in the fortunate position of being able to tutor your child in the vain hope they may get into Tiffin School. I want my daughter to go to a mixed Secondary school and don't see why she shouldn't have the same options as her brother has had. I know I am not alone in feeling this way so I'm hoping there is enough opposition to make you re-think your admission arrangements.</p>				
	Unknown	<p>Re Proposal 4: The linking system is an established process that works well and enables those with a real local roots (i.e. a long term commitment to state schooling in the area through Primary and School) to be more confident of getting school places in the community secondary schools.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing as the parent of a child in Year 3 at The Vineyard School to express my strong support for the proposed removal of the 'linking' policy that currently exists, and its replacement by a school selection policy based primarily on distance from the school. My view is that the 'linking' policy discriminates against families at certain schools, denying them choices which other families have. It can also have the detrimental effect of driving families away from schools at which their children are very happy, obliging them to move schools in order to be able to attend the secondary school of their choice, thereby causing unnecessary disruption and distress to the children. To allocate secondary school places by distance seems to me more logical, fairer, and much better for the children involved. I very much hope that the change of policy will be implemented. I know that my views are shared by a very large number of parents at The Vineyard School.</p>				
	Parents	<p>Re Proposal 4: My husband and I write to you to voice in the strongest possible terms our opposition to the proposed changes to admissions for Teddington School. Our daughter currently attends Stanley Primary School (she joined the school in Nursery and is now in Year 2), and we had specifically chosen this school so that she would be able to form relationships that would last her from Nursery right through to 6th Form. [Our daughter] was adopted [...] in 2005 (through Richmond Council's adoption and fostering team) and, while she is currently thriving in many ways, she finds it difficult to establish relationships and friendships. She is very reserved and takes a very long time to allow people in. Because we live in Hampton, it is clear that she would stand no chance of getting into Teddington under the proposed arrangements, so the relationships that will finally have been established over 8 years will be broken at a crucial time in her development, not least as it will also be at a time when she is trying to deal with properly understanding her personal story of biological parent abandonment, never mind the onset of puberty and all of its issues. We beg you not to enforce this change – we struggle to see any tangible benefit in your proposal paper and know that it can only harm our very precious and much loved daughter.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you about the removal of the 'linked school' system that is in place at some secondary schools in our borough. I have four children, two of who are currently attending The Vineyard School in Richmond. As you know, The Vineyard is not linked with any secondary school, which limits our choice of secondary school. With four children I can see how different their needs are and think it very important to have a choice of secondary school - to match my boys' needs with the facilities, curriculum and approach of the teachers at the schools. I would like to have the opportunity to consider Orleans Park and Grey Court schools as secondary education providers for my boys – both schools are a short distance away and can easily be accessed on the local transport system from the centre of Richmond where we live, so there would be no need for additional transport on the roads. As a parent in the Borough of Richmond, I am asking you to use the fair system of 'home to school distance' as the main criteria for selection at these secondary schools. Please remove the linked school system which discriminates against my children for no apparent reason.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to express my support for the abolition of the linked primary school admission policy. I have children at Archdeacon Cambridge's School and hope for them to attend Orleans Park Secondary School, so we could be considered beneficiaries of the linked system. However, my choice of schools has been largely a question of distance, and as non-churchgoers, we have found ourselves in the position where in order to send our children to the local secular secondary school we had a choice of two church primary schools (Archdeacon Cambridge's and St Mary's) as the local secular primary school (Trafalgar) is not linked to Orleans Park. In my view it is quite clearly wrong that one has to attend a church primary school in order to obtain a place at a secular secondary school. The current linked school system also has a bearing on the future use of the Clifden Road site, as it is currently the case that boys at St James' Primary School have no local secondary school places on offer as there is no secondary school link in place. Removal of the linked school system would provide a level playing field for all children applying for secondary school places irrespective of their religion or choice of primary school.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a parent living in LBRuT and having struggled to get my son into Teddington and knowing that he would have had a place offered at [Orleans Park] in the first round of offers I strongly believe that it is time for LBRuT to remove the school link criterion from the school's admission policy.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am very concerned about the removal of the linked school criterion proposed for the 2013/2014 admission dates primarily because of the short timescales involved. Many parents like myself have made important decisions about educating children up to this point based upon the criteria as it stands. We have made decisions on where to live / which schools to send our children to based on the current criteria and for it to be changed within the space of one year may have massive implications. My main concern is that there are a large number of children who have been sent to private primary schools who will suddenly be eligible for a place at the local state schools. As schools like Orleans Park perform better and better there will be a temptation for parents from the private sector to want to opt back in for secondary education. I think therefore that it will put an increased pressure on places at the schools. I have a son in year 5 at St Stephen's and we live in North St Margarets. We have made decisions on where to live and where to send [our son] to school based upon the linked school criterion. I am concerned that on the basis of distance alone we suddenly may be without a place. This may be a good change in the long term but I think you should plan for 5/6 years ahead so parents do not suddenly have the rug pulled out from under all their careful planning so far. Alternatively have you considered making all state primary schools in the borough linked schools to eliminate an influx back from the private sector?</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Thank you for the clearly presented consultation paper on the removal of linked school status from three of the Borough's secondary schools. It seems to me to make sense to remove the [linked school criterion] from the admissions policies of these schools and to make the primary admissions criterion that of home to school distance. That would be fairer for families living within the borough. We are not likely to be personally affected by this change as our eldest child is already at Orleans Park and her younger sisters will be admitted under the sibling criterion. But I do know a family who live very close to Teddington school who were denied a place because their daughter attended a non-linked Catholic school. I know another family in East Twickenham who are unable to get into Orleans Park because their child goes to a non-linked school in Richmond. Such anomalies would be remedied by removing the [linked school criterion].</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing in strong support of the proposal to remove the "links system" for Teddington, Orleans Park and Grey Court Schools. The link system discriminates against children who attend other local schools, including children whose parents choose to send them to a faith school and children whose parents have saved the borough the cost of their primary education by sending them to private schools. I have three children in a borough primary school. Under the current system they will not be able to attend any of our three closest secondary schools: Waldegrave (because they are all boys) Teddington and Orleans, (because they attend St James's primary school, which is our closest primary, instead of one of the linked schools.) This seems manifestly unfair. St James's is an excellent school which cannot fill all of its</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		places in Years 5 and 6 because no one wants to move their children to a school whose pupils are excluded from their local secondaries. It's a shame to let such an educational opportunity go to waste. Furthermore, if the local schools were opened up, there would be less competition for the proposed Catholic school, leaving plenty of space for non-Catholics who would like to send their children there. Thank you for addressing this issue – we appreciate your efforts to make this situation fairer.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I wanted to add my objections to the removal of linked schools. My daughter who is in Year 5 has great friends and has developed good relationships with her peers at Orleans infant and St Stephen's over the years. We always assumed these would continue into senior school when relationships take on even more importance. We live [in] Isleworth. I am aware we may still get a place even with the removal of linked school but there is no certainty. How do you explain to your child that 95 percent of their classmates are going to the local senior but she may not just because the goal posts have been shifted once again for school admissions and therefore we are not in the correct area? It seems totally logical that the linked schools are the nearest schools and I cannot see any good reason to change this.				
	Parents	Re Proposal 4: We live in Hampton Hill on the border with Teddington and have a daughter and a son. We are Catholic church goers and are therefore in a good position for either Gumley or Waldegrave for our daughter, but because the children attend St James's Twickenham, my son will have a real problem getting into a local secondary school. It feels grossly unfair that my daughter will have the option of a local school no more than 10 minutes from our house, but my son will have to travel out of the borough for his secondary education. Obviously the debate surrounding the new Catholic/non-Catholic secondary school debate still rages on and may well resolve our current problem. However, if it turns out to be the non-Catholic school with a linked school policy, then we'll still be in the same position. The tables in your document prove interesting reading and it is unfair to think that children so far away are able to gain access to Teddington and Orleans Park, yet we who are only a couple of miles away, can't. I hope the consultation stops this anomaly and provides a fairer approach to the provision of secondary education.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: At present, the current linked system effectively spreads the catchment area across a broad area of St Margarets and Twickenham as the criteria effectively becomes how far you live from a linked school (i.e. did your child get into a linked school) rather than specifically how far do you live from Orleans Park. This is especially relevant for those parents who live to the north of the A316 – they get into St Stephens and so into Orleans Park which may not be the case if the link is broken. Breaking the link will have the effect of polarising the catchment area around Orleans Park which is unhelpful to housing prices, inclusive education and community spirit.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to say I am very unhappy about the current proposal to remove St Stephen's link school status. I have two children there, who have benefitted from the link, coming from Orleans Infant, and who I hope will be able to attend Orleans Park. We are local to all the schools, and as a single working parent it is very important to me that my children attend a local school, and both attend the same school. I would like to register my objection to this change.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am delighted to learn that there is a consultation taking place with regard to the link school criterion. My two daughters attend St James's Catholic School and my eldest is in Year 6, with Secondary schooling approaching. My husband and I are bemused that she will not be offered a place at Teddington School, is out of the catchment area for Waldegrave, and in all likelihood be offered a place miles away in a school without a decent reputation. We are hoping she will be offered a place in Tiffin, having let her sit the entrance exam, but I realize her chances are slim. Despite the fact that our house is only some 200m away from Teddington School, under the current entrance criteria, she cannot go there. What a shame. It is Tiffin or hefty fees in the private sector for us.				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I think it is quite reasonable to remove the link school status and instead allocate on proximity, great idea. Also, [you] need to get rid of sibling link for pupils who live out of a school's catchment area. I have a great problem with students who live well out of a school's area getting in due to sibling priority. E.g. family who moved to Feltham whose subsequent children have higher priority for Orleans than those who live next to the school. Students who live in Ham or Chiswick and attend Orleans as they have a statement. Siblings having higher priority for a place than pupils who live next door to the school. Pupils whose parents lie about where they live to get child 1 into the school then the siblings have high priority for a place.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have some comments on the proposed removal of the linked school criterion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To remove if for 2013/2014 is very quick. Parents who are looking at secondary schools while their children are in yr 5, which most do, are doing so not knowing what the criteria for admission will be. It would be better for the children and parents to be visiting schools knowing the admission criteria and therefore be able to make the best use of their visits and understand the realistic chances of an application to the particular school being successful. I therefore think that it should be delayed at least one year. Then next year the Y5 children can visit knowing for certain what the criteria would be. 2. For the Kingston link school pupils, it would be preferable to leave the link in place until the new secondary school in North Kingston has been built. This would give certainty for the next couple of years, and then one change of admission criteria. This would seem a sensible approach for the children caught up in the current uncertain and confusing situation. <p>For information I have a child in yr 5 at St Pauls C of E junior School, Kingston – a link school with Teddington.</p>				
	Unknown	<p>Re Proposal 4: I do not think linked school status should change: the arguments you make are not strong enough to support the changes.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have reviewed the consultation document and I am deeply concerned about this change. Surely those children attending Teddington primary schools (that are currently linked to Teddington school) should get preference. The proposed changes will mean that children living outside the Borough (living closer to the school) will get school places. It also opens up places to children currently attending Catholic schools who were well aware they would probably not secure a place in a Teddington school. Also, these proposed changes have a status angle - those able to afford the move to a house close to the school will secure places.</p>				
	Parent (and member of Education and Children's Overview and Scrutiny Committee)	<p>Re Proposal 4: I'd like to respond to the Linked School Policy consultation, in my capacity as a local parent with children at Archdeacon Cambridge's school. Although removing the links would be detrimental to my own family and many of our friends, I don't think that the policy's continuation can be defended, because it unfairly disadvantages children at non-linked primaries. In my view it should have been removed a long time ago, and certainly reviewed after the Sacred Heart judgement in 2007. If the policy is to be removed then it should be removed as quickly as possible, i.e. for 2013 admissions as proposed. There will be lots of uncertainty and anxiety about the effects and the sooner the change occurs, the sooner people will be able to understand the consequences and begin to adjust their expectations for their child's future secondary school. Regarding my own children's school, the removal of the link to Orleans Park will result in more children (mostly boys) being offered Twickenham Academy. Unfortunately TA does not yet have the full confidence of parents and so some will go private or move house in order to avoid it. However, by making the change sooner rather than later, those effects will hopefully be minimised. If a significant number of children do transfer with their peers, in a single cohort, then confidence will inevitably be increased, as will the confidence of subsequent cohorts. I would be in favour of all of the borough's maintained secondary schools allocating a proportion of their places by lottery (within a defined geographical area based on travel time). That would help to minimise the impact of people moving house to try and escape</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		the effects of the policy change. It would also give people living further away "hope" that they may still be able to access their school of choice. I suppose I would view it as a spoonful of sugar to help the medicine go down.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would not support the use of the proposed oversubscription criteria for community mixed secondary schools because this would prevent those who have social communication needs not having those few students they have affinity with from their primary school joining them in secondary school. Admittedly strong SEN provisions in schools could soften this but it does seem unnecessarily harsh to break the social ties of those who have difficulty forming relationships.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing as a concerned parent with a son in year 4 currently attending St Paul's Church of England Junior School, Kingston. The admissions proposals directly impact on us as the school would lose its current link to Teddington. We appreciate that the school is not in the Richmond LEA and can see the logic behind the proposals, especially if the schools are over subscribed. However, there are not sufficient secondary school places to cater for Kingston children especially in the 3 years before the proposed new secondary school is built. Would it not be possible to align the new admissions arrangements for Richmond with the building of the new school in Kingston so that there a sufficiency of places across the area is maintained? There is real concern across our school at the lack of secondary school places in the area particularly with the expansion of primary schools that began in 2008.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We have three children currently at schools in three different boroughs, the older two in private secondary schools in Kingston and Wimbledon respectively. My husband and I are both state-educated. My oldest child is now 18, the youngest 10. The main reason we chose to educate our older two children privately from aged 4 actually stemmed from our concerns about secondary state education in the borough back in 1996 and the lack of sixth forms attached to secondary schools, something we both feel very strongly about. However, for a variety of reasons we decided to educate our youngest child through the state system and he was at Archdeacon Cambridge until the end of Year 4 (July 2011). It had been our intention to consider state secondary school provision for him either locally or at Tiffin in Kingston. However, it became clear to us that our chances of getting into Orleans was getting slimmer due to pressure on places and our geographical location (we are in Strawberry Hill). As getting into Tiffin is somewhat of a lottery and involves putting one's child under considerable pressure, we chose to move him at the end of Year 4 to a private school in Twickenham. Clearly, sending three children simultaneously to private school places an enormous financial burden on a family and involves considerable sacrifices. We are fortunate that with these sacrifices, we can choose that option, but what are the alternatives for other parents who are not in that position? Although children in our road have got in to Teddington School in recent years (none very recently to my knowledge), all those that did go went to primary schools other than Archdeacon, presumably because of their link status. We have also been under the impression that despite the current link status of Archdeacon Cambridge, we were not guaranteed to get a place for our son at Orleans anyway. What seems to have been removed as far as I can see, is any actual real choice for parents. My other concern, though not directly part of this debate, is what is going to happen to the Clifden Road site and the never-ending expansion of the Richmond primary schools. If the Clifden Road site were to become a new 'open to all secondary school', rather than the Catholic secondary school that the Catholic schools want, this would offer a real, local alternative that would be walking distance for a lot of local children, rather than them having to negotiate their way to Whitton. The expansion of Richmond primary schools that feed into Orleans has meant that Twickenham children have been pushed out, and this expansion has been quite rapid in the last few years. It is quite clear now that the agenda is to force Twickenham children to Whitton whether the parents like it or not. Rebranding and renaming is all very well, but at the end of the day, the catchment areas for Twickenham Academy and Orleans are very different and always have been (I have lived in the area for over 20 years and was indeed a School Doctor covering many of the local state schools from Hampton up to Barnes for a number of years). As other parents have already indicated, we have paid a lot of money to buy homes in a very expensive area of London and pay very high Community Charges, but the provision of education across the borough is not equal and has always struggles to meet the excellent standards				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>set by the Primary Schools. Furthermore, having schools who have special interests in Maths, Science or Languages (which a lot of money was spent on) is meaningless to parents when they have, in effect, no real choice of school to send their children to. In addition to this, there is of course the on-going debate about the provision of single sex education for girls at Waldegrave whilst there is no reciprocal provision for boys and there is very little choice in Sixth Form Provision - we failed to get our oldest child a place at Esher College, despite getting the application in on the first day (apparently we should have gone to the main Post Office at am in the morning to intercept the post before it was distributed and taken our child out of her school exams to stand any chance of getting in - yes, really!!!). I feel there are many aspects to this debate, not merely the ending of link status. I don't feel the proposed change to the link policy has been well advertised, nor been allowed sufficient time for an open and inclusive debate. I wonder how many parents are actually aware of what is on the agenda at all? It seems to me that boys in Twickenham schools, particularly Archdeacon Cambridge and Trafalgar, are going to draw the short straw in terms of choice of secondary school. The education of our children is of paramount importance to us, as I'm sure it is to all parents. I do hope that the Education Department takes into account local parents' views and considers delaying the end of the Link Policy to allow both a full and open debate and to give current parents of children at the top end of primary school, particularly those parents of boys, a chance to consider their options. I would also like to see a much more open debate about what should happen to the Clifden Road site, since this represents a huge opportunity to improve Secondary School provision for all children in Twickenham, not just those who are Roman Catholic.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Twickenham currently has one very good school (for boys); the alternatives are poor and clearly require a concerted effort by all those who have a responsibility for education in the borough to bring them up to an acceptable standard. I feel strongly that any attention given by the council to local secondary schools should be focussed on raising standards at the poorer-performing schools, rather than shuffling deckchairs (which is what this exercise is). Orleans Park will shortly be in a position to set its own admissions policies and I see no good reason for the Council members to step in and change them ahead of the school's having that responsibility itself. It is a terrible shame that a borough which prides itself (rightly) on its excellent primary school provision lets down so many of its constituents with poor secondary school provision. Wasting money and effort on unnecessary administrative changes is not the way to improve things. This borough deserves good state schools for all and I would expect the provision of those to be the priority of your department for the next few years at least.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We have a child who is currently attending Trafalgar Junior School, and who will be moving to secondary school in September 2013. The removal of the linked schools criterion will therefore apply to his secondary school application. It was particularly interesting to see the current allocation figures for the three schools. Although Trafalgar is a link school for Teddington, there is very little chance that our son will be accepted at this school due to distance and, under the current situation, he could not be considered for Orleans Park School due to the stringent linked schools criterion. This means that he only has a realistic chance of being accepted into one school, Twickenham Academy, and this does not represent much of a choice. We would therefore like to support the proposal to remove the linked school criterion from Orleans Park and Teddington. Although this removal would probably reduce our chances of our son being accepted at Teddington (unlikely anyway), it would increase his chances of acceptance at Orleans Park. This seems to be a fairer outcome, given that this school is closer to our home, and easier to access via public transport than Teddington. It has been very frustrating that children at Trafalgar School have, until now, been ineligible to attend Orleans Park, and ironic that children living outside the borough sometimes have a greater chance of attending this school.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: This is a change that I strongly support. I have 2 sons who are currently at the Vineyard, in years 3 and 6. We live in St Margarets and my older son has been directly affected by the linked school "trap". Both my sons went to Orleans Infant and my older boy went to St Stephen's for a couple of years. They have a wide circle of friends in St Margarets and Orleans Park is our nearest secondary school - it's walking distance from our home. We moved our boys to the Vineyard in February 2011 as our older son was not faring well at St Stephens. The move to the Vineyard has been a great success - our boys are both thriving there. It is an excellent and really well run school. The sole drawback with the Vineyard, however, is that it is not a linked school to Orleans Park. This means that despite our proximity to Orleans Park, in practice, our year 6 son will not be able to go there. His secondary school choice will, in effect, be Christ's. This factor causes us real distress and anxiety. We have no connections with Christ's and none of my son's local friends (from St Margarets) will be there. A primary practical concern will be transport arrangements. Orleans Park is a 10 minute walk from our home; it's a 2 mile walk to Christ's. In practice we would no doubt have to drive our son to Christ's. In this age of concern for the environment, and over-crowded public transport, it seems bizarre that we have a school system in Richmond which places historic "links" ahead of proximity thereby reducing the number of pupils who can simply walk to school. This is quite apart from the clear social benefits of a child going to secondary school within his local community. I think our family is a great example of the real harm of the linked school system. It is plainly an arbitrary and anachronistic regime and I would wholly endorse its removal. It is hard to get away from the good sense and logic off a system which follows the core priorities of specific needs of a particular pupil, siblings and then proximity.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My opinions are derived from being a parent of two children who attended St James' Catholic Primary and are who are now attending Catholic secondary schools in Hounslow. I would likely have applied to both Orleans and Teddington but didn't think it was worthwhile. I'll summarise my points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The link school status of both Orleans and Teddington, and the fact that St James is not a link school for any secondary, made me feel that my choices for secondary were significantly curtailed, in particular for my son. As a result he has to travel to Gunnersbury Catholic School in south Ealing. For girls they at least have the choice of Waldegrave, which does not operate such a policy; • I'm sure that many parents are unaware that they may be severely limiting their secondary school choices when they choose their primary. I was certainly not aware of the implications; • While some Catholic parents will positively want a Catholic secondary school, many do not. They want a good school that is not too far to travel. The fact that as many girls from St James have historically gone to Gumley as have gone to Waldegrave supports what I say. I certainly feel that my children are now at liberty to choose whether they wish to be practising Catholics or not now they are 12 and 14 years old; the schooling they have had to date has already done its job, whether they know it or not; • The schools in question are all heavily oversubscribed, so it is never going to be possible for a school such as St James to gain link status and it's unlikely that a linked school will lose their status. I understand the rationale behind it, but its proved to be a trap; • The root cause of the problem is a lack of secondary school spaces. Without this the LSP could operate as intended. • Personally I see that the removal of the LSP and the discussion around the Clifden College site are linked. Many, if not the majority, of Catholic parents would not be demanding that it was a Catholic secondary school if they felt they would get a fair chance at the other options. I would certainly be of that opinion. There is a shortage of spaces all round, not just for the Catholic children, I recognise that. • I understand the desire to try to keep Richmond secondary schools available for Richmond residents but the fact that Hounslow schools have link status over Richmond primaries flies in the face of that already. 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I fully support the proposal to remove the linked school criterion for these schools in favour of a new "home to distance" criterion. My son and daughter, currently at Vineyard School, would not be guaranteed admission to a local secondary school if the linked school criterion was maintained (Vineyard has no current links because of decisions of parents of previous cohorts). Moving primary school to assure admission to Orleans (which is within 1km of our home) would be unnecessarily disruptive for their education.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I strongly support the Council's proposal to move to a distance-based admissions system for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The linked-school policy was originally intended to provide some certainty and continuity for parents and children. But in a context of greatly increased pressure for school places, it now increases stress and uncertainty. • There is an implicit assumption within the policy that parents will be able to choose to send their child to a primary school which has a link to their local secondary school. But, in part due to their high quality, almost all of the borough's primary schools are now over-subscribed. Many families living very close to Teddington, Orleans Park or Grey Court secondary schools are unable to get a place for their child in a linked primary school. • This is compounded by the high proportion of church schools with links to Teddington, Orleans Park and Grey Court, which means that access to community secondary schools is, in practice, based partly on church attendance. For example, in East Twickenham, only families who are able to get a church foundation place at St Mary's can get a place at Orleans Park. Children from religious and non-Christian ethnic minorities are sent to The Vineyard, which does not have a link to any secondary school. Not only is this unfair, it also leaves the Council exposed to potential legal challenge. • A distance-based system would mean children were travelling shorter distances to school – better for them, and the borough's transport system. • The current system encourages parents to switch schools when their children reach year 6. This is unnecessarily disruptive for the children, and places an additional burden on the borough's schools. 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My daughter currently attends St Paul's junior school in North Kingston. She is in Year 5, so will be the year that is affected first if the link school system is removed. I've also been a teacher at Latchmere School for 7 years, so am fairly familiar with the school system in our local area. As a parent living in North Kingston, I am extremely concerned about the proposed removal of the link school system by Richmond borough. This system has long been in place and greatly increases the chance that our children have a quality secondary place available to them. It's the same old story - there is no non selective secondary school in North Kingston. This has been recognised, and in the original proposal to build a new secondary here, the idea was it will open in 2013 (- perhaps this is why this date was chosen by Richmond to reconsider their admission procedure?). However, as we all know, the powers that be have decided that we don't need this school as urgently, so the plans have had one set back after another. I'm aware that this is the fault of Kingston Council, not Richmond, but that does nothing to help our situation. It is my concern is that if the admissions criteria go down to distance alone, in KT2, we are not in close proximity to a school, so we will effectively miss out on the 'popular' schools, as they fill up from a smaller radius. Coombe will be filled by children from New Malden/Kingston Hill, Hollyfield by children from KT1 and Surbiton, Tolworth Girls/Southborough by children from Tolworth/Surbiton, Grey Court from Ham, etc. This is a real concern, as I have known of three North Kingston children in recent years that have not put the feeder school down on their admissions form for whatever reason, and got offered Chessington Community College (2) and another school over the far side</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>of Richmond (whose name escapes me). These were the only schools left after the others had filled up with more local children. Some St Paul's parents will obviously live closer than others to Teddington School, but with the feeder school system going, I am convinced that the admission radius for all schools will shrink, so previous year's results may not be relevant. This will be a bigger problem in a few years when the school expansion years hit Year 6, though hopefully the situation in Kingston Borough will have been addressed by then. That along with Teddington School's recent new build, which will only increase its popularity. My suggestion would be that the link school system is left in place until the new secondary opens in North Kingston. I'm aware that as a Kingston resident responding to Richmond Council, my views might not be so considered, but I would hope that the council could see the knock on effects of this decision and could consider putting it on hold at the present time. Please consider my views as a concerned parent.</p>				
	Parents	<p>Re Proposal 4: My wife and her family have lived in Teddington for 40 years. We love the area and that is why we decided to settle here when she gave up her job to look after our first son full time. It meant we could be close to my wife's family, and close to St Mary's & St Peter's, which we knew to be a good school and one that fed into Teddington secondary school. We have lived here now for nine years in the assured knowledge that our eldest son, who is now ten, would enter Teddington School via this route. We live within what I consider to be a relatively unfair education admission system. It is my belief that to discriminate against a child by denying him what his parents think is the best school option for him because of their particular religion or due to the fact that he is born a male, is in my opinion pretty difficult to defend rationally. However, this is the system in which we find ourselves - the system that also has declared SMSPP a feeder school into Teddington Secondary school. It is one of the main facts that has driven major decisions for our family over the last ten years. Now we hear that the only part of the admission system that actually might benefit our family may be abandoned and that our eldest son (and therefore, all our sons) may not be admitted to Teddington after all. Our son is in year five, with strong bonds with friends who are all probably safe in the assumption that they will go to Teddington, he will be devastated if he doesn't get into Teddington. This news arrives after the worst economic decline on record that makes private education a pipe dream and that makes moving house prohibitively expensive even before you take into account the increase that these proposed changes will have had on house prices within the catchment and the parallel drop in ours. I can sympathise with those who live close and who are in favour of the proposed change, especially those whose children are not in feeder schools, but for us this is unfair in the harshest possible terms. It is disastrous for our family. My wife and I do feel like guinea pigs for the local education system. SMSPP had a bulge year with the assurance that there would not be another one soon after. This reassurance proved unfounded as another bulge followed with more assurances that also proved confusing, as the school then began expansion. Again I sympathise with the views expressed by those in favour of all these measures, but it is always my duty and my wife's duty as parents to represent the best interests of our children, who have sat in bigger classes than they might have, in a more crowded school than they might have, and in a very well managed building site but a building site none the less. Now it looks like the secondary education that we were assured of is now in very real jeopardy. I am afraid we are not impressed by pledged improvements at other schools that we will be encouraged to look at. Teddington School is our choice. Politicians are always championing choice for parents but it's at times like these that I wonder if that is all just empty rhetoric. Sadly, the nearest secondary school to us, the excellent Waldegrave School is only a choice for parents with girls. There are two aspects of this proposed change that bother us most. Firstly, it directly contradicts what we have been told by various members of the educational system. The second is the timing. The proposed start time for this change is the year that would effectively rule out our eldest son's entry. It's a time that also has seen our real income dwindle, our house price fall due to the economic climate, and now fall again due to a proposal that is out of our hands. If it were one year later this would be a non-issue, as the proposal stands, it is catastrophe. There is not enough time allowed by this proposal for us to get our son used to the idea of another school or another area, or for us to be able to move without downsizing when we really need to upsize. We want our children to go to Teddington. Our children want to go to Teddington. We have been to open days, we have watched the new building</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		go up, and we have listened to the teachers and parents of those who attend. This proposed change represents the most unjust rug-pull imaginable. We implore you not to go ahead with it. If such a change is necessary, can it not be timetabled far enough in advance, 5 or 6 years, so that any new parents entering SMSP or other current feeder schools can do so under the informed knowledge that the feeder system is being phased out and therefore gives them a fair and reasonable amount of time to adjust their family's path.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4 and Proposal 5: I understand Richmond Council's desire to have an inclusive school policy and that the linked school policy runs contrary to that in that it disadvantages children not attending a linked primary school. I have no problem losing the linked school system if you can also ensure that the non inclusive Catholic school proposed in Twickenham does not go ahead. Can you also review the female only entry of Waldegrave school in Twickenham as this is also non inclusive? For your information I have a boy in Year 1 at Stanley Primary which I consider to be an excellent primary school as reflected in its Ofsted report this year.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of 2 boys at St Mary's School in Richmond Road, and I oppose the change which has been proposed making St Mary's a non linked school to Orleans Park secondary school. There is already a lack of boys' schools in the area, so we have not much choice in the first place. We wish the link between the schools would continue, as it keeps a good communal spirit as well, as the children can continue with their peers.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: Following the meeting [on 5 January] at St Marys, I would like to raise my concerns regarding the removal of the link status. I do not wish the status to be removed as I believe very strongly that community relationships and peer relationships are paramount in strengthening educational progress for children. Children learn not only in a conducive environment but their development and motivation is key to the peers and surroundings they have worked with over the 7 years where they have built relationships and been part of community groups. I believe the boundary change will impact on learning and by not keeping linked children together, I believe this change will place an enormous amount of stress on parents and families and increase the pressure of the admission and application process. People have chosen to live here in Twickenham and chosen St Marys as a school as they believed the linked facility would support the continuing education of their children with peace of mind. The removal of this is causing unnecessary anxiety to both the children, families and will critically affect the wellbeing of those families where stress such as this is caused.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I wish to register my opposition to the proposals. We live in Craneford Way and both our children (currently Yr 3 & Yr1) attend St Mary's. As I understand it, currently, the vast majority of St Mary's pupils transfer to Orleans Park and we were hoping & expecting to also have the opportunity to do so, when the time comes for our children to move to secondary school. We would like our children to be able to attend Orleans along with their class mates to continue being part of the community we have built, rather than our children potentially having to be part of the few that will have to go elsewhere (potentially to a lower performing school) and having to form completely new friendships, whilst also having to cope with the major changes that come from the change from Junior to Senior school. The ethos of St Mary's has been particularly important to our children to help build strong friendships and we have built an amazing support network (this is particularly important in my son's case as he finds school very difficult). I believe it would be extremely detrimental (particularly to my son's education) to have to build this up again at a new school where he has few friends. In teenage years, the peer group is particularly important and I had hoped our children would go through those years together, with their current class mates. This is the underlying rationale for linked schools and one we should maintain.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We herewith request you to take note of our opposition to abolishing the linked school criteria of St. Mary's CE School for				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		admission to Orleans Park School - we think it is very important for children to be able to move on to secondary schools together with their friends and we believe this would no longer be possible if the admission criteria were changed.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you to log my opposition against the proposed abolishment of the link school between St Mary's CoE and Orleans Park. My husband and I are very concerned about the future for our eldest daughter who has been at St Mary's since reception and is now in year 5, our son who is now in year 11 in Orleans Park went through both schools and this was a natural progression- it is daunting enough for a 11 year old to start a new school but when you have had a link with the new school for 7 years previously and most of your peers will be going it doesn't seem very fair that you may not get to go to that school. I feel that this is a very bad system and that if it is changing then the parents should be told this before they start the school or the juniors at least so they have a chance to do something before they make close friends. We had to move a little further away from where we were originally but decided to travel and pay the price to keep my children in a school they were happy in and that i knew the 'feeder' school was a decent one as my son has been happy there. It is such a shame that after living in Richmond borough all my life that I don't get a say in where my children will go to school and I feel very worried about this as does my 9 year old daughter. I really do hope that this proposal does not go forward as it will be a terrible upset to a lot of children that have had their heart set on going to Orleans Park.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: After due reflection I would like to register my strong opposition to the changes, which are for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the changes purport to improve fairness, I feel that make it more unfair by removing choice from a large number of families. While parents in some areas of the borough will have improved choices, being able to choose Orleans Park as a school where before they could not, other areas will have reduced choice and in certain areas towards the edges and specifically the West of the borough they will have no choice at all. • You stated that with the proposal, less or even no out-of-borough children would be likely to be admitted to Orleans Park. Looking at the map and depending on the number of children applying, it would be very possible that preference would be given to some out-of-borough children before Richmond residents due to the location of the boundary. • With the proposed policy change, a larger proportion of children than in recent years will be forced to split from their peers, with whom they have built up a strong and potentially life-long relationship. By implementing this policy, the council would be causing undue stress to many children that they would otherwise avoid, including to those who DO make it into Orleans but their friends live a little too far away. The stress also extends to the parents who will need to build new ties with people in new areas. It would be equivalent to the pressure of moving house, well recognized as a major factor in increasing stress. • The current policy leads to a certain amount of confidence regarding where children will be placed: if you are in a linked school you are very likely to be placed in Orleans Park, if you are not then it is very unlikely. With the change in proposal it adds considerably to the uncertainty and worry my family and others like us will have until the applications are processed and the decision on where the boundary would be for 2013/14 admission. This additional uncertainty would apply to the borderline families both in linked and not in linked schools. • Decisions have been made by many parents on where to live given the current admissions policy and they will be unable to adjust their living situation in the short time remaining before application for secondary school places needs to be made. While I accept the admissions policy can change via a process such as this I also believe this change is too sudden for people to make alternate provisions. I understand from the meeting that legislation may preclude longer term changes but that does not mean I should just 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a schem primary the borou	Proposal 2: to retain the	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-o	Proposal 4: to introduce	Proposal 5: to retain the
		<p>accept that this short-term change is inevitable. By opposing the change I hope to influence the council to reconsider this proposal and push for legislation that DOES allow longer-term change.</p> <p>I realize there are some positives in the proposed change and can see why it is being put forward. However on balance I firmly believe that the negative effects, especially for our family and those that live in areas closer to Orleans Park than any other school but outside the boundary the proposal will bring into existence, far outweigh the positives. As you can see by the length and thought that has gone into this mail that I have strong feelings about this change.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We oppose the abolition of the link between some primary schools, including St. Mary's, and Orleans Park school, which is our nearest school. It seems that our local authority is introducing a policy of bussing. This could prove to be quite controversial both locally and nationally and support for the policy could be politically costly.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to raise my strong objection to the proposed change to admissions policy. The existing selection policy allows for continuity, stability and child welfare by ensuring many pupils who have studied together and built strong friendships are able to continue to study together into secondary school. I have 2 children who currently attend St Mary's - next door to Orleans. My understanding is that the new policy would effectively block them from moving to the school next door along with their friends.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to log my strong objections to the proposal and ask that the link school policy is kept. The proposal would have a hugely negative impact on children and their families living in North and West Twickenham who would be effectively relegated to having access to only one secondary school, which also happens to be the lowest performing in the area. We would be lying outside Orleans catchment as well as having no hope of access to Waldegrave, as Archdeacon children, mostly living in west Twickenham would – due to no access to Orleans – take up even more of Waldegrave spaces, meaning the catchment area for Waldegrave would shrink as well. Thus you would create a secondary school vacuum between central and east Twickenham on the one side and Twickenham Green/ the Cross roads on the other pushing everyone North into Whitton academy as their only option. In contrast families in the already socio economically privileged areas of East Twickenham and Richmond Hill would benefit unfairly as they would then have practically guaranteed access to Orleans and Waldegrave regardless of whether they have their children at the current local link schools, have recently moved in or have any ties to the school communities. Families here are much more likely to be able to afford private education than anywhere else in the Borough and have indeed chosen to live here well knowing about the school link policy. We live in the Heathfield area and our children share their school and neighbourhood, resulting in a real sense of community. Our daughter in year 5 would be absolutely devastated if she could not join her class mates in Orleans and would be driven into an isolated position at the Whitton academy as those who live nearby with older siblings would still go to Orleans and only a few children like ours would be affected by the pure distance rule in the first year. Secondary school is a time where peer relationships are crucial for aspirations, academic success and social development. My daughter would be at a severe disadvantage would she have to sever the ties she has built via the St. Mary's community which should now seamlessly lead to an Orleans one. By your own admission, this was the principle for setting up school links in the first place and it applies more than ever. Your statement regarding Whitton's improvement was not comforting as even if the trajectory you described keeps on going up we would still be attending a school that for the moment simply is not yet at the same standard. My daughter is interested in maths and languages, both excellently provided at Orleans but not the focus at Whitton. The fact is that the proposal would effectively force our children to bear the brunt of the experiment whether we could help pull the school up at the risk of getting a lower quality education themselves. We moved to Twickenham in 2001 and bought the house here particularly because of this community and the access to top schools like St. Mary's and Orleans. Parents in East Twickenham/ Richmond Hill chose to invest and live there well knowing about the school link policy and setting other priorities. I therefore do not think it is acceptable to</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>break up our school link and create benefits for one area to the detriment of another at such short notice. We would also have an economic disadvantage as house prices in the already top price areas would rise further whilst areas like Heathfield, Northern St Margarets and West Twickenham would be negatively affected. On the whole the proposal would create much more "class" division with all the affluent families being able to send their children to the top performing schools whilst those in less affluent areas have to take the less performing one, further widening the gap in their potential future achievements. Since most people who live in the areas that would have no longer access to Orleans would not have the financial alternative of private education you would be effectively creating a two tier system of secondary school provision by socio economic boundaries which will not be beneficial for anyone. A mixture of pupil backgrounds is surely desirable for their development and the cohesion of the community in the Borough as a whole rather than firmly embedding who lives not he right and the wrong side of the tracks. The focus should lie not in forcing those with the weakest influence into the least performing schools but on creating equally good schools where they are needed (e.g. by creating extra capacity at top schools in the short term and by using such site as the Richmond Adult Education college not for a Catholic but a general school whilst less performing schools are getting better) and thus abolishing the gross oversubscribed status of the top performing secondary schools in a positive way. Whilst this is certainly more costly in the short term it does provide long term benefits for all concerned and would actually be in line with the proclaimed high standards of education the council likes to market so freely. Given that education spend per child in the Borough is nowhere near the national top rates and we are top council tax payers and live an economically sound area we can expect that investment. We therefore ask that the proposal is abandoned for this year and schools are then free to make - if at all - changes in their admissions policies themselves in one, two or three years time once they have made their academy decisions and are established in their new form. By that time we may then also have more free schools on offer and may see some improvement in Whitton which would mean that any changes would have a much less negative impact. Rushing though this "last chance to change something" council proposal on the back of those with children currently in year five penalises our segment of the community unfairly and is not acceptable.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my opposition to the change of catchment area for Orleans Park School. My sons have both attended St Mary's school and along with their classmates have been offered places at Orleans Park. The idea that in the future my children would have been sent to another senior school further away with none of their classmates and lower attainment is very disappointing. The current system works very well which is why Orleans is successful, why change it, surely better to emulate it.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Further to the meeting [at St Mary's on 5 January], I am emailing to log my concern with the proposal to abolish the link between St. Mary's and Orleans Park school for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your main rationale for the proposed change is fairness, yet you insist on maintaining the dual catchment areas for Waldegrave – this is inconsistent with your rationale to drop the linked school status, is unfair, and guarantees children from East Twickenham and Richmond Hill access to both Waldegrave and OP, at the expense of children from other parts of Twickenham. • For children in years 4, 3 and lower this situation will would look even more extreme as there are higher numbers of children in the primary schools for those years. I am not convinced that the modelling has taken account of this. • Our children's only secondary school option is likely to be being Whitton Academy. <p style="margin-left: 40px;">1. I would like my children to be able to attend OP along with their class mates and continue being part of the community that we have been part of since nursery level education.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>2. Whitton is not our closest school, OP is. We would have to rely on public transport to get to this school, whereas we are able to walk to OP. I'm sure that the government's Living Streets Walk to School campaign would prefer us to be going to our closest school, and one that is walkable to.</p> <p>3. I do not want my children to be part of the experiment to see if a different catchment can lift the results of this lower performing school, and one where you would like to fill your spare capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clifden Road site seems to have been earmarked for a Catholic secondary school – surely that site (if it is to be a school) should have an inclusive admissions policy so that children from Twickenham that do not get into either OP or Waldegrave still have another school option that is walkable to? 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I oppose the abolishing of the automatic link between junior and secondary schools. I think continuity in education is important unless you are changing schools for something better. Children should have the right to stay in the same stream with the same group of children without having to fight for it. There is enough disruption in education so I would prefer to keep things stable. Also I am disabled so my son would need to be able to get to and from school safely in the event that I might not be available. Also my grand -son attends the same school now and would wish to continue to do so.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: On balance I am against the abolition of the link. To be honest this is wholly due to the fact that I believe that my year 5 son may be disadvantaged by the new policy. I live [in] Court Way (the Richmond College end of the road) and it seems I would be right at the edge of the new catchment possibly being pushed out of Orleans Park School by the East Twickenham/Vineyard contingent. In addition I am concerned that without a new Catholic School in central Twickenham parents of children at St James's Catholic Primary would apply to Orleans when at the moment they are not linked so wouldn't have a chance of a place. Given the area covered by St James and its admission criteria it is certainly likely that some of the St James children may live nearer to Orleans than I do thus jeopardising my son's chance further. I wonder whether this has been factored into your forecasting model? Can you give me any reassurance on this? You may ask why my son should be preferred over the St James children and indeed that would be a valid question. I can only say that those children and their parents have a choice of Catholic Schools in other boroughs such as Gumley House for girls and St Mark's for boys. I do not have those possibilities. My real concern is not the quality of education at Whitton/Twickenham Academy but the very real possibility that my son will be among a very small number of children who do not progress to Orleans from St Mary's with their friends - a prospect which breaks my heart. All other arguments such as falling house prices, lower academic standards etc are, to me, secondary. I believe the most compelling argument for keeping link schools is the one you presented last night - that it enables pupils to progress to secondary school with their peers/friends. Secondary transfer is difficult enough (and I know as I have an 18 year old son and went through the school trauma with him 6/7 years ago) without being the only child to transfer without his friends. The current parents at The Vineyard knew that that school had no link when they accepted a place there - I believe the link with Grey Court was lost many years ago as a result of so many Vineyard parents choosing private school and there has never been a link to Orleans. They now wish to change things in their favour. I, on the other hand, bought my house 10 years ago understanding that my children would get into St Mary's and progress from there to Orleans and this was a strong factor when deciding where to buy. I saw all the children in Court Way going off to St Mary's and Orleans and believed we would be safe - as I said earlier, I have already experienced the trauma of secondary school transfer with my oldest son and the problem of living in the wrong part of the borough</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		and did not want to go through this again. I urge you not to abolish the link school system. In the words of the old adage - if it ain't broke don't fix it. I would also like to take this opportunity to give my view on the Waldegrave admission system as I have a year 4 daughter as well as a year 5 son. You agreed last night that Waldegrave is seen as a borough wide resource and therefore girls across the borough should have a chance to go there. The current system favours Teddington/West Twickenham and Richmond - how can it be fair for Richmond girls to leap frog over Twickenham girls? The only truly fair way to allocate Waldegrave places and ensure fair opportunity across the borough is random allocation - I for one would be prepared to accept my chances along with everyone else.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am against the idea of the changing of the admission criteria to Orleans school from St Mary's. My children currently go to St Marys but we live near to the rugby ground which means that they will probably end up going to Twickenham Academy, which I'm sure is a good school but I would prefer my children went to the secondary school that their peers will go to.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to raise the following concerns myself in opposition to your plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Firstly I would like to know what the RuT Admissions Forum discussions were and who were the committee members. Is it possible to access the minutes of the meeting? It would be interesting to know how many of the committee members have children at the Vineyard for instance, as that school seems to have been highlighted as suffering the most. 2. Although Orleans Park may well be oversubscribed looking at your numbers it seems that only one child from St Mary's school actually did not gain admission in 2011. It also seems rather strange that the total number of children from both Hounslow Schools not to get in was 1. If you excluded Hounslow children then there wouldn't have been a single child from St Mary's missing out. I know for a fact that the vast majority of children in both year 5 classes come from the Borough of Richmond upon Thames, so your point about freeing up places for RuT children is illogical. 3. I think that your third bullet point on slide 4 is also rather fanciful. If you took the time to ask the parents of children in all the years through St Mary's I am sure they would agree that it is totally fair to base admission preferences made by parents of previous year 6 children. After all I am sure many parents sending their children to St Mary's have and had the same opinion from day one about where they thought their children would go onto secondary school. 4. I would like to know where the children attending the Vineyard mainly go to secondary school. Is their local secondary school so horrendously oversubscribed that they are forced to travel vast distances? The argument of children being forced to go to private school is a non starter as the majority of children attending private school are there through parental choice and not default from the state system. 5. Finally I think it is absolutely unfair to impose this draconian rule so suddenly. Hundreds of parents from reception to year 5 have sent their children to Mary's in the knowledge of the linked system to Orleans Park. Surely if you are going to abolish the linked status it would be fairer to do it in 5 years time when everyone at the school has passed through and future parents to St Mary's are fully aware of the ramifications of sending their children to our excellent school. Or do you really want to drive this legislation through before the next local election! <p>As a resident of North Central Twickenham I am extremely annoyed by this decision as you can deduce from the email. I do agree with your point about of RuT residents having access to RuT schools, but it strikes me that you are forcing children into a new untested academy in a incredibly unfair way.</p>				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: My son attends St Mary's Primary school and I have heard about the council's plans to abolish the linked status of St Mary's to Orleans Park School - as a parent I am very unhappy about this proposal and vehemently object to it. I fell it will adversely affect my son as it will mean that he may no longer be able to attend the same secondary school as a lot of his classmates and friends which is essential for the well being of a child as they make the important transition from primary to secondary school. I urge the council to reconsider this as a matter of				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		urgency.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to lodge our opposition to the proposal currently being consulted on to remove the 'linked school' criterion for admission to Orleans Park. Our oldest daughter is currently attending St Mary's Primary School in Year 5, so we may be directly impacted by the proposed change. We feel there are significant advantages to the current 'linked school' criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides certainty for families (there is no concern about catchment areas fluctuating year to year, for instance as the proportion of families sending their children to private secondary schools varies) • it provides certainty for the individual children • it provides continuity for the children; they know many of their current classmates are going to be going to Orleans and this makes the transition to secondary school more successful • it enables co-ordination between the primary schools and Orleans, once again assisting in the transition to secondary school for individuals but also allowing for easier co-ordination and continuity of teaching. It must benefit teaching at Orleans that they know what the children in their classes have covered previously because of the close links with the feeder Primary schools. <p>Given all the above it comes as no surprise that Orleans is a successful and improving school. We do think the linked school policy is assisting in supporting that improvement. We therefore believe the Council is wrong to consider changing the criterion because it will risk undermining the improvement of Orleans and it will be detrimental to individual children and families (particularly those who will be devastated not to be able to secure a place at Orleans). Please do not change the existing admissions oversubscription criteria for Orleans Park School. Even if Council fails to see the merits for arguments (such as those listed below) for retaining the linked school criteria we think it is grossly unfair of Council to consider rushing through these changes in such a short timescale. School choice is a fundamental choice for families. Supportive parents care deeply about the school their children will attend and it is wrong to suddenly change that school at such short notice. For that reason we do not think Richmond should consider implementing any change (if change is decided upon) before 2016/2017. This would give time for parents to adjust to the change and take individual action if they felt that appropriate. Separately, in support of the points we made below can we note the following extract from the DfE Code of Admissions 2010: "The use of named feeder schools can support good curriculum and geographical links and local continuity between phases in an area...."</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have two children which are students at Stanley School. I would like to voice my support for the proposed changes to the link school system. The current system is unfair to children at Catholic schools and to families that have relocated to the area. However, I would like to also voice my concerns about a shortage of places in good or outstanding schools (particularly for boys) which attend Stanley. Many Stanley families would not be able to choose to send their children to a private school and we need places in quality secondary schools. Even though dropping the link school system would negatively affect our chances of getting into Teddington, I still believe that it is the right thing to do. The new school at Clifden Rd would be our nearest secondary school. I will be very disappointed if that school is not option for our children because of our beliefs. I urge the council to look at the issue of secondary schools holistically and plan realistically for all the children that have taken hundreds of new reception places across the borough.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to oppose to the plans to abolish school link between St Mary's Primary School and Orleans Park Secondary school. We would like our kids to continue to go together into Secondary school. Also, we do not want to be part of experiment that council proposes in order to improve Whitton Academy.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent / Parent-governor	<p>Re Proposal 4: Whilst I agree with the rationale behind the proposal to remove the link, my question is: is it unfair to remove the link for families who have children currently in linked primary schools, especially in Key Stage 2, as it seems like a retrospective policy change; the goal posts are being moved. Many of our parents feel the carpet is being pulled from under their feet when their children are in year 5. Would it be fairer to remove the link status once all current primary children in the linked schools have reached Year 7? Or at least all junior school children. That way all future junior school choices will be made knowing there is no link and families will have from year 3 to decide what they want to do. I am fully supportive of the fairer, no link, system, and living in East Twickenham myself I am probably unaffected, so I am writing this from an objective standpoint, having heard "very concerned" responses from other parents who would be affected.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I understand the complexity of creating and maintaining a fair admissions policy for the borough, but want to raise a strong objection to the prospect of changing the linked school status at such short notice. Surely it is unfair on families who have arranged their housing and school plans around the existing criteria, suddenly to change it during their child's time at (for example) a linked primary school? Our youngest son is currently in Year 2 at Stanley School, which we chose for our children precisely because of its linked school status. His two older siblings are currently at Teddington School in Years 10 and 7, though the younger of them will be finishing Year 11 just as Adam finishes Year 6 at Stanley, which seems to mean that the sibling criterion won't apply for Adam. Given that we moved from Brixton (Lambeth) to Teddington in 2007 in order to find good community primary and secondary schools, it seems extremely harsh to change the ground rules once we have made these family commitments, and possibly leave a third child unable to follow his siblings, even though we are in the same house and he's at the same primary school. I feel strongly that any change to linked school status should only apply to children starting at the (previously) linked school after the status has been changed, so that families can take all conditions into account when they choose their primary school. Otherwise there will be many children and families who have based their primary school choices on one set of conditions suddenly finding the goal posts have been radically moved.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would NOT support the use of the proposed oversubscription criteria for community mixed secondary schools ie I would support the retention of the linked school criterion. Reasons:</p> <p>Losing LSP will disrupt continuity My son attends St Paul's Junior School in Kingston, where a large number of children progress to Teddington: if the LSP is abolished the probability of him gaining a place at Teddington would be greatly reduced, and should he not get a place we feel his transition to secondary school would be much less smooth. Losing the LSP disrupts continuity for the children and the schools involved, creating extra anxiety for children at an already stressful time.</p> <p>Too short notice Losing the LSP for 2013 entry is short notice for those of us with children currently in Year 5. While a place at a school of choice is never a certainty, we value education highly and having done our research previously and moved house to our give our son a fair chance of a place at a good mixed community school, it does seem unfair for him to have absolutely no idea where he will end up if the LSP is abolished. It is as though the goalposts have been moved at the last minute, allowing us little time to move again.</p> <p>Potential further disruption to admissions policies With many of the schools set to become academies, they will be able to set their own admissions policies: I do not see what benefit there would</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		be in changing the policy this coming year when the academies are free to change their policies yet again the following year.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I write in response to the above consultation and make the following points in opposition to the proposed changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are good educational arguments for having link arrangements because it keeps groups together between Year 5/6 and Year 7/8 at a point in their education when children often fall back. • It's presumptuous of the Council to change the admissions policy for three secondary schools at a time when the schools are consulting on becoming academies in 2012. Academies are legally responsible for their own admissions policy not the Council. If the Council believes that secondary schools should be self-governing, then it should let them govern themselves • It's unhelpfully disruptive of the Council to seek changes to admissions in 2013 at a time when it is implementing lots of other changes (the Twickenham school, academy conversions, possible new free schools) and when the new academies (Twickenham, Hampton and Sheen) are still bedding down. A possible result is that anxious parents will fear the worst and seek alternatives which will harm the Council's plans to improve. It would be better to wait for the changes to settle down and to review the evidence in a couple of year's time. 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to lodge my opposition about the proposed change to the junior schools that have a link status with Orleans Park. I feel very strongly that the link status of schools such as St Mary's with Orleans Park should remain in place. I, like many of my friends, have built up a close relationship with parents and children at St Mary's. I wish my children to remain with their peer group through their schooling as they move up to senior school. This link is the foundation of the local community. Its removal will be the beginning of a decline of this part of Twickenham. It will affect the immediate community, with many people looking to move. This part of Twickenham wants its children to be schooled in Twickenham not Whitton.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my objection to the proposed change to the linked school admission policy for Orleans Park. My daughter is in year 3 of St Marys and I live in Heathfield South. This would mean that we would probably not be able to attend Orleans under the new policy. I don't think there are good enough reasons for the change and think it would be very harmful to children at this difficult age to have to leave all their piers behind and deal with such a big change with that added stress.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: After reading your consultation document on the removal of the 'linked school criteria' for some of the local secondary schools I would like to object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the linked schools in preference of distance to school will mean that parents will look to purchase properties in the immediate vicinity to guarantee a school place. This will only serve to put pressure on the primary schools placed closest which in the case of Orleans Park secondary means St Marys and Orleans Infants who are already highly over-subscribed. • Over the last few years primary school places have been in great shortage with the LA providing bulge classes and additional permanent places. This is bound to impact on places available at secondary level and surely the LA should be looking to increase places at this level to match the number of classes added from feeder schools guaranteeing a smooth transition for students rather than turning it into a location lottery. 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having a link between primary and secondary level is beneficial to both schools allowing them to collaborate on various events to prepare children for the transition. This is surely in the best interests of the children. <p>Finally, the secondary schools currently cater to a wide range of families from different backgrounds providing for children from diverse backgrounds. With home to school distance becoming a primary factor, the schools could lose some of their diversity as they are situated in the heart of 'middle class' Twickenham/Teddington.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a parent of a pupil at St Mary's and who has had two children attend Orleans Park as a result of the close link that both schools have worked hard to forge, I object to the primary schools in Twickenham losing their link status to Orleans. A more fair policy for children who attend schools in Twickenham would be to remove the link status in Primary schools in Isleworth to Orleans in 2013. They are in the Hounslow Borough and have a choice of mixed and single sexed secondary Schools in Hounslow. After doing so, you could then look at the admissions for that year before cutting all link status to Richmond primary schools in 2013. If this proposal goes ahead, parents feel they have no choice in choosing a good Secondary school for their children. It is only right that the standard of Whitton Academy be consistently the same as Orleans before considering removing the link status so if St Mary's and other link school pupils are going to be separated from their friends and the familiarly of Orleans Park, you at least give them the same opportunity for learning and achieving. Particularly with St Mary's, Orleans is next to them and the St Mary's pupils have benefitted from this and has seen moving to Orleans as a natural, stress free and positive experience as moving to Secondary School is a huge step for children. St Mary's is still in the process of taking on the huge responsibility of expanding the school to accommodate for the increased numbers of children in the borough. I think this project should be finished and have the parents and children settled before having to worry about Secondary schools for their older siblings.</p>				
	Parents	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my name to the petition regarding admissions criteria for the 2013 year to Orleans Park School. I am in support of the removal of link schools because we live extremely close to the school and my daughter who attends The Vineyard School stands no chance of attending Orleans with the existing arrangements. I also have two sons who will have the same problem in the forthcoming few years. Surely it is in the interests of a community to enable local children to attend local schools.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the removal of linked school status for the admission of 2013 pupils from primary schools to Orleans Park Secondary. When choosing a primary school for my daughters a key criterion within the choice was its linked school status to Orleans Park. I was told, in person at Regal House, that any change to that linked status would only be made with a three notice period. I am shocked to hear that this change is being considered for the coming year as it gives parents little or no chance to plan for the implications of such a change. Those who chose to send their children to unlinked schools did so knowing that the linked status was not there and have had 6 years to decide how to plan for this. For one of the three schools affected the number of Borough children gaining entry to the school after the changes actually reduces. Further, the numbers only show a partial picture. Whilst I appreciate the wish to support Richmond Borough residents it only considers the three schools mentioned rather than considering the overall affect on Borough families. Many in-Borough families who have moved into houses and chosen schools after thorough research into the school situation may suddenly find themselves unable to get children into any Borough school as a consequence. As the consultation documents admits, the criteria will all change when schools become academies so this disruptive change, affecting children's futures, is all for the sake of one year. All that will be achieved is unnecessary anxiety and confusion for parents for an extra year, without it being part of a longer term, stable strategy. The consultation document itself does not give parents the information with which to understand the impact on us and hence to know to what extent we will be affected, or where we might end up having to send our children if we become outside catchment for our desired school. As I understand it, all Borough schools within our area have been oversubscribed so we could end up being unable to get our children into any Borough school. Having been a Borough resident for</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		15 year and having monitored the catchment situation each year to make sure that my children could attend the school of our choice I am horrified to find this sudden change being proposed that makes that monitoring and care pointless. I urge you to reconsider this ill-thought through proposal.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I wish to register my strong feelings AGAINST the proposed change of admissions policy. Abandoning the link between St Mary's junior school and Orleans Park will cause my son (currently in year 5) & family more than a few problems:</p> <p>1 – He will want to be with his friends, many of them might well not go to Whitton (assuming he was sent there). 2 – his mother and I are divorced and the pair of us struggle with full time jobs as well as picking him up from School, going to Whitton will mean I have to leave work even earlier & may result in my place of employment refusing to let me go earlier (Orleans Park is a lot closer to my work) Child minders are few and far between and cost a GREAT deal of money we both can ill afford.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am very disappointed that the borough is planning to remove this criterion. I have two children currently attending Worple Primary School in Isleworth and we live in the borough of Richmond. Orleans Park is our nearest comprehensive mixed secondary school. I had felt reasonably confident that my children would be able to attend Orleans Park thanks to the existence of the link. In fact that is one of the reasons why I chose for them to go to Worple in the first place. However, if the link is removed it is highly likely that my children will not be able to attend Orleans Park, or in fact any other school in the borough of Richmond because we live close to the border with Hounslow. The alternative schools are either single-sex or quite a lot further away from our home. The removal of the link criterion will therefore take away the chance my children have of being admitted to their closest mixed community secondary school. Its removal has also been proposed within a fairly short timescale rather than giving plenty of warning that things are going to change. Finally, I note that if Orleans Park becomes an academy it will probably change its admission arrangements anyway, in consultation with the local authority, so I would like to question why the borough is proposing to change the admission criteria now, given that they are likely to change again the year after.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Removing the admission link between St Marys C of E School and Orleans Park would be unfair in two respects. First, it would favour residents of Richmond, whose children attend the Vineyard, at the expense of the residents of central and western Twickenham despite Orleans Park being a school located in the heart of Twickenham and next door to St Marys. Second, parents such as I have carefully planned our children's education on the understanding that they would move on to Orleans after St Marys. We made sometimes awkward choices to ensure our children attended this school mainly to safeguard that progression to Orleans. That transition is now being threatened because children from The Vineyard - for example - may now have the chance to step into our children's places, although their parents probably never planned it that way or had our reasonable expectations. Please understand that I appreciate the local authority has to make painful decisions in the context of rising demand for places at popular schools, but in this instance the impact would be 100 percent unfair.</p>				
	Parent / Community governor	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my concern over the proposal to drop the linked school status from the admissions criteria for Orleans Park school. I am writing in the capacity of a parent at one of the linked schools (Worple Primary) and as a community governor at that school. I am being advised that although I am a resident of Richmond Borough and Orleans Park is my nearest comprehensive school, my children will probably not be able to attend Orleans Park which is our preferred school (especially since many of the other secondary schools locally are single sex and/or faith schools). In fact the whole community surrounding Worple School feel very much let down by this proposal which will effectively mean that suddenly the next tranche of children will not be able to attend the school that their friends want to the previous year. Many of these people may have selected Worple partially because it had this linked status, which is being dropped very abruptly. Even if the changes are indeed inevitable, they should be phased in over a longer period so that parents who selected a school because of this link are not suddenly let down and have time to react appropriately. In addition, if very few Worple children are able to attend Orleans Park after the change, surely</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		this will make the link itself ineffective. This would be a shame as it has benefits to the school outside of merely improving chances of admission.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4 and Proposal 5: Thank you first of all for taking the time to come to St Mary's Junior School. I have to tell you that, having listened to your explanations, I remain vehemently opposed to the revisions that are proposed to break the link from St Mary's to Orleans Park School. One of my objections is that you are introducing changes to the Orleans selection system whilst leaving Waldegrave School to carry on as it is. That is fundamentally inconsistent and inequitable and will leave many families who could expect to get their children into Orleans under the existing linked system and who have planned their lives accordingly at a considerable disadvantage. If your projections as to catchment under your proposed arrangements are correct then we should be comfortably inside the likely catchment boundary. However how can you possibly consider it fair to require Orleans to select purely on proximity and allow Waldegrave to select based on entirely arbitrary population pockets that do not follow the same rules and will give some parents in the relevant locations much greater choice? Our daughter is currently in Year 5 and will be the first year to experience the change in admissions arrangements should this be implemented. Whilst I welcome the potential addition of free schools to give further choice, these applications are under consideration at the Department of Education and will not be an option for at least 18 months if not longer. I also appreciate that the Council is pumping considerable amounts of money into Twickenham Academy but this again will take some time to "pull its socks up". I feel in this way that the currently Year 5 and Year 4 are being forced into a change before these improvements have become a reality.</p>				
	Unknown	Re Proposal 4: I would like to object to the new rule for Orleans Park secondary admissions.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We reject the closure of the 'linked schools status' that you proposed at St. Mary's School. In justifying such a position in your powerpoint you state:</p> <p>1.RuT Admissions Forum recommendation This is of course not a proper reason - it is just saying that you agree with someone else whose position is on the face of it unsupported. Real reasons justifying such a closure are required if it is to be seen as the 'right decision'.</p> <p>2.The criterion no longer provides a guarantee of a place, as it has been oversubscribed for Orleans Park and Teddington since 2005 and 2004 respectively This is not a reason for closing such provision down. An analogous argument would be that old-age care is not available to all people so therefore it should be closed down. The link still provides some continuity of education, and your argument should be one of showing why this concern (which I assume you see to be valuable) should be overridden by some other more important concern.</p> <p>3.Would be fairer not to base a child's chance of admission on preferences made by the parents of previous Year 6 children The wording of this is not clear. Rather than putting forward a position of what it means to be fair or unfair, it simply alleges that linked schools are unfair. It certainly does not directly engage with the principles of 'linked schools' set out in your own powerpoint that they provide continuity of education.</p> <p>When you do discuss the Council's reasons for proposing the closure of such linking, you state:</p> <p>1. Would free up places for RuT children 2. Would enable more local children to stand a chance of gaining a place in their closest mixed community secondary school This seems extraordinary coming from a Council that has just authorised a Roman Catholic secondary school with a sixth form in our area; a body that has a long reputation of being highly exclusive, and which would not free up places for RUT children, and which would not enable</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>more local children to stand a chance of gaining a place in their local secondary school. If the Council was absolutely committed to such principles, they would never have acted like this in this other case. Given that the Council is not absolutely committed to such principles (as their decision on the RC school clearly reveals), you need to argue for why such principles outweigh those of the continuity of education in this particular case, even if they don't outweigh the needs of a religious ethos in the case of a secondary RC school. I see no real argument for this.</p> <p>You write against the link that it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would arguably perpetuate unfairness; especially for east Twickenham children attending The Vineyard and other local children attending private schools. Such a concept of fairness assumes that the principles of continuity are irrelevant, and that an individualistic idea of fairness should be implemented in its place; it is exactly this replacement of one principle with another however that should have been argued for. Further, private schools, by definition, reject such an idea of neutral fairness, and seek to provide a better quality of education for young people whose families can pay for it. Nevertheless, using such schools as a reason for such a proposal, you argue that the public sector's continuity of education should be undermined so as to allow such families to benefit from a principle that they are quite clearly not committed to. 2. Likely to be the last chance to reform the admission arrangements in a coordinated way. This is quite evidently not a reason. It might be the last change for a country to push the nuclear button while it still has a nuclear deterrent, but this is in no way a reason for doing so. <p>In short, we have yet to be provided with any compelling reason for the change in policy that engages with the principles set out for the continuity of education. The reasons explicitly set out for the change are not properly reasons but shared opinions or at best alternative principles to those of the continuity of education. Further, those alternative principles have been dramatically rejected by some of the Council's other educational decisions, demonstrating the Council's need to state why those principles should be adhered to in this specific case. Given that this has clearly not been done, it would be unwise for the Council to undermine the continuity of education in our area.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Although I live very close to Orleans Park school, I do object in principle to the removal of a link between a primary school and a secondary school. I feel that the children growing up together should be able to stay with their peers and friends.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to register our opposition to the proposed abolishment of the link between St Mary's CE School and Orleans Park School. We have two young children at St Mary's, and we have spent many years building up relationships with the school and local community. It is very worrying to think that our children may be separated from their friends at age 11 and sent to a school further away. I can appreciate that the Borough Council is obliged to try to manage the Orleans Park intake at age 11. But it seems grossly unfair to force this change onto children who, with their classmates, are already in the Orleans Park 'connection' – and whose parents have chosen the primary school partly because the link to Orleans Park exists in the first place. The link between the two schools is a strong one: we feel that it would be unfair to break it with so little prior notice. We strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I wanted to express my objection to the proposed removal of the Linked School status as admission criteria for Orleans Park secondary school. Having consulted a map, I strongly believe that this change in admission policy will be detrimental to families in our neighbourhood – Heatham i.e. the streets around Whitton Road – causing a lot of additional uncertainty and anxiety to both pupils and parents. If distance becomes the criteria, our neighbourhood will be amongst the furthest from Orleans Park, on the outer edge of the likely catchment area. Despite this, Orleans Park is our local secondary school and by far the nearest (Court Way is 1.4km away from Orleans Park and 3.3km away from Twickenham Academy.) Not only that, but, as you know, St Mary's CE Primary School – our nearest Primary school and the school where the majority of children from our neighbourhood go - is actually situated next door to Orleans Park, helping create special ties between</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>the two school communities. For people living in the Heatham area whose children attend a local primary school, the current Linked School System is therefore delivering on what it set out to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A majority of Yr 6 children transfer with their peers to Orleans Park, which makes a supportive transition to Secondary school. • Being next door to each other, St Mary's and Orleans Park have over the years developed special ties - e.g. St Mary's pupils attending lessons at Orleans Park in Years 5 and 6 – which have fostered a sense of community between the schools which again benefits pupils by creating educational continuity and easing transition. • Even if this can no longer be guaranteed as such, children from the Heatham neighbourhood stand a good chance of being admitted to Orleans Park, their closest community secondary school (our chances will definitely become lower if the LSP is removed) • Our children are able to walk to Orleans Park in the same way they have walked to St Mary's school throughout their years at primary school (they have to travel by road to get to Twickenham Academy, their second nearest school) <p>Why change the system, if it is actually working, certainly for St Mary's? In addition, the Linked School status has been established for over 10 years now. Parents understand the system and they make their preferences for admission to Primary schools in full awareness of this policy. Removing the LSP effectively “moves the goal post” for families, changing the rules which they had understood when making choices in terms of where to live and which Primary school to attend. This seems totally unnecessary. Over recent years, families from our area have already suffered a lot of anxiety over admission into Primary school, having had to rely on the opening of bulge classes to get a place into our local Primary. It therefore seems particularly unfair, that the admission policy for secondary schools should be changed for those same families, causing increased uncertainty, stress and anxiety once again. Finally, our area is about to be transformed by one – and most probably two - very large residential developments (the redevelopment of Twickenham station and of the old Post Office depot). As you know, the Station's planned high rise residential development has had a lot of opposition from people in our neighbourhood – including all three Councillors - as we do not believe this is an appropriate development for the area and we know that it will put extra pressure on already oversubscribed local schools. These developments are placed in between Heatham and our local primary and secondary schools pushing us further down the admission list if distance is the criteria that is used. Despite overwhelming opposition from residents, the Station development has now been approved by the Council. You will pardon Heatham residents for feeling somewhat "victimised" by the current Council administration... I sincerely hope that the Council considers the unnecessary anxiety that a change in goal post will mean to all parents and pupils of St Mary's school and that the proposal is rejected.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I write to register my objection to your proposed co-ordinated secondary admission scheme for 2013/14, specifically your proposal to remove the link between primary and secondary schools. I have no direct interest in this as my child is already at Orleans Park secondary school. However, as someone who has benefitted from the link school system myself, I feel that for the sake of other parents I have to raise my objections to your proposals. My objections are:</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The link school system allows primary and linked secondary schools to work closely together to effect a smooth transition. At my child's primary school this joint planning started in year 4 with the Orleans French teacher taking year 4 classes. My child benefitted from teaching by French, maths and sports staff from Orleans before he had started there and this made for a very smooth transition. With demand so heavy for Orleans and Teddington, I believe many more children from schools that are currently linked would not get a place under the new system. If a smaller percentage of children were going to the formerly linked schools there would be less joint primary/secondary planning, with ongoing effects for the children's secondary-school stage. And even if joint planning were to continue, it would be very upsetting for primary children who had come to regard the nearby secondary as their school to find they were not going there after all. Many parents have chosen primary schools with an eye to the secondary link. It is unfair to these parents to change the goal posts at this late stage change the game. Alternative schools to Orleans and Teddington (the most over-subscribed schools, I believe) are on the outskirts of the borough, so some children from currently-linked schools may find they don't get a place at, say, Teddington and are offered a place even further away from their home. The alternative schools (Hampton and Twickenham Academy) are run by outside sponsors and offer a form of education that many parents would not choose for their children (I looked at the Swedish-style system that Twickenham Academy uses and feel it is very different from what the rest of the UK is using and I would not want that approach for my child). <p>I do realise that there is pressure on school places and that parents who move into the area have a problem finding a place at their nearest school. However, instead of breaking up existing school communities, and disrupting social groups that have been together since Reception, what the council should be doing is to get a move-on with building a new <i>inclusive</i> secondary school for local children in Twickenham, which would help solve the problem.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am contacting you to add my voice to the parents who are appalled at the idea of removing the linked school status. Many parents have made important decisions for their family's future based on the existing linked schools policy and it is a disgracefully high-handed u-turn on the council's behalf to consider removing the policy. As a family at Archdeacon Cambridge's School, we will be in a very difficult situation which will have huge implications on our family's ability to stay in Twickenham, if the link is removed. Having read your presentation to St Mary's parents, I must ask you to consider very carefully the justness of removing the linked status.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to vote strongly against the plan to abolish the school link admission criteria for St Mary's CE school in Twickenham and Orleans Park (St Mary's being the link intake for Orleans Park). I am a parent of children attending St Mary's school and as a part of this community I am hoping that our concerns are going to be heard.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my support for linked schools, and objection to this criterion being removed.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to my objection to the proposed Abolishment of the Linked schools to Orleans status to be noted. I would also like it to be noted that I am very much opposed to the fact the Waldegrave admissions policy still excludes people living in St Margarets but includes the Vineyard - this is ludicrous and not at all fair and in the spirit of a fair community. You mentioned that there are ample places in the</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		Richmond Borough to accommodate all the children, then why do the Vineyard/Richmond students need to access Waldegrave when we have been excluded?				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: My husband and I are in favour of the linked school criterion for Orleans Park School.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the removal of the link between St Mary's C of E school and Orleans Park. Living in Court Way I believe we will now be unlikely to be accepted to Orleans and will be more likely to get Whitton Academy. Our son is very happy at St Mary's as we are and we will lose the close community link with friends and parents. Also, Whitton academy is not within easy walking distance which is a priority for most parents and apparently the government initiatives. Whilst I am sure Whitton Academy may improve over the coming years, it is not the school we would choose for our son at present and it would be very sad to see school friends split to such a degree as they will be if this link is removed.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: Please, note my opposition to the plan to abolish the school link between St Mary's CE school and Orleans Park.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: With 3 children attending Stanley Infant School in Teddington, I feel I should add my views to this consultation. I feel losing the link school criterion will disrupt continuity in the education system within Richmond, and also open up Teddington school to a flood of 'out of Borough' applicants. One of our main reasons for choosing Stanley School was its linked status to Teddington school, and I am sure that I am not alone in this reasoning. Geographically, Stanley is quite far away from Teddington School, and the link status was a major attraction for the school, without this we will see a lot of the children who have been together since nursery split up at a critical time in their education. Furthermore, due to the location of Teddington school, removing the link status criterion would open up Teddington school to Ham residents, on the basis of geographical access over the footbridge at Teddington lock. With few alternative secondary education options for those of us in the 'Stanley School' area of Teddington (especially those of us with boys), I feel the linked school criterion is a valuable asset to Stanley School and should be retained.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to log my opposition to the change in Orleans admission policy and the removal of link status for St Mary's school. This school works extremely hard in creating a strong community feel for its pupils and I believe this should be continued by allowing the children to attend Orleans together which is what the current linked status enables.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have read the documents concerning the consultation on the removal of the linked school status, and I am extremely unhappy. My son is currently at St Marys school and extremely happy. If you go ahead with the removal of the link school system he will be unable to move on to Orleans with the rest of his friends, and instead will be forced to go through a substantial disruption at a key educational age. The whole point of the link system is to maintain a degree of stability to our children's education, not to help the local authority even out distribution of school places. When did this priority change? Our whole financial planning and decisions on where we chose to live were based on the current school structure. It seems that by removing the link you simply move the issue from east Twickenham to west Twickenham, and put even more pressure into the debate concerning the Clifden Road site. Had we known of these changes we would have made different financial & educational decisions, but we are now left with a potential bombshell in our child's education. I am extremely unhappy that these decisions are being made for the wrong reasons.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a resident of East Twickenham, living within a few minutes walk of Orleans Park School. I have two daughters both of whom attended The Vineyard School (leaving in 2006 and 2009), but were unable to gain a place at Orleans Park on account of the linked school policy. I thoroughly support the abolition of the linked school policy. While I understand the historical reason for introducing the linked school policy back in 1991, in practice in our experience it has worked against pupils being able to attend their local secondary school. It results in pupils having to travel further to school, which is not beneficial for the pupils or the environment. It also in our experience created disruption				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		at primary school level as children were moved to different junior schools in years 4 and 5 to create the necessary "link". A system mainly based on distance from home avoids these issues.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the proposed removal of linked school criterion to Teddington School for 2013/14 entry. My children are currently at St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School, and I disagree with the current proposal. Teddington School has recently undergone a consultation process to convert to Academy Status, with a decision due in Spring 2012. If the school does convert to an Academy, the school governing body would be responsible for setting their own entry criteria for the 2014/15 intake. This current proposed change to the entry criteria for 2013/14 could therefore be followed by another change in 2014/15 (once the school governing body are responsible). This undermines the existing school governing body and is very disruptive for both parents and children. It is also important that an increased notice period is provided before any changes, so that parents fully understand the implications for their children and can make decisions accordingly. I think that the consultation on the changes to the entry criteria should wait until <u>after</u> the decision to convert the school to an Academy, at which time a sensible long term decision can be made by those responsible. Rushing through a change before the decision would give little benefit and would be unreasonably disruptive to all involved. Whilst I support the idea that all children should stand a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest secondary school, regardless of which primary school they attend, I do not agree with current proposal.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: In principle I agree that children should attend their nearest schools and therefore distance rather than the link system should be the way forward. However, I do have concerns about the removal of the link system without looking at the priority A and B areas of the Waldegrave catchment at the same time. Without this, parents living in the most affluent parts of the borough (particularly East Twickenham and parts of Richmond) will be able to apply to Orleans Park, Waldegrave and probably Grey Court which are all highly successful schools and will most probably get access to their first choice school. Living in Central Twickenham (Strafford Road), the only option for us is Orleans Park (our preferred option as it happens and a decision not regretted for our first child). However, many families in Central Twickenham who wanted their daughters to attend Waldegrave are denied access to Waldegrave. If you are to remove the links then I really think that you must also look at the priority A and B areas of Waldegrave at the same time so that the rule applies to all families within the borough that you have the opportunity to attend your nearest school not based on these priority areas which will give a clear advantage to families living in certain areas of the borough.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As parents of children at St Mary's, we had hoped that our children would be able to progress to Orleans Park and do so with their peers, remaining active members of the local community, not one in Whitton to which we have no connection. Removing the school's link status will have an adverse effect on a great number of children and threatens to damage the wider community. We do not live in Whitton and wish to send our children to our <i>local</i> school: measuring locality in terms of metres in no way reflects the meaning of <i>local</i> as it applies to a school community. We live in the Heathfield area and prospects for getting a place in 2014 at Orleans Park look grim; those living in other parts of the Borough who will benefit already have wider options. We would urge that this proposal is at least delayed to allow more time for greater consultation with those who will be affected for a very long time to come.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to you to register our objection to the proposed removal of the link schools system in Richmond upon Thames. We have one child in year 7 at Orleans Park and one in year 5 in St Mary's CE School, Twickenham. We are not directly affected by the proposals as, at the present time, it does not appear to be the Council's intention to alter its sibling policy. Objectively, however, we feel the proposals are unjustified and appear to be a crude attempt at social engineering. We acknowledge that going to a senior school is an opportunity to meet a broader range of children from across the Borough; Orleans Park achieves this while maintaining the continuity of pre-existing friendships. The proposal prejudices the happiness of children who currently benefit from the link system. Having one son who started at Orleans Park in September 2011, we are impressed by how the school manages the integration of children from a variety of backgrounds</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		and schools while enabling continuity of friendships. Our experience is that there is a shortage of good state schools for boys in Twickenham; girl pupils have the choice of attending Waldegrave to which there is no male equivalent. The proposals are such that girls retain the Waldegrave option while boys from linked schools will just have to "take their chances". It seems inequitable that the Council is considering removing the linked school status without addressing the lack of choices for boys in the Borough. Finally, we note your comments on the Vineyard and "other private schools"; the parents concerned have made a conscious choice to opt out of the state system. Presumably when they make this choice, they do so with full knowledge that a link system exists and that, if they choose to re-enter the state system, they will not benefit from it. We do not understand why the Council seeks to protect the interests of children in the private sector (which fall outside its remit) to the potential detriment of children in the state system.				
	Parents	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to urge you to reconsider the proposed removal of link status from 2013 as it gives insufficient warning for parents with children in year 5 to re-plan their child's secondary schooling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people in the area, like us, have been living in Teddington for 10-15 years with the plan to send their children to Teddington School. • The removal of the link status in 2013 (next year) will give insufficient time for people like us to adequately plan and reconsider the options for their children's education. • We have been in the Richmond Borough / Teddington area for over 15 years. (10 years ago we moved from a more central Teddington address to the border of Hampton Hill and Teddington.) We chose to live here on the basis that we would be able to offer our son access to Teddington School as, despite it being in the outer realms of the catchment area, we would have the link status from St Mary's and St Peter's to improve our chances of entry. We would have chosen to live elsewhere had we known the key criterion was to be based solely on distance. • Also, if we had thought this link was to be removed, we would also have considered sending our elder daughter to Teddington School (instead of Waldegrave) to increase our son's chance of entry to the school (based on sibling policy). In short, we feel it is highly unfair that we, and undoubtedly, many others, are being given 1 year's notice that the system is to change. <p>We, like many, genuinely hope you will reconsider this proposal and instead plan any introduction from, at the very least, 2014 onwards.</p>				
	Borough resident	Re Proposal 4: I am in favour of the removal of "Linked" status for local schools such as Collis, St Mary's and St Peter's, etc.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a resident of the Borough of Richmond upon Thames and have my daughter currently studying at St Mary's CE School. I wish to register my opposition to the proposed abolition of the linked school status with Orleans Park.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: On the issue of whether the linked schools criterion should be removed I can say that the link between Darell and Grey Court is a cherished one; a significant proportion of Darell pupils do move to Grey Court after Year 6, indeed many parents, including myself, chose to send our children to Darell on the basis that they would move to Grey Court after leaving Darell. I am very concerned that my daughter and my son would not have the opportunity of moving to the school of our choice should the link be removed. I understand that the council has made				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>the case that Grey Court currently has sufficient places to admit Darell pupils; this may be true but could in no way be guaranteed in the future. Such reasoning is, in any case, a misnomer – if admissions are not an issue between Darell and Grey Court why would you wish to remove the link in the first place. There are too few community schools in the borough and the council should not assume that parents want to send their children to church schools nor make it more difficult for them to send their children to Community Schools. Our nearest secondary school is Christ's, for philosophical reasons I do not wish to send my children to a religious school but regardless of my personal beliefs, in times of over-subscription, there is a church reference criteria for admissions to Christ's which would effectively bar many parents from sending their children there. In conclusion I would like to urge you not to remove the link criterion to schools. I am sure this is a sentiment that would be shared by many families in our situation, and will become increasingly apparent to you, even more so had this consultation been more prominently advertised.</p>				
	Parent	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed abolishment of the link status between St. Mary's School and Orleans Park School, as I believe this has some serious implications which will most importantly be of detriment to my children's education. Living in Heathfield North, and worshipping at All Hallows church, our children currently attend St. Mary's Infant School, and would naturally go on to study at Orleans Park with all their friends when reaching secondary stage education given its link status. You have told us that in future children from non-linked schools but living closer, would have preference over St Mary's children living further away, affecting parents like ourselves who live in the Western and Northern part of the St. Mary's catchment area. We sit just under the border of the distance you said would be 1.8km pathway distance (we currently live 1.7km pathway distance). The proposal for a dual catchment area would result in East Twickenham/Richmond Hill having almost guaranteed access to Waldegrave and Orleans, whilst West and North Twickenham would have access to neither, and be left with only Whitton Academy as a choice for secondary school. As parents we would like our children to be able to attend Orleans along with their class mates and continue being part of the community we have built, rather than having to send them elsewhere, where we do not have connections, and having to be part of the council's experiment at social engineering, to lift lower performing schools. We feel in Teenage years, our children's peer group is particularly important, and we had hoped our children would go through those years together with those friends made at St Mary's, together with the parent friends we have made. This is not only relevant to academic friends made, but also through the various NCT groups which we attend as parents, where our children's friends who attend Orleans infants will go on to study at secondary level at Orleans secondary school, where lifelong friends can then become school colleagues. This is the underlying rationale for linked schools and one the council should maintain. Furthermore, it is absurd that our children will attend St. Mary's throughout their primary education, and then not go on to Orleans, given the St Mary's Junior site is further away from our front door than Orleans Park School. I therefore request the council, as a local resident and council tax payer, to take into account the views of the many concerned parents objecting to your proposals, and urge you to keep linked school status between St. Mary's and Orleans Park.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to register my objection to the proposed change in link school status, for Orleans Park. I am a parent of a child in St Mary's and two children at Orleans Park. I feel that the existing arrangements are a suitable compromise between dealing with needs of children from the immediate areas close to the school and those from the wider community. I believe that by narrowing the catchment area, Orleans will become less representative than the current cross section of children from within the borough and beyond. Orleans educates a relatively broad range of children which adds to the culture and atmosphere of the school. There seems to be an undercurrent of resentment towards children from the adjacent boroughs being educated within Richmond schools, overlooking the fact that many Richmond children use the range of schools available in the borough of Hounslow. Within greater London there is always going to be movement across boroughs and</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		this should not be seen in a negative light.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to notify you that I strongly object to the proposal to abolish the link between St Marys and Orleans Park School.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have a son who attends Orleans Infants. Whilst I am aware that Orleans Infants itself does not have linked status with Orleans Park School, it has had this status indirectly via St Stephens. I strongly believe that it is important for children to experience and grow through the school system as part of a community. Communities are formed not just by geography but through the collective experiences of a group of people. In no context is this greater than in the context of children's education - children attending school together and participating in extra curricular activities together and the parents of those children forming close ties as a result. The proposal to break this link is not only unfair to the children whose friendships will be broken but also has a wider effect on community. I register my objection to the council's proposals and ask that the council reconsiders its decision, putting greater weight on the negative impact caused by the breaking up of established community groups.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have read your presentation regarding the removal of the linked school criterion for Orleans Park and I am worried about the changes you are about to make. You are trying to change a system which works perfectly well and which helps make our community so strong in Twickenham. My daughter attends St Mary's CE School and I hope that she and her brother, in time will be able to join Orleans Park School. However, this is now uncertain given the changes the council is making. Since we have joined St Mary's we never felt so close to our community which is very important for the children and for us. I am well aware that some areas of the borough are less well served for schools but this was known to those living in the areas when they bought their property. We made a decision to live where we are in order to be able to send our children to St Mary's and then to Orleans Park. We also had to pay a premium for our house because of the good catchment area of our street. It appears that you are now trying to move the 'goal posts'. By moving children to the Whitton Academy from their current target of Orleans Park they lose the chance to attend a school which has recently been rated Outstanding by Ofsted. You can understand our concern. I would like to know what the advantage is of changing a system which already works very well. Surely this change is highly disruptive for very little obvious benefit.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have children at St Mary's School in Twickenham and I wish to add my voice to the opposition to the proposed change to the admissions policy to Orleans Secondary School. I can only see the downsides in this proposal - for example breaking up social groups at an incredibly important age and introducing an increased level of stress in the homes of your residents. Along with the views of the majority of parents I would urge you to disregard these proposals in favour of maintaining the system of linked schools.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: Please excuse this direct approach but we find ourselves among an increasing number of parents who find themselves in quite a difficult position and I am hoping you might be able to help. I understand there is a linked Schools criterion which works to the detriment of Vineyard Primary School. Although I am sure you are aware of this issue I hope you will spare a moment to consider the damage this policy causes to the borough, to an outstanding local school that deserves your protection, and to the lives of children and parents every year as they scramble to make State Education work. An outstanding Primary School deserves an outstanding Secondary School. To ensure that State Education is a realistic option in this Borough the Vineyard Primary School simply must be served by a Secondary School that promises to continue such an excellent start right through to 18. We have three children, 2 boys who are still at the Vineyard [and a girl] who has now gone				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>on to Tiffin Girls' School. The Vineyard is an extraordinarily good school, and we feel enormously privileged to have been able to send our children there. It is a wonderful start for them. However, it is not overstating the case that the work of all the teachers and committed parents is being unravelled by a policy which forces parents to act in a way which inevitably undermines the school that they love. As children approach 11, parents (particularly those of boys), are pushed into an unhappy, and unnecessary, position. Parents want to carry on their outstanding education their children are receiving at an outstanding secondary school, one of which is on their doorstep. Orleans Park is walkable for us but I understand our children will not be considered for this school. Why? Because of this policy we either have to consider the private system (which many cannot afford and many more actively disagree with), or worse still we have to seriously consider taking our children out of the Vineyard to place them into a school that is linked to a Secondary School of our choosing. Both choices harm the Vineyard School and the children's development quite unnecessarily. Please can you move to protect the Vineyard School and extend eligibility of local children to local schools of excellence as a matter of urgency? If you cannot do this could you please spare a moment to explain the above system to committed parents who are beginning to despair in a State system that appears to be letting their children down badly.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to object to a proposal for dropping linked school admissions to Orleans Park school. We have children in years 3 and 1 and we've lived in this area for over 16 years now. Our children are very happy at their school and they are forming very important friendships which we would like to have an opportunity to maintain. Teenage years can be difficult enough without taking away their closest friends and relationship they have with them. Over the years we've lived in this area we have compromised on quite a few things in order to make sure that our children have a chance to go to a good school and give them the best start in their lives. With the proposed changes we would be likely not to be able to get into a good school, we would find ourselves with a choice of a single school. We are now facing a possibility of not having a good school for our children to go to, as the council is proposing dropping linked school to Orleans, building an exclusive Catholic secondary school, and not leaving any options for majority of the borough. That certainly doesn't seem fair. Most parents are not able to afford private schools, but have thought that we ensured our children will be given opportunity to go to a good school. Hope council is finally going to listen to people in Richmond borough and do what is right for majority of people living in the Borough.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my opposition to this proposal. My son has been at Alexandra Infant/St Paul's School, Kingston since nursery and is now in Year 5: a key criterion for wanting him to attend these schools was always the link between St Paul's and Teddington, a school we have always held in high regard. 1) Lack of notice - we have been thinking in terms of Teddington for some years and so has Edward. To move the goalposts at the eleventh hour seems particularly tough for all concerned, creating unforeseeable stress and anxiety and relatively little time to make alternative plans. 2) There will be a loss of continuity – my son and his classmates have older friends/siblings who are already at Teddington, with more expecting to go this year. A sudden rupture in this relationship means that suddenly kids from St Paul's will be seeking new secondary school options, siblings will be separated and a large proportion of St Paul's leavers will take a step into the unknown rather than into an environment full of familiar and friendly faces. 3) This proposal seems unnecessary in the context of longer-term developments - given that Teddington is set to become an Academy, and will therefore be able to set its own admissions policies in the near future, it seems somewhat gratuitous to make significant policy changes that will only apply for a single year. I hope you will consider the above points in your forthcoming meetings and not remove the "linked school" criterion, at least in the proposed timeframe.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My daughter is in Year 5 at St Paul's C of E Junior School, Kingston, and is due to start secondary school in September 2013. St Paul's has for some years been linked with Teddington School, and my daughter's year group would be the first to be affected by the</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>proposed removal of the link school system. We do not have a local non-selective secondary school in North Kingston. Plans to build a new secondary school in North Kingston will not be realised in time to provide places for current Year 5 students. My fear is that if the link system is removed, and places are offered on the basis of distance alone, then our nearest non-selective schools - Teddington and Grey Court in Richmond Borough which currently operate links with local primaries, and Coombe Girls and Hollyfield in Kingston Borough which already admit on distance criteria - will fill up from a smaller radius, leaving children from North Kingston without a place in any local school and having to travel much longer distances, perhaps to Chessington or even further away. I can see that from Richmond's point of view this is Kingston's problem. However, I would ask that Richmond consider the needs of North Kingston families, continue to honour the school links which have been nurtured in past years, and delay the proposed changes to secondary admissions until the new North Kingston secondary school opens.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am parent of girl from St Paul's C of E school in Kingston, who will need a secondary school entry in 2013. I would like to bring my points across in DISAGREEMENT of removing link from St Paul's C of E school to Teddington school. If this link will be removed my daughter:</p> <p>1) By distance, will be able to get to Coombe Girls' School. This is not guaranteed, as entrance by distance from our house just on border line of qualifying for a place. Chances of getting in this school will be close to impossible, when 30 to 50 girls will put their applications to Coombe girls!!!!!! 2) Will be not able, by distance criteria, to get place in any other school in the area. As currently standing, we live outside of all other local secondary schools distance criteria. This situation will worsen, when three Kingston schools will need a placement in secondary school. This number will be around 200 children!!!!!! 3) In a impossible chance, my daughter will be offered a place in Coombe Girls', this school is not suitable for my daughter. It is single sex school!! It is against our beliefs to put child in single sex school, as her emotional development and social skills will suffer!!!!!! 4) Most likely will get a place somewhere in a very long travel distance school from home, which will resolve in putting a lot of unnecessary pressure on my daughter's live(and mine as a parent, as I will have to drive her). My daughter is a grate athlete. She is a swimmer in Kingston Royals Swimming Club. Her training involves attendance to Kingfisher swimming pool 4 times a week for duration of hour and a half. In two years (by 2013) her training will involve morning and evening training six times in week. It would be very much impossible to continue training and studying if school is far away from home. I have toddler, who is travelling to all training sessions in the moment. This is very hard for him! If school will be further away from home and swimming pool, our family will not be able to support competitive swimming!!! On a final note, by removing link to school in Teddington, we will be not able to get to local school, nor have a choice to educate our daughter in mixed school, nor continue supporting our daughter's sports ambition. Option of education in local private sector or moving houses, in current economical climate, not available to us. Please reconsider very carefully your proposal of removal link to Teddington, until new secondary school in operation in Kingston!!!!</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My children currently attend St Paul's Junior School, Kingston, one of the linked schools to Teddington. There is no non-selective community Secondary school in Kingston and from where we live, our nearest non-selective community Secondary school is Teddington. If the link were to be removed and as a result my children not able to attend Teddington, due to demand for schools in this area we would be unlikely to get a place at any of our nearest schools and therefore would be looking at schools a significant distance away. Based on historic evidence places could be offered at Chessington Community College, or at the far side of Richmond. This would have a negative impact as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased congestion on the roads • Increased pollution 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children moving to a secondary school without their Primary School peers, making settling-in harder • Children living a significant distance from their peers at secondary school making it harder to make new friendships which would be even more essential if they have already been separated from their Primary School peers. <p>I do understand that people living in Richmond would like the links to be removed but until there are enough secondary school places available in the areas that would be affected by the removal of the links, surely this cannot be considered as a viable option. As a mother who was at the receiving end of a lack of places for my child when starting in Reception due to bad planning and lack of information it is inconceivable that we should be in a similar situation when we apply for his Secondary School place. Please consider the wider impact of your proposals.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I wish to express our objections to the proposed change to Orleans Park admissions policy as a feeder school for St Mary's pupils. We experienced great difficulty in obtaining a place for our daughter at our nearest school, St Mary's in 2007, being one of 200 applicants without any school place in the borough. When our daughter finally obtained a place, we assumed that she would make the natural transition to Orleans without having to go through the same ordeal and anxiety as previously. However, we are looking at finding ourselves in this position AGAIN. It is unjust that schools in East Twickenham and Richmond Hill have the options of Waldegrave AND Orleans, whereas families living in North Twickenham, who live nearer to both these schools do not. I urge that you will take into account the implications for families living in parts of Twickenham who are not being considered in this decision making.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4 and Proposal 5: We would like to express our strong objection to the removal of the LSP from all schools currently linked to Orleans Secondary School. This would have an extreme negative effect on all those children attending St Mary's CE school, whose junior site is located within/adjacent to the grounds of Orleans school. Removing the link status especially for St. Mary's CE School, would put these children at a definite disadvantage and adversely affect those in the Western and Northern sections of the St Mary's traditional catchment area. Children from East Twickenham, and Richmond areas, for whom these changes would benefit most, are already well served by Christ School, Richmond Park Academy and unfair priority access to Waldegrave School. You yourself said, at a meeting at St Mary's Juniors on Thursday 5th January, that provided the same application pattern as in 2011 continued, the catchment area for Orleans would move eastwards and Southwards, and the probable outer limit of the catchment area for admission in 2013 would be around 1.8 km. pathway distance. Looking at a map this would mean anyone in the Western Heathfield Roads (HM CPZ) area, North of the A316 and near or beyond the Heath Road dip may not get into Orleans. If, as is likely, more applications than in the past come from non-linked school applicants, this new area would contract even further away from the North and West and so will affect a significant proportion of current St. Mary's families. This could mean applicants from parts of Heathfield North and South, Court Way, Craneford Way, Chudleigh and Egerton roads being excluded. For children in current years 4, 3 and lower, this picture would look even grimmer as there will be a large number of children currently in bulge classes to accommodate, not forgetting the extra strain on resources the new station housing development will put of limited places. It is hypocritical of the council to only consider removing the LSP for Orleans, Grey Court and Teddington Academy (popular schools), without also considering the removal the LSP from ALL schools in the borough and a change to the admissions arrangements for Waldegrave. If the LSP were to be removed for all schools in the borough and the admissions policy for entry into Waldegrave changed to give children living in the effected North and West Twickenham areas a realistic chance of admission, the removal of the LSP might not be considered quite so detrimental. Given that current year 5 children will be applying in September, it is extremely unfair to try to introduce this significant change so quickly. Parents of children in current year 5 have very little time to make alternative arrangements in order to ensure their child obtains a place at their school of choice. The decision to drop the LSP should also be dependent upon the proposed new school at Clifden Road being available to the children of North and West Twickenham instead of abandoning them to an educational wasteland in the intervening years. This is of course assuming</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>that the New School actually materialises.</p> <p><u>Re: Review of Waldegrave Priority Admissions Areas</u></p> <p>If the council is so determined to remove the LSP, it should also take a look at the admissions policy for Waldegrave. It seems hypocritical and inconsistent to; on the one hand propose the removal of the LSP from some schools, whilst on the other continuing to use the location of out of borough historic linked schools in determining the admissions areas for Waldegrave. Surly this is in dire need of review as well. The use of out of borough schools that were linked to Waldegrave in 1998, (i.e. North – John Betts, Hammersmith; South – St John’s School, Kingston; East – St Faith’s School; Wandsworth and West – Forge Lane, Hounslow) to determine the basis for the boundary of priority admission areas in the borough is long overdue for review. The demographics of the area have changed significantly since then and the demand for places is huge. As it stands, the policy favours girls living in the rich enclaves of Strawberry Hill and Teddington in Area A (85%) and Richmond in Area B (15%). Large tranches of central and North Twickenham, Whitton, St Margarets and Marble hill are excluded. The policy is open to abuse as parents rush to buy or rent long enough within a short distance of the school in order to secure a place for their eldest daughter. Surely it is now time to redraw the priority areas and perhaps split the borough into three or four areas so that girls from all over the borough have a fairer chance of obtaining a place. Another option may be to introduce a lottery system. Many of the reasons given for considering the removal of the LSP can equally be applied to Waldegrave regarding a review of the priority enrolment areas, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the priority areas is much longer overdue than the review of the LSP which was last carried out in 2006. • “Basing children’s chances of admission on preferences made by the parents of previous Year 6 children” in 1998 “is unfair”. * • Removing or redesigning the priority areas “could lead to a more even geographical distribution of the borough’s children at entry to Year 7”*. • The intake of children into Waldegrave would not be limited to those fortunate enough to live in the few affluent streets around the school and the Area B boundary line. <p><i>* Quotes taken from Consultation on removal of the ‘linked schools’ criterion for admission to Grey Court, Orleans Park and Teddington for 2013/2014 entry</i></p> <p>We appreciate Waldegrave is a special case, as it is the only girls school in the borough and demand is high for places. But if the removal of the LSP for Orleans etc. goes ahead, this will leave areas of the borough without any choice of school at all. Re-drawing the priority areas may go some way towards redressing the balance. As we understand it, Waldegrave is also consulting on converting to academy status “and would, if they became academies, be able to set their own admissions arrangements for 2014/2015 onwards so this could be the last opportunity” for the local authority to propose a coordinated review of the priority areas. An argument you use to rush through the removal of the LSP from Orleans, Grey Court and Teddington Academy.</p>				
	Unknown	Re Proposal 4: I would like to log my objection to the abolishing of the links school.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: Please abolish the linked school policy.				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my support to the Vineyard governors' argument against the linked schools policy. I am extremely worried that my son will miss out on his preferred secondary school because an unfair advantage is given to pupils at linked schools even though they may live further away from the secondary school than us .I sincerely request that the linked schools policy be abolished.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a parent of a Year 5 Pupil at The Vineyard School I support the proposed abolition of the link school policy, which we believe is inequitable and which has discriminated against our pupils and their families for several years. This is because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The link system is fundamentally flawed in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to that child, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. For a school such as The Vineyard with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. Those of our pupils who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils. 2. It is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in-borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, while children who live in the streets surrounding Orleans Park are unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places by the council at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP. 3. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. 4. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP. 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my voice to the request to abolish the Link system for the Vineyard School. We have lived in Richmond for over 15 years and have 4 children, sadly only one at the Vineyard at the moment but we are looking at moving the others in as we can.</p> <p>The Vineyard is a very special school attracting a very diverse set of people from all over the world.....but critically live in the local community in Richmond. This creates a very specific issue when these parents move onto their next posting or back to their homeland. The Link approach penalises the remaining children as the school will not hit the numbers going to one individual school. One of the reasons our three elder boys are in private school in Richmond is the concern over where they would end up at secondary school given the challenges of securing places in the better local state secondaries. Richmond has a real problem with secondary schools. Many parents would love to support the great progress being made in the state secondaries in the borough but feel it is too much of a lottery and so end up going private or moving.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>I would ask you to consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The link system is fundamentally flawed in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to that child, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. For a school such as The Vineyard with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. Those of our pupils who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils. 2. It is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, while children who live in the streets surrounding Orleans Park are unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places by the council at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP. 3. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. 4. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP. 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My daughter is 7 years old and is currently attending The Vineyard School. I am against the Link school system because it discriminates against children in the borough - for example we live next to Orleans Park. But because historical links with other schools it would be very difficult for us to obtain a place there - as we are not a link school. Attendance to secondary school should be linked to the child's ability to perform. Richmond is the only borough in London operating this Link system which is discriminating against children in our community. Richmond is one of the lowest performing boroughs in the Country (5th from the bottom) when it comes to children being accepted to the preferred secondary school - and no wonder we are unable to send our children to local schools because of historic links to out of the borough schools!! I hope the Council sees common sense and does the right thing by our children and abolished this ancient system.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to request that Richmond Council's Link School Policy be abolished. I am a parent of 2 children at the Vineyard School (Y6 and Y3) and it is clear that, as the Vineyard School does not have a linked secondary school, its pupils are discriminated against when trying to transfer to local state secondary schools. I was shocked to learn that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in 2011 Richmond was the 5th lowest performing Local Authority nationally in terms of meeting parents' preferences for secondary schools. The LSP, which excludes local children from their local schools simply because of practices established many years ago when pupil numbers were lower, must surely be a large contributor to this v poor performance; 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that Richmond is the only borough in London that still operates an LSP. <p>I very much hope that the Council takes this opportunity to abolish this outdated policy.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are the parents of a child in year 1 at the Vineyard Primary school. We understand that the Vineyard has written to you outlining why they strongly support the proposed abolition of the current link school policy system. I write to confirm that I wholeheartedly agree with the views that they have already expressed to you in detail. As long term residents of the Borough of Richmond, who has no desire to leave the area, it is both alarming and of considerable concern to understand that Richmond is the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. We strongly urge you to abolish this inequitable policy.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my opposition to the proposed removal of 'linked school' status for St Mary's and St Peter's Church of England Primary School (SMSP) in Teddington. My son is currently in Year 3 at SMSP and we are massively disappointed that there is a proposal to have this link removed. Had we known about this when he was enrolled we could have made an informed decision. One of the primary reasons he was enrolled at SMSP was the linked status with Teddington.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the scheme which will unfairly disadvantage my daughter who is in year 4 at The Vineyard School. The risk of her being unplaced, eligibility based on previous years when the tone and strengths of schools change because of hard work of teaching staff and school leadership means the school that is best for her now will undoubtedly shift. Richmond seems behind other London boroughs in keeping this policy. Because of the time, costs, energy, and risks associated with longer commutes it is a wasteful policy forcing more movement at time of rising fuels costs, environmental damage, and greater levels of emotional stress in our teenage children in the Richmond borough. Unfortunately long commutes don't typically transfer to healthy walking or cycling.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my support to The Vineyard governors' argument against the linked school policy. I am very worried that my son will miss out on his preferred secondary school because an unfair advantage is given to pupils at linked school even though they may live further away from the secondary school than us. I strongly hope that the linked school policy be abolished.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I live in Richmond and have 2 children in the Vineyard School. I oppose the LSP scheme for the reasons below and request its abolishment and replacement by a fairer scheme that will give my children as fair a chance as children from other schools to obtain secondary school places.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The link system is fundamentally flawed in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to that child, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. For a school such as The Vineyard with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. Those of our pupils who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils. It is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, while children who live in the streets surrounding Orleans Park are unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places by the council at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP.</p> <p>3. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools.</p> <p>4. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I'd like to register my opposition to having a Link policy for schooling in the borough. Why? In short because I think it will unfairly disadvantage my son's future schooling opportunities. Why should my son's eligibility for secondary state school be based on the behaviour of other parents in the years preceding? Put another way – why should my son's eligibility be compromised because the Vineyard has a higher portion of parents willing to fund private education from year 6/high proportion moving abroad? Nothing to do with me, my family or my circumstances. And is it right that the requirement to not disadvantage schools from other boroughs has the net effect of discriminating in their favour – at the expense of children from The Vineyard & within the borough? No other London borough supports this LSP policy. Why compound the problem in a borough that already has the 5th worst record in London?</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you on the issue of the potential withdrawal of the 'Linked School' status for Teddington school from St. Pauls Junior school in Kingston, which if enforced would create many problems for myself and many other parents of children who attend St. Pauls along with my 2 children. In our area of North Kingston we are not blessed with a huge choice of secondary schools to send our children to. In fact our closest school geographically by far is Tiffin Grammar school but of course that raises other issues about admissions separate to simple geography. This link to Teddington has been a reassurance to parents that we will be able to get a place at a school we have chosen rather than potentially our last choices which might be as far away as Chessington. I do hope that you will be able to consider our situation, which reflects more on the paucity of secondary schools in our area than any reflection on the children themselves and decide to keep this linked status between Teddington and St. Pauls. One of the reasons that we moved to this area when the children were young was because of this link to Teddington, even before the refurbishments were carried out, so I would be sad and disappointed if this were taken away.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My daughter is in Year 5 at St Paul's C of E Junior School, Kingston, and is due to start secondary school in September 2013. St Paul's has for some years been linked with Teddington School, and my daughter's year group would be the first to be affected by the proposed removal of the link school system. We do not have a local non-selective secondary school in North Kingston. Plans to build a new secondary school in North Kingston will not be realised in time to provide places for current Year 5 students. My fear is that if the link system is removed, and places are offered on the basis of distance alone, then our nearest non-selective schools - Teddington and Grey Court in Richmond Borough which currently operate links with local primaries, and Coombe Girls and Hollyfield in Kingston Borough which already admit on distance criteria - will fill up from a smaller radius, leaving children from North Kingston without a place in any local school and having to travel much longer distances, perhaps to Chessington or even further away. I can see that from Richmond's point of view this is Kingston's problem. However, I would ask that Richmond consider the needs of North Kingston families, continue to honour the school links which have been nurtured in past years, and delay the proposed changes to secondary admissions until the new North Kingston secondary school opens.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you regarding the proposal to remove the link from St Paul's C of E Junior School to Teddington Secondary</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>School. Firstly, having specifically moved to North Kingston in order to send my two children to St Paul's and its link to Teddington, I am extremely disappointed that this link may now be removed. My children are in Year 4 and Year 5 at St Paul's and we find ourselves in a very distressing situation whilst this decision is being considered. Secondly, we find ourselves in a position where due our location, we are very poorly placed for applications to other secondary schools. This decision is surely one that can be delayed until there is at least a viable option for a secondary school in North Kingston. I would ask that you consider this decision sympathetically to mine and many other families who find themselves in this upsetting situation.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of two children attending The Vineyard School in Richmond and I am writing to register my strongly held views regarding the Link School Consultation. I must say that I believe the link system is completely unfair and discriminates against local families and their children. My arguments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe the Link School Policy (LSP) is intended to help ensure fair allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It is intended to avoid disadvantaging people. However, this is not the outcome that it produces for Vineyard School parents and pupils. Instead, pupils who wish to transfer from their allocated state primary school to the most proximate state secondary are discriminated against. <p><i>EXAMPLE: We live just a couple of hundred yards from Orleans Park school grounds but under the current system it is very unlikely that my children would be able to attend their local state secondary school which is our preference. This is because at The Vineyard there are a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools or leaving the area / country altogether after Year 6. In this context, it is very difficult to envisage 25% of a cohort moving to any one secondary, and so it's highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Whilst it may be illegal for any borough to <u>discriminate against</u> out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students, this surely cannot imply that it is legitimate or appropriate that the LSP should <u>positively discriminate in favour</u> of out of borough pupils and against local families / children. Yet this does appear to be what is happening. With many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans Park on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, we have the crazy situation whereby children who live just a 3 minute walk to Orleans Park will be unable to obtain places at the adjacent secondary school simply because they were allocated a place at The Vineyard School (which is unlinked). <p>Of course, if distance rather than linked status were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would still be as accessible to out of borough families - just as they are in any other borough. However, they would not be 'more accessible' to those families than to families living just a stones throw away. Yet this does seem to be the rather perverse and unintended consequence of the current set up. It needs to be changed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. In 2011, I am informed that 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form. This places Richmond Borough as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. I am sure that you will agree that this is simply not good enough. 4. Finally, I think it's worth noting that Richmond is apparently the only London borough still to operate an LSP. I believe Harrow Council, previously had an LSP in place but they abolished theirs from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>school. I would suggest that there is no sound argument for Richmond Borough to continue to operate the LSP given its perverse consequences that act against local tax paying residents and their families in the borough.</p> <p>I would urge that the council abolishes an unfair system of selection which serves no purpose other than to penalise local children.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a parent of 2 boys currently in years 5 and 3 at St Mary's and St Peter's primary School I am hugely concerned about the removal of the School's links with Teddington School. Having grown up in this Borough (attending Waldegrave School, but with a brother at Teddington Boys School) I already feel that boys are at a disadvantage in Teddington, with less choice than the girls. As such, the SMSP "link" to Teddington School was certainly a factor in our Primary School choice. Already worried about whether my boys will get in to Teddington I have contacted the Education Admissions section for the last 3 years to see whether we would have been allocated a place, living in the North of Teddington. Fortunately the answer has been yes, on one occasion only by c150m and definitely because of the link. I am concerned that without the link we do not stand a chance (with far more parents applying from Kingston and significantly altering the figures in section 5 of your report). With a boy in year 5 you really haven't given us, and many other parents, any time to plan for an alternative. Should you decide to proceed with the proposals I feel strongly that they should at least be delayed to allow parents time to plan and the current primary schools time to help prepare parents.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing as a parent of 2 children at The Vineyard School and as a resident in East Twickenham to make my views known in terms of the Link School Consultation. I strongly believe that we need to move away from the link system for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The link system is fundamentally flawed in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to our children, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. <p>For a school such as The Vineyard, with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. Those of our pupils who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils. I have every intention of sending my children to a state secondary school and would like this to be my local school.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, whilst our children who live a 3 minute walk to Orleans Park will be unable to obtain places there simply because they have attended The Vineyard School (which is unlinked). If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP. 3. I understand that in 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools.</p> <p>4. I have been advised that Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP.</p> <p>I would strongly argue that the time is right to abolish a system which is unfair and penalises local children.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I appeal to you to please abolish the link school policy based on the below 3 points:</p> <p>The Vineyard School supports the proposed abolition of the link school policy, which we believe is inequitable and which has discriminated against our pupils and their families for several years. This is because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The link system is <u>fundamentally flawed</u> in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to that child, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. For a school such as The Vineyard with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. Those of our pupils who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils. 2. It is <u>illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students</u>. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, while children who live in the streets surrounding Orleans Park are unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places by the council at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP. 3. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. 4. <u>Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP</u>. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP. 				
	Parent (and parent-governor)	<p>Re Proposal 4: In response to the Local Authority's consultation on linked school criteria for future secondary admissions to Teddington school, as a parent I object to the proposal and would prefer to maintain the existing linked school criteria. The current arrangements provide some degree of stability and predictability. It seems short sighted to change the admissions criteria without having a policy first to increase the number of secondary school places in response to the over subscription already being experienced in our local primary schools and which will</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		shortly impact the linked secondary schools. It's clear from the consultation document that the Local Authority is uncertain as to the consequences of the proposed change. It seems that the proposal will simply worsen the situation for parents living on the Teddington side of the River Thames. Substantially more time (i.e. years) is needed in the event that any change is to be introduced, so that parents, schools and the LA may adjust in an orderly way.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to oppose the proposed removal of LINK status for St Marys and St Peters School in Teddington with Teddington School. Our son currently attends SMSP and one of our goals with him attending that school was to have the established benefit of continuity and stability in his move to secondary schooling. Transfer to secondary school is a difficult and often stressful time for young people and the reassurance of having an established peer group with him would be invaluable. By removing the LINK status our son would be extremely unlikely to get a place at Teddington School (based on the rising demand for places, proximity to school etc) and would thus be thrown into a new environment with children he does not know. I would respectfully request that you re-consider the proposed removal of LINK status.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you to lodge my views on why link schools are important and lodge my concerns and objections about the proposed removal of the link school status between St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School and Teddington Secondary School.</p> <p>Why the LINK school is important?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I believe the link school goes some way towards ensuring that local children within Teddington go to a local Teddington School – which brings about local friendships, local positives for the community and also can mean that children can locally “walk “ or travel to school etc without long travel times. - I believe that it means that educational and local community links are tighter, more robust and stable for the local community. - Means that friendships made at primary schools can be taken into secondary education meaning that children are more able to deal with changes in their lives and helping with their support networks. - Also, it helps with sibling continuity if there is more than 5 years between children – to help keep whole families linked to schools <p>My concerns if the LINK school status is removed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think there will be a reduction in the number of children from St Mary's and St Peter's who will get offers to Teddington School - The demand for places will increase from Kingston and Ham (away from the Teddington local area) - There will be a reduction in choice of local secondary schools for Teddington Children <p>I also believe that this change is being rushed through – when many parents have moved homes based on current criteria and with siblings about to apply next year. It would seem to me that there needs to be more thought and time given to this especially with all the investment in new schools, expansions to schools being planned over the next 5 years. Surely those investments in secondary schools would need to be established and to measure how admission patterns settle before such radical changes are made to the current link school status and admission criteria.</p>				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I must say I have always been surprised that there are so many wonderful primary schools in the area but that there seems to be very few, what I would call good state secondary schools. (Good for me means of a high academic standard and ones which also support and provide an environment for strong personal development (manners, ethos, social understanding, confidence, self-esteem). I think this is				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>especially true for boys. Like most parents, I want my children to continue their education in an environment that can meet the above criteria, but I would also like to have a choice; one school may be suitable for one child but not necessarily for a sibling. 'The main reason I can see for the continuing of the link system is to support children who have social needs. Friendship groups and mutual support from peers is vital to those who find it especially difficult to form and cement relationships with others, or indeed who need familiar faces in order to feel comfortable and ultimately grow in a new environment. The severing of social support groups of students who have social difficulties/confidence/ self-esteem issues at a time when they most need those few friends is a clear concern for me. My son attends Archdeacon Cambridge's school and, having attended the open evening at Orleans Park last year, I know it would provide just the right environment (encouragement, motivated & enthusiastic teachers, a sound ethos) for my son to grow in.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I wanted to register formally my own objection to the proposed change to the link school status for Orleans Park. I have three children currently attending Chase Bridge Primary School and, clearly, any change in the link school policy would have a material effect on our choice of secondary school. On behalf of my own family (and other affected Chase Bridge families), I would urge you strongly to reconsider the proposed policy change.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I hear that there is a current consultation over the link school policy in Richmond and would like to put forward my views objecting to this please. If my understanding is correct the system is highly inequitable and I cannot quite understand why it was set up in the first place given that state school selection is supposed to be done mainly on a geographic basis. Why does this system exist as it encourages children to travel long distances to a school and increase the already high volume of school run cars on the road when it would be much easier - and fairer - to put children in the school nearest to their home? I hear - but have not checked this out - that many people from outside the borough (who do not pay Richmond Council tax) try and get their children into the schools within the borough - presumably because they are deemed as higher quality than the ones in their borough. This is simply unfair to the Richmond families who find themselves not able to get into those schools nearest to them – many of whom end up putting them into the private system when they otherwise would not have done. It also perhaps leaves the more unpopular schools to take children from less ambitious parents thus perpetuating their reputation for not being quite up to standard. My son is at the Vineyard which does not have a link policy so I simply plan to send him to the nearest school – and would be extremely angry if this were not possible due to another school having priority due to a link. Also the fact that no there is no other London borough uses the link system is perhaps proof that it is highly inequitable and should not have existed in the first place.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am not happy that the link status of Chase Bridge Primary will be removed in the proposed changes as Orleans is our nearest secondary school. It would leave us no choice on secondary education for our two children currently in Year 1 and reception.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to lodge my opposition to the proposal for the removal of link school status to Teddington School. I am a mother of three young boys, two of whom are at St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School (my youngest is due to start at the pre-school in September this year), and it is therefore a great concern that there may be a risk that they now won't get into Teddington School at secondary level. We have lived in Teddington for over 10 years and I would be so upset if after all this time they had to go to a secondary school outside of Teddington - especially as we paid such a high price to move to the area to get them into good schools! We currently live on Elleray Road and are planning to move but will now be restricted to an area much closer to Teddington School to ensure that they can get in. I am in no doubt that house prices in the 'River Roads' will soar and may then be out of our price range when we come to move.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4 and Proposal 5: We would like to object to the removal of the links to the secondary schools. We are really concerned that there will be nothing to stop people coming in and renting property closer to the school for the duration of the admissions procedure and taking places that would have gone to genuine local children. We know of many people who have rented out their existing property in Twickenham and moved to a property on Waldegrave's doorstep for the duration of the admissions procedure and have then moved back to their existing</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>property. They all successfully secured places for their daughters at Waldegrave. If the links ARE removed, I would like some assurances that there are firm measures in place to prevent people from doing this as it is completely unfair. If this means removing a child from school 8 months down the line (to use the example you gave us), so be it. I am sure people might learn from this example and be put off from doing it if some action against it was actually taken. Also on the subject of Waldegrave, many of us in the Heatham area (who are potentially going to miss out on Orleans places) would have more of a chance of getting in to Waldegrave if the same proximity rules that you are proposing for Orleans, are applied to Waldegrave instead of the current system. I know you said this would not change as it is to give girls across the whole borough a chance of getting in. If this is the case, make Waldegrave a lottery system where the names of all girls in Richmond borough are picked out of the hat. In this way, every girl would genuinely have a chance and it would stop all the people who rent property just to get their children into the school.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I wish to object to the removal of the above and as a resident of Craneford Way echo the objections raised by [another respondent]. As [the other respondent notes]notes, the Linked School status has been established for over 10 years now and this policy certainly affected our choice of St. Mary's as a Primary School - removing the LSP is changing the goal posts for many people and seems totally unnecessary and unfair. At the very least, if changes have to be made, I would ask these to be phased in so that current children at the affected schools benefit from the linked status that they were led to believe existed for them. We are also one of the families from the area that has already suffered a lot of anxiety over admission into Primary school, having had to rely on the opening of bulge classes to get a place into our local Primary. It therefore seems particularly unfair, that the admission policy for secondary schools should be changed for us and those other affected families, causing increased uncertainty, stress and anxiety once again.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Having read the consultation document, I would like to highlight my concerns over the removal of the link from St Pauls' Junior School in Kingston to Teddington and Grey Court schools. As a parent of a child in Year 5 I am very concerned that, following the removal of this link, and without the concrete proposals of a new secondary school being built in North Kingston, it would leave my child with very little choice for a local secondary school. As mentioned in the consultation document, the aim is "Regardless of which primary school they attend, children should stand a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest mixed community secondary school". With the removal of this link, this also removes this 'realistic chance'. I fully understand the need to ensure that pupils have the chance to attend a local school, but the local schools to my child are both Teddington and Grey Court. The removal of the link system would be understandable if there was a suitable local alternative. As an additional point, I have always been amazed that, with the lack of secondary places in North Kingston, why the entrance criteria to the two Tiffin schools have remained selective? With a quick change of the rules, in the same way that the rules are being changed to break the link, we would suddenly have two local North Kingston secondary schools. Surely that would solve all the problems? I hope that you understand the position of the parents whose local schools are Teddington and Grey Court, and choose to keep the link to these schools until a suitable local alternative is found.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to lodge my lack of support for the proposed removal of the 'linked school' criteria for admissions in Teddington, Orleans Park and Grey Court School. I am a parent of two children at St Mary's and Peter's C of E school in Teddington; a daughter in year 4 and a son in year 1. I am also an employee of Waldegrave School for Girls in Twickenham, although the views expressed in this email are my own, and not that of the school. I have a number of concerns with this proposal:</p> <p>1. Effect on the children</p> <p>The current system allows for strong relationships within the borough between primaries and secondaries, and therefore provides excellent</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>continuity. These relationships could be fragmented with children going on to a number of different secondaries. Also, the importance of continuing friendships of children in their early teens should not be underestimated.</p> <p>2. The notice period</p> <p>The time frame in which this change is proposed is far too short. When I chose St Mary's and St Peter's for my children, I was entering into a system whereby their secondary school was already determined, not guaranteed I know, but with some degree of certainty. In August this year, we moved to Strawberry Hill from Teddington, still close to Teddington School, and 'safe' in the knowledge that this move wouldn't affect their eligibility to go to Teddington School. Now this consultation has started I fear we may be too far away, as many of the Kingston addresses will be closer. Our move was time-consuming, stressful and expensive and not something we plan to do again within the next couple of years. Our decision to do this may have been different had we known about this. I think it is only fair that parents who have already entered the school system on this premise should have their link school honoured. Therefore any removal of the link school should be known to parents WHEN ENTERING RECEPTION. To this end, I would say 7 years notice is much fairer, and even then, after full and frank consultation.</p> <p>3. The catchment area for Teddington School</p> <p>It is likely that many of the applications for Teddington School will come from the London Borough of Kingston. I understand from some research carried out by the SMSP governors that 3 Kingston primaries are closer than SMSP. As a priority, I believe that Richmond schools should serve the needs of Richmond children first and foremost. This proposal gives more choice to the parents in Kingston, whilst lessening ours.</p> <p>4. Academy Proposals</p> <p>It is very likely within the next few weeks that the Governing Bodies of the borough's secondary schools will vote in favour of becoming academies. As a result of this, they will each have some freedom over their admissions criteria. I believe the borough should wait until the schools have converted, and let them decide their admissions criteria. This will avoid further changes and disruption.</p> <p>5. New secondary schools</p> <p>Until a decision has been finalised regarding the location, intake, admissions criteria and opening date of the proposed secondaries in Twickenham and Kingston, I believe it is best to leave things as they are. There may be a need to review the admissions policy as a necessity in the near future. Currently there isn't, and in not changing it, this minimises disruption and prevents confusion.</p> <p>6. House price inequality across the borough</p> <p>The value of homes close to the more popular secondary schools will soar, making them inaccessible for many people. In addition, there will be black spots, where people have trouble selling family homes close to the less popular secondaries. I am already aware of this problem in</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>Hampton Hill, where the only comprehensive secondary school option is Hampton Academy; yet to prove itself under its new leadership. If this is already happening, it is only going to get much, much worse.</p> <p>7. Did we vote for this?</p> <p>I know the Sixth Form in schools proposal was an election pledge of the incumbent Conservative council, however, I don't remember a change to secondary school admissions being one of their policies. Apologies, and I stand corrected, if this is an oversight on my part. I do hope you consider my points, and those of others within the Borough of Richmond, ahead of those within Kingston, whom I suspect will be more supportive of the proposals. These proposed changes are unnecessary, and muddy the waters when so much else is going on within education in the borough. They distract us from the real issue, which is the overwhelming need for more places in outstanding schools. I know you have to deal daily with the demands of parents here in Richmond, but ultimately we all want the best for our children, which surely can only be a good thing.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Thank you for providing an opportunity to respond to the current consultation on the removal of the 'linked schools' criterion for admission to three of the borough's secondary schools. We recognise the efforts being made to improve the exam results of the secondary schools in the borough which perform relatively less well but it would appear likely that at least for the next few years that over-subscription to the most popular secondary schools will remain a problem. Given that context, we favour the removal of the linked school criterion for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current situation is inconsistent. For all but three secondary schools the two criteria which impact on most applications are sibling link and proximity. Removal of the linked schools criterion would make more a more transparent system, operating upon the same principles across the borough. 2. With the link criterion in operation, it seems there is no prospect of a non-linked primary school meeting the numerical criteria for establishing a link. In other words, future options are automatically predetermined by the historic decisions taken parents. 3. A higher proportion of children leave the borough's education system at 11 in some primary schools than in others. This, I believe, is a factor why in the past some primary schools have not been able to generate or maintain the numbers required for a link with their closest secondary schools. This is one important way in which the linked criterion operates in a perverse and unfair way. The choice for those children at a non linked primary school for whom selective or independent education is not an option is in effect been curtailed by the choices exercised by other parents to take their children out of the LBRuT system. 4. By making it more difficult for some children to go to their local mixed secondary school, the linked criteria is an additional factor which causes youngsters to have to make lengthy and sometimes complicated journeys. I think most parents would prefer for their children especially in the early years of their secondary education to have a simple short journey and this would also have a beneficial environmental impact where parents are driving their children to schools further away where there isn't a straight-forward public transport option. 5. It appears from reading the consultation document that the way in which the linked school criterion operates within the borough is relatively 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		unusual, not to say, anomalous, when considered along secondary admissions elsewhere in the country.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to object to the proposed changes to the linked school status that are currently being discussed. I have a son at St Mary's and St Peter's in Teddington and feel the proposed changes would limit his future school options.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of 2 children at St Mary's and St. Peter's School. I feel strongly about the retention of the linked school status in Teddington. I believe the intention was to retain the sense of community in this area. Teddington currently has a strong feeling of community a large part of which is fostered by the local schooling. Children can walk to their school with their peers and stay with them through their schooling. This was a large part of the reason we moved to Teddington from central London. We want our Teddington children to be able to go to "Teddington" school. Whilst the consultation document asserts that there are some Teddington children that don't get into Teddington school – there is nothing in the consultation document that shows that this unfairness would be remedied – nor is there anything that shows that greater unfairness would not be created by this change. Given the potential effect of the change proposed, I don't see how a chance can be taken like this. There are so many variables and unknowns. You cannot easily extrapolate from current decisions made by parents without know what their decision would have been if their child had/had not gone to a linked school. I am also not clear what viable option there would be for children from Teddington in terms of secondary schools. I don't feel I understand why this makes sense when it is not clear what effect it would have on secondary school places. I understand that the distance from school criteria is sensible (and most Teddington parents understand that they need to be within a certain distance of the school anyway) but when you look at the distribution of schools – this would seriously disadvantage Teddington children who may have to travel further to schools other areas don't favour. Presumably there will be a number of Ham children for whom it would be just as easy to get to Grey Court as Teddington but if Grey Court was the only option for a Teddington child (currently more likely to have a place given it is less popular) the journey could be prohibitive. The most sensible thing would seem to be to allow the plans to create a new Kingston and Twickenham School to go ahead and the effects understood before making such a radical change. Likewise – the standard of all the schools in the area should be at the same level so that parents make the choice you are talking about – i.e. sending their children to their local community school rather than a preferred school.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: My son is a pupil in year 3 at St Mary and St Peter's school in Teddington and we are strongly opposed to the proposal to remove the linked school status system which connects SMSP to Teddington School. As we live in Teddington and it is by far and away our closest school we would very much like our son to attend Teddington School. When we chose to send our son to SMSP 4 years ago this choice was partly based on the fact that the school was linked to Teddington School. Since then Teddington School's building programme has been completed and the school's popularity only increased so that without the linked school status our son might not get a place at the school even though it is our closest school. Instead he would have to travel a much greater distance to attend a school that was not necessarily our first choice. We feel badly let down by the council who seem to say one thing and act in a different way. When our son entered SMSP he was part of an 'emergency' bulge year, with the assurance that there would not another one, as this was a 'one off'. This proved to be untrue as another bulge year followed and then the school embarked on a major expansion process. It would have been nice to have known the true intentions behind the bulge year when our son was admitted to the school but at every stage we feel that the council and the school have said one thing but acted in a completely different way, making it difficult to establish the facts of the matter. Now it appears as if the secondary education we were assured of is in very real jeopardy. We are sceptical of the improvements which are promised in other schools. Teddington School remains our school of choice. However, it feels to us as if the council is disregarding parental choice in our case - whilst championing it for others - in our situation parental choice has effectively been taken out of our hands! Finally, we feel that the proposed start time for this change is far too soon. It does not give parents of children at existing linked schools enough time to change direction. If the linked school status is to be removed then surely it is fairer to timetable it 6 years or so in advance so that new parents entering into the primary school sector				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		do so with their eyes open and full awareness of the situation.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: My children currently attend a link school (St Mary's and St Peters) for Teddington School. My concern with regards this proposal is that Teddington School could potentially begin to service the education needs of areas in Kingston and Ham over and above the needs of families in some parts of central Teddington.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I write in support of the proposal to <u>remove</u> Linked Status of local schools.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I wish to protest strongly against the discontinuation of the school link system in Richmond. As a parent whose child has recently joined Chase Bridge Primary School I am very concerned that this will have a serious effect on my child's education. My main reason for sending my daughter to Chase Bridge was because the school was linked to Orleans Park Secondary School where my family and I also attended. I feel it would be extremely unfair and discriminatory to many families if you were to put us in a position that limits us on choice for our children's secondary education. When we made our choices for Primary Schools we did this with Secondary education in mind. I hope you take this email seriously and I would like you to think about the future education of our children and I urge you strongly to reconsider.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: You have requested responses to your consultation regarding a move away from the 'linked schools' criteria in favour of distance. From a review of you consultation document I can not see a compelling argument for change, and indeed see residence in the borough at risk of losing out. I can see no good reason to change the admissions criteria that has been successfully deployed since 1991 and formally confirm my objection to the proposal.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you to express my opposition to the proposed removal of the 'linked school' criterion from Grey Court and Teddington Schools' admissions policies. We live in North Kingston and, like many families in the area, have benefitted from the local junior schools' links to these excellent schools in Richmond Borough. If the links were removed it would mean many children in this area would have to travel further to secondary schools on the other side of Kingston Borough to attend a school where they are unlikely to know any other children and where they will probably receive an inferior education. The situation would have been alleviated by the proposed construction of a new secondary school in North Kingston but this has been shelved so we have no idea when, if ever, the new school will be ready. I understand that as a Kingston resident my opinion may not be important to Richmond Council but I feel too strongly to let the proposal pass without comment. I urge the Admissions Forum to recommend that the Council Cabinet reject the proposed changes at their meeting in March.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We are writing as parents of 3 primary school children to express our serious concern over the proposed change to the 2013/2014 admission arrangements for community schools within the borough. This change does nothing to address the underlying problem which is a lack of secondary school places in schools within the borough achieving good or outstanding assessments by Ofsted. This should be addressed, by ensuring the number of schools which have demonstrated this level of achievement is adequate, prior to changing the admissions criteria. Secondly families such as ours have already made decisions about where to live based upon the existing admissions approach and criteria. It is unreasonable and unfair to change this without giving adequate advance notice of the intention to make the change, and what criteria will be applied in future. Furthermore it will have the practical effect of reducing the catchment area for the most popular schools. This will put increased demand on primary school provision in these areas as parents seek to move into the reduced catchment area. It will drive up property prices in these areas reducing the diversity of pupils to those from wealthier backgrounds and limiting opportunity for those less well off. This is not appropriate for a community school.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4 and Proposal 5: In our particular case we are not happy with the proposal for a number of reasons. 1. Our daughter attends and was accepted into St Mary's Primary School from our current address which is Egerton Road which why we				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a schem primary the borou	Proposal 2: to retain the	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-o	Proposal 4: to introduce	Proposal 5: to retain the n
		<p>moved here. We live in Twickenham feel part of the Twickenham community and not Whitton. The catchment boundary is likely to fall within the Heatham area, and so split the local community</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. She presumes that she will now go to the school next door to Orleans Park with all her peers which is what we had presumed also. Although not currently old enough to walk to school on her own she will do so with her peers and would obviously do so at Orleans. We would not want her either walking or cycling down the A316 to Whitton Academy or would it practical for her to walk into Twickenham when she is over half way to Orleans to then catch the H22 to the Academy. 3. Your reasons for the change appear to be using a minority of children to bolster up the statistics of a school that is not doing so well – my understanding from local residents around us is that your predecessors asked the same for Orleans a few years back and most obliged to secure the future for children in Twickenham to go to a good state secondary school. Orleans is a Twickenham based school but it now appears you are pushing the boundaries out further to Richmond but on an un-fair basis and by not including Waldegrave Girls on a distance criteria it appears you are in danger of creating a “elitism catchment area”. 4. Other residents have already been told that Heathfield house prices will drop due to not being in the catchment area for good schools. 5. My daughter is dyslexic but is not severe enough to get statemented but receives additional support from St Mary’s backed up by feeling comfortable with her peers. I recently went to a presentation given by Orleans and know that she will also continue to receive the support she needs along with the fact the St Mary’s have strong links with Orleans. It is very important that she goes with the majority of her friends to the school as first set for the criteria of linked schools “guarantee children could transfer en bloc with their peers” The majority of her peers will get into Orleans as they do live slightly closer and although we are still within the “1800 metre” catchment would possibly not get by you extending the catchment area further into Richmond. 6. One of the reasons for buying our house was being accessible to St Marys and the secondary school link was also taken into consideration. Having this taken away would leave an option of moving house, but would cost tens of thousands in fees alone, and it is unreasonable to change the admission system in such short notice. Similarly, those living in the East knew the admissions system when they bought, and so should accept the situation (this is not "perpetuating unfairness". The assertion that "it isn't possible to consult on a change that would be implemented in three, four or more years' time" is an unacceptably lame excuse. This is exactly the time frame that such an important modification needs, and so your procedures need to change! 7. If the intention is to increase the number of places open to RuT borough residents, then why not just remove the link on the Hounslow schools? 8. Any changes to the admissions policy for Orleans must be consistent with that of Waldegrave. It would be unreasonable to remove the St Mary’s link status without also removing the Eastern catchment area for Waldegrave. This would leave Western Twickenham in a lose/lose situation, and Eastern Twickenham would be win/win. Your presentation mentions reforms in a co-ordinated way, and Waldegrave should be part of it. The assertion that this is the last chance for such a reform is ludicrous. <p>It feels a ridiculous situation that we are in that she got into St Marys and now the school that could not be any closer for secondary education could now be excluded for us.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to state our opposition to the proposal to remove the linked school policy (LSP) with specific reference to St Mary's and St Peter's and Teddington School for the following reasons;</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timescales - the timescale given for the removal of the LSP does not give sufficient time to make alternative arrangements which for some may include having to move house to be closer to their school of preference. Advance notice of more than a few months should be given to give parent's the opportunity to make such important decisions - current year 5 parents have to apply in October of this year giving only a few months between the decision date and the date of secondary application. • Continuity of education - It is beneficial for Year 7 children to enter a secondary school with children from their primary school – continuity of friendships is vital to successful transition to secondary school. - this will not be the case if the LSP is withdrawn and children from Ham and Kingston primary schools will be eligible on the distance criteria for a place at Teddington school and will have come from primary schools not in Teddington and as a result less places will be available for children from SMSP at Teddington school. There will no longer be that continuity of friendships as children who live in different parts of Teddington will not secure a place at Teddington School. • Changes in Secondary Schools - as Teddington is currently going through the academy consultation process and as stated in your document which if it goes ahead then it would then be able to set their own admission arrangements from 2014/2015 onwards then there is a possibility that the whatever is decided for 2013 could change again in 2014 and continuity would be lost for the sake of one year and would adversely effect those children transferring in 2013. In addition there is mention of new schools in North Kingston and Twickenham, both of which if go ahead wii offer more choice for parents in Kingston and Twickenham, but again children living in north/west Teddington, Hampton Hill and Hampton would not benefit from these new schools and without the LSP policy would not be close enough on distance to gain a place at Teddington School. • House prices - the removal of of the LSP would mean that children can attend a primary school anywhere in the borough and then move near Teddington school and automatically get a place at the school which will make the house prices even more out of reach for the average person and will favour people who are able to afford to live near Teddington school where the majority of houses are more expensive than other parts of Teddington. <p>Although we agree that which ever system is in place there will be winners and losers and no system is satisfactory to all whilst ever parents feel they do not have a choice in their child's education. All the schools are not the same in the borough and not all schools suit every child but to base your child's secondary school choice purely on distance to school is not in the best interest of the child. When making the decision which primary school to send our children to this decision was also based on the linked secondary school and that is why when we moved from Teddington to Hampton over 4 years ago we made the decision to keep our youngest daughter at SMSP in order that she would be able to go to Teddington school where her brother and sister attended and not move her to a primary school in Hampton. Now to hear that there is a chance the linked school policy is possibly going to be removed for admissions in 2013 the year that our daughter would be starting year 7 is very distressing. Based on distance we would not get a place at Tedddington or Waldegrave and our daughter would be given a place at our closest school Hampton Academy where non of her primary school friends will be going. If we had known about the proposed removal of the LSP we could have made a more informed decision about whether to move her from a primary school in Teddington to one in Hampton or indeed whether to have moved to Hampton at all.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		Changing school admissions policy has a huge impact on children and their futures and we feel that not enough notice has been given in order for parent's to be able to make such important decisions and would ask you to re consider your proposal to remove the LSP for the 2013 admission and wait until the academy consultation process has concluded at Teddington and decisions on the proposed new secondary schools are made and then give at least two academic years notice that the LSP is to be withdrawn.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my alarm and concern at the proposal to remove the link between Orleans Park School and my daughters primary school - Chase Bridge. We moved to the area at great expense and decided on our house for the one reason that it would ensure our daughter got a place at Chase bridge school and our choice for this primary school was the link with Orleans Park School. Where we have always hoped that our children would continue on to their secondary education. We have invested our life savings, sweat and tears, now only to be faced with the nightmare of the link being removed if the proposal to remove the linked primary schools goes ahead. There is no way that we as a family can afford to move any nearer to Orleans Park. Our hopes and plans for our children's education would be dashed, causing unnecessary strain and heartache. Should the link system remain in place we still have no guarantees that our daughter will get a place at Orleans Park, but we will have done all we can to give her a good chance with the current admissions system. If the primary school links are removed, it will turn our lives upside down. I sincerely hope that you will take into account our situation which is the same as hundreds of other families in the borough.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I'm writing to note that, as a Vineyard parent, I'm strongly opposed to Richmond Council's link school policy. The policy goes against the basic principles of meritocracy, equality and fairness which, in my view should guide policy throughout society. Hence I would like this policy to be abolished as soon as possible.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to formally disagree with the Council's proposal to remove the link status from primary schools to Teddington. My 3 children attend St Mary's and St Peter's School in Teddington and I wholeheartedly agree with the arguments portrayed by our governors in their consultation document. With all the changes to both primary (particularly the huge increase in children) and secondary schools in the local area in recent years - I feel that it would be the wrong decision to add more uncertainty to the transition to secondary.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We would like to lodge our opposition to the plan to stop the link schools from Chase Bridge.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I just wanted to register our opposition to the proposal to alter the linked schools system of admissions for Teddington school. With the route of access to the school by which Ham residents are closest being pedestrian only, the change would result in a major increase in traffic to the area, since many parents of the youngest children are unlikely to want them to walk across the common on dark evenings. Meanwhile, excluded Teddington residents would then have a much greater distance to travel to reach their allocated school, further increasing the volume of traffic in Teddington. This displacement will benefit Kingston council tax payers at the expense of Richmond council tax payers, with Teddington residents unable to attend Teddington School - a very disappointing outcome. Perhaps distance, if felt to be the most appropriate admissions criteria should be measured via public transport routes, rather than distance on foot only.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: With reference to the proposed changes for the over subscription criteria for Grey Court, Orleans Park and Teddington secondary schools, I would like you to record that I do NOT support the proposal. Linked primary schools were introduced to ensure that a large proportion of students reap the benefits of educational continuity by transferring to a secondary school with their peers. I fully support the maintenance of this approach. The proposed alternative will be detrimental to those children impacted.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you to ask for Richmond Council's link school policy to be abolished. My daughter is a pupil at Vineyard Primary School. It was the outstanding quality of the primary schools such as Vineyard and Marshgate and the reputation of secondary schools such as				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls												
		<p>Orleans Park that drew us to the borough. However I am horrified to now learn that by accepting the place at Vineyard my daughter will be at a severe disadvantage when moving on to a state secondary school because Vineyard is not 'linked' to a secondary school. I have learnt we have very limited options because, on the basis of historic numbers, out of borough pupils have access to the Richmond secondary schools that are denied to borough families. It's been drawn to my attention that in 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing local authority nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. This is a very sorry statistic for the borough where our primary schools' performance tops National League tables of results and [they] are the envy of other London boroughs. It seems very wrong in principle to restrict a child's educational choice at 11-16 based on the school they attend at the age of 4. I understand Richmond is the last London borough to operate this scheme, Harrow Council having dropped it in favour of allocating places by distance. This seems an awful lot fairer to me. I hope you will put an end to this discriminatory system.</p>																
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We want to make a strong objection to the removal of link status for Teddington school for a number of reasons. We fully agree with the letter provided to you from our daughters primary school, St. Mary's and St. Peter's Primary School, in Teddington as written by Cllr. Knight. Our daughter is in year 3 and will be impacted by the changes the council is proposing. We have lived in Teddington for 11 years, it is our home and there should be NO doubt that we have the option to educate our daughter in Teddington given that schools are available at both the primary and secondary levels. The council has expanded ALL 3 of Teddington's primary schools and Hampton Wick Infants recently. Where shall all of these children go to secondary school if not Teddington? The fundamental issue with this proposal is that Teddington school, due to its physical location, will no longer be a school for Teddington families. Based simply on proximity, the school will be flooded with applications from Kingston and Ham. Where does the council propose Teddington children go for secondary education if not TEDDDINGTON school? Waldegrave is currently girls only and heavily oversubscribed. Is it true that Richmond council receive money from Hounslow council for Waldegrave places offered to girls from that borough? Will Kingston and Ham councils be paying Richmond council for children attending Teddington school as this school in our borough? It seems that borough schools should provide places for the children in its borough before offering to children in others. Offering school places should not be a money making proposition but a logical, sensible approach to best educating children in our borough. If it is money making than there is a risk that Richmond council will favour a number of places being provided to other boroughs each term to generate revenue instead of educating children in Richmond being the first priority. We pay very high council taxes and have done for 11 years. We expect to educate our child in our borough.</p> <p>http://www.channel4.com/news/richmond-tops-bill-for-council-tax-payments</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010</th> <th>Est Cost Per Head</th> <th>Estimated Council Tax per dwelling</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Richmond</td> <td>£751</td> <td>£1,779</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kingston</td> <td>£617</td> <td>£1,696</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hounslow</td> <td>£515</td> <td>£1,304</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					2010	Est Cost Per Head	Estimated Council Tax per dwelling	Richmond	£751	£1,779	Kingston	£617	£1,696	Hounslow	£515	£1,304
2010	Est Cost Per Head	Estimated Council Tax per dwelling																
Richmond	£751	£1,779																
Kingston	£617	£1,696																
Hounslow	£515	£1,304																

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		Councils prevent us from using waste sites in other boroughs but education is free game. Priorities and logic seems askew. What is the ultimate purpose of removing the link status now and in such a short time frame? This is particularly frustrating when the council has no new secondary school places to offer those that will miss out, especially the non-Catholics. This is unfair to Teddington parents whose Teddington primary school children are approaching their secondary years and have expectations (realistic one must admit) of educating their children at Teddington School. (Especially us Richmond Council tax payers.)				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing because I support the proposed abolition of the link school policy, I believe it has discriminated against children in the Richmond Borough. We have recently moved to the borough and accepted a place for our twins at the Vineyard school, a few months later we bought a home in St Margarets erroneously thinking we would be in the catchment for Orleans Park School when our twins were old enough to attend. I recently found out I have found out we would have to move our children AGAIN to a linked school to gain a place at a school that is a stone's throw away.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my opinion on the Linked School Policy. I have two children currently attending The Vineyard primary school and my eldest child is at senior school in Wimbledon, having been at The Vineyard since reception. I feel very strongly that the LSP should be abolished and the distance the child lives from school to be the main criteria for allocation of placement for secondary school. We have lived in Park Road, East Twickenham for 15 years and were very disappointed when our eldest child was not offered a place at Orleans Infant school for reception in 2004, as it was our closest primary school and Hugo had also attended the nursery in 2003. The allocation of Hugo's reception place with the current LSP, then continues to dictate where he and my other two children can attend secondary school as The Vineyard school has no links to a secondary school. Although we have been extremely happy that our children ended up at The Vineyard, I feel it is unfair that your proximity to a secondary school is barely taken into account. Richmond being the only London borough to continue with the Linked School Policy, would seem to need to change this to make the system a little fairer.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you to add my support to the case for abolishing the existing link school policy. In both my capacity as a north-St Margarets living, Vineyard-parent and in my role as a parent governor at the Vineyard, I feel very strongly that this policy is now outdated, defunct, unfair and discriminatory towards many of the borough's children. As the council's consultation document clearly states, the policy is no longer able to do what it was set up to do i.e. the policy is broken and needs to be repaired/replaced. In addition, Vineyard is one of 10 primary schools in the borough whose children are discriminated against in the transfer to secondary school, because of the decisions made; or patterns of transfer established, in previous years. These children are denied places at secondary schools on the basis of whether their school is linked or not - something that these young people have no control over. How can that be fair? We all know how admissions to the borough primary schools have been affected by the population expansion in recent years. There must be numerous children (including my own daughter) who have been placed in bulge classes some distance from their home, perhaps at a school without link status. If the linked school policy is allowed to continue, how many of these children will YET AGAIN miss out on their choice of school, because they were unable to secure a place in their nearest local primary school? Also, how many more children (and their desperate parents) will be put through the unnecessary upheaval of transferring from a non-linked to a linked primary school, in an attempt to position themselves with the best 'chance' of securing the secondary school place of their choice. I urge you and the Council to listen to the parents and children of this borough and remove the link school policy so that admissions criteria work properly and are equally fair going forward.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you with reference to the change of Orleans admissions policy. My husband and I would like to voice our strong opposition to this proposal. We have lived in this area for 9 years. One of the main reasons for our decision to live in Twickenham was the policy of linked secondary schools. With this proposed change we have lost any choice for our two daughters. The curriculum approach at Twickenham academy is untried, its very experimental, where as the curriculum at Orleans is traditional and highly successful. As I'm sure you				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		know Orleans Ofsted in November 2010 outstanding. "This is because it delivers an excellent quality of education which has enabled students to reach high standards" this is what we would expect for our daughters. If this policy is implemented, in order to gain any choice of secondary school for my children we will have to plan to move out of the borough. This is a real shame as we enjoy being part of this community, we have built good friendships.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I refer to the Consultation on School Admission Arrangements for 2013/14 entry and, in particular, the proposal to remove the Secondary Linked School Status. I live in Teddington and am the mother of two children, the oldest of which is in the reception year at St Mary's and St Peter's Church of England School. I am opposed to the proposal to remove the "linked school" oversubscription criterion with respect to Teddington Secondary School for the reasons provided by the St Mary's and St Peter's Board of Governors in their response to the proposal. In particular, I am opposed to the proposed timing of the changes and would refer you to the comments made by the St Mary's and St Peter's Governors in item 3 of their submission. I am a parent who has very recently been in the position of having to make a decision on school places and the existence of the current "linked school" system strongly influenced my final decision. Being a Roman Catholic, if the current situation with respect to linked school status had not been a factor, I would have chosen St James' RC school as my first choice primary school when applying for a reception place for my son. However, as it appeared that this would most likely rule out my son obtaining a secondary school place at Teddington School (and there being no Catholic secondary school in the Borough) I made the decision to put a Church of England school as my first choice so that my son would at least stand a good chance of obtaining a secondary school place at his local secondary. As a result, it would be very frustrating for me (and, I am sure, for other Teddington parents) if the system were to change between now and my son reaching year 7, as it would negate the principal criterion upon which I chose my child's primary school (which in turn filters down to my second child whom I would want to send to the same primary school as her brother).				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of a child attending Latchmere Junior School and would like to respond to the consultation regarding the proposed removal of the 'linked school' criterion from the oversubscription criteria for Grey Court, Orleans Park and Teddington. If 'home to school distance' would instead be the main criterion for determining allocations for the three schools, where will all the children from our Schools in North Kingston go? I would like you to include in your consultation that most parents DO NOT AGREE to the proposals for ending this 'link'.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my concern regarding the above suggested changes. Removing the 'linked' status from schools such as St Mary's & St Peter's primary school in Teddington will soon make it impossible for local parents to get their children in to a local state secondary school. The only other state school in the area is Waldegrave School for girls and I have three sons... Paying for private secondary schools for my three children would be financially challenging (if not completely impossible!). I therefore strongly oppose these proposed changes.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to formally object to the loss of the link system which links primary schools to senior schools.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my personal support of the proposed abolition of the link school policy. I am a parent of reception aged children attending the Vineyard Primary School and believe the current linked schools policy discriminates against children, like my own, who happen to attend an unlinked primary school. To clarify my understanding of the issue: 1. The link system is flawed in that it determines my child's eligibility for a place at a secondary school based on decisions made, in previous years, by families totally unrelated me, or my child. I understand that, historically, The Vineyard has seen a large proportion of pupils transfer to private schools or move out of the area and that as a result it has never managed to establish a link under the current LSP				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a schem primar the	Proposal 2: to retain the	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-o	Proposal 4: to introduce	Proposal 5: to retain the n
		<p>rules. Further, as I understand, under the current system, even if more than 25% of current Y6 families wanted to send their children to one of the local Secondary schools and, even if they lived very close to the school in question, those schools, required to provide priority to pupils from linked schools and currently over subscribed, would be unlikely to offer a place to sufficient (or indeed any) Vineyard pupils thus further perpetuating our unlinked status. Children at the Vineyard who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils.</p> <p>2. I understand it is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, while children who may live in the streets surrounding a borough Secondary school, for example, may be unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places, by the council, at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP.</p> <p>It is worth noting that with current over subscription to borough primary schools very few families have any choice over which primary school they attend, linked or unlinked. In my recent experience parents with children in reception just feel grateful their children have a place at a local school. I am aware however, anecdotally, of several families in East Twickenham, for example, who have moved their children during Junior school from the Vineyard to St Stephens specifically because of fear that the linked school system would otherwise discriminate against them. This is a symptom of the LSP and , where it happens, can only be disruptive to the primary schools, the children and the families involved.</p> <p>3. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my voice to the growing number of parents concerned by the proposed removal of the linked school criteria for Grey Court School and Teddington School. I currently have two children at Latchmere school, and due to a change in family circumstances we were forced to move to South Kingston earlier this year. This now means that, under the removal of linked school criteria, my children will be in a position of being unable to attend Grey Court school with the majority of their fellow classmates. Secondary school commencement is an unsettling and frightening time for some children and I firmly believe that the stability and comfort that they receive from having familiar faces around has a hugely positive impact. As the daughter of a family of secondary school teachers, I can confirm that many teachers would share this view wholeheartedly.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to place my objection to ending this link. If the link ends it is very likely that many of the children from St Mary's and St Peter's School would not get places at Teddington School. I currently have a son at Teddington School and would my daughter to go the in Sept 2013.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a St Mary's parent, I am opposed to the proposal of ending the linked schools criteria that has been in place between Orleans Park School and St Mary's. I feel it would be detrimental to the nature of the balance of children that attend St Mary's – all of whom</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		come from a very specific local area and who should have direct access to their local secondary school. Children between Orleans and St Mary's invariably mix due to locality, after school clubs, friendships made elsewhere and so on - they are able to walk to school, to use the local parks and they benefit from a shared sense of community, both in the village of St Margarets and Twickenham town. I object to the proposal and hope that others do the same!				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We live in Beresford Avenue in East Twickenham but as our children do not go to St Stephen's or St Mary's primary school are unable to obtain a place at our local, walkable, secondary school Orleans Park due to the current linked schools system. While I understand that there must be some rules to manage the large application numbers and limited places, it seems illogical that the children that live closest are unable to attend the school, especially when there is such a lottery to get into the linked primary schools. In our environmentally aware age, it seems crazy that our children cannot just walk to their nearest school. Under the current system mine will have to catch a bus or train to get to school. It also seems inconsistent with the application process for Primary school applications where your location does count. Most importantly it penalizes children who have moved into the borough as your entire education is set by where you get into primary school as 4 years old! I appreciate this is no easy task and that not everyone can be pleased but there must be logic in allowing local children to attend local schools. As well as being fair it helps builds local communities which are priceless.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to express, through this email, my objection to Richmond Council's link school system. I believe this system not to be in line with the interests of parents and students from the borough and in fact believe it to be inequitable and discriminatory to the families and pupils from schools in Richmond. This system is forcing our children to attend secondary school in accordance to the decision of previous families, from other generations and facing potentially other type of challenges, and I am in fact concerned that statistically those families are not representative of the reality that each pupil is facing when leaving Y6. I also believe the sample of families applying for state school is very reduced in comparison to the entire community. A lot of people are choosing private education and also moving outside the borough when their children reach that level of education. As such we, Richmond families, are not given the correct weight in terms of representation of provenience in what primary school is concerned. Finally, it is apparent that no other London borough operates this scheme, what supports my point above, and that statistics show that Richmond is in the tail of the country in regards to fulfilling preferences from application forms for this purpose. As such I would ask you to please consider the abolishment of this link school policy.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my opposition to the proposed removal of 'linked school' status for St Mary's and St Peter's Church of England Primary School (SMSP) in Teddington. My son is currently in Year 3 at SMSP and I am massively disappointed that there is a proposal to have this link removed. Had we known about this when he was enrolled we could have made an informed decision. One of the primary reasons he was enrolled at SMSP was the linked status with Teddington.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I wish to express my objection to the current Linked School Policy practised within the borough. As a parent of children attending an 'unlinked' school, it is clear to see that the practice is advantageous to some pupils and not to others. I would be interested to hear how the borough justifies the practice of not offering equal opportunities to all its residents. The school and its governors have set out their formal objections, which I wholeheartedly support. I understand that parents of children attending linked schools are likely to be unhappy if the system which clearly works in their favour is abolished, but in modern society, where we are all supposed to be treated equally and given access to the same opportunities, surely the time has come for the last bastion of this unfair system to succumb to change and allow all children in the borough an equal opportunity.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: In regard to the current consultation over the linked school system I would like to add my support to those wishing to maintain the linked school system.				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent whose children go to the Vineyard school, and I support the proposed abolition of the link school policy, which I believe is inequitable and which has discriminated against pupils and their families for several years. This is because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The link system is fundamentally flawed in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to that child, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. For a school such as The Vineyard with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that it can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. I believe that my children who will probably transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for my children. 2. It is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, while children who live in the streets surrounding Orleans Park are unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places by the council at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP. 3. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. 4. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP. 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent whose child attends Latchmere school which has historically been a linked school with Grey Court School. I <u>object</u> to proposed change to remove linked school because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My child may not to be placed in a secondary school if the change occurred. • We accepted a place at Latchmere School on the basis that Grey Court was linked to Latchmere School and any change to that would be contrary and lessening of our agreement when we accepted a place at Latchmere School. <p>We do not agree with a proposal to remove the linked school status, should a change occur then it should be planned well into the future so as not to affect any children at primary school i.e. any change <u>should not occur until 2019/2020</u>, parents would have the opportunity to plan accordingly with any primary school choice and know if that were or not linked to a secondary school.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to object to the proposal to remove the linked school status for North Kingston Schools such as Latchmere. This will affect the chance for both my children to attend Grey Court and also leaves us in the position of not having a "local" non selective state school. I wonder why it is so impossible for Kingston and Richmond to work together on finding a solution to this, to find a way in which the children of both boroughs can access their nearest state school.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have reviewed the consultation paper and would like to add my voice to the feeling that removing the 'Linked School' status would have a negative impact on Grey Court and the primary schools in Kingston. I have three children at Latchmere, who I hope will attend Grey Court, if they do not then I have no idea where they will go, as we have no local school in North Kingston (a matter of long debate and consultation in and of itself I know). The relationship between Latchmere and Grey Court has been a long one and allows both Latchmere and Grey Court to build strong relationships between pupils, staff and head teachers. Without this linked status who will Latchmere build relationships with, how will they prepare their Y6 pupils for transition.... As you state in your own consultation paper when these schools take on academy status they will be allowed to set their own admissions criteria, so within a period of 3 years we will have to embrace two major changes, potentially affecting all three of my children. Without a proper alternative of a North Kingston secondary school I think this is short term and unnecessary change.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Both my husband and I feel that the 'linked school' criterion between borough schools should be removed. Having read the documentation removal of the links seems a much fairer way of allocating places.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to register my concerns about the plan by Richmond Council to remove the linked schools criteria for admission to Teddington and Grey Court in 2013. My child currently attends St Paul's Junior School in Kingston. Whilst I can appreciate that we do not reside in the Borough of Richmond St Paul's has been linked with Teddington for 19 years and has sent the required number of children year upon year to maintain this link. In terms of geography Teddington and Grey Court are our nearest state secondary schools. I have spent the last 5 years in the belief that my child's primary school was linked to Teddington and that they would go to school there as has happened in every year 6 class preceding us. If the linked school criterion is removed it is extremely unlikely that any children from St Pauls will get a place at Teddington or Grey Court thus leaving us with no school place at all. As you can imagine this is rather worrying as we have only a 6 month period after the outcome of the consultation on 22nd March 2012 to find an alternative school. Would it not be possible for Richmond to leave the linked school criteria in place for a further period to give sufficient notice to parents to make alternative arrangements? Ideally could the linked schools system be maintained until North Kingston has a Secondary School which is currently under consultation?</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of two children at Latchmere School, which is currently linked with Grey Court. I am writing to OBJECT to the removal of the linked school status between Latchmere and Grey Court until a clear decision has been made on the delivery of a new secondary school in North Kingston. Removing this link now would reduce the choice for North Kingston parents and in the absence of a new secondary school, would be short sighted. Once a new school has been delivered, this arrangement should of course be reviewed. I believe that the removal of this link will limit choices for North Kingston parents because it will reduce the extent of the overall catchment for Grey Court in those parts of North Kingston that are furthest away from Grey Court by distance (particularly those living at the southern end, closest to the town centre). Overall, this will lead to less choice for North Kingston parents.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to raise an objection to the closing of the link to Orleans Park School, I was hoping my daughter could go there as her brother had such a wonderful experience at that school, as have most of my neighbours children still attending the school, and our choices for our children would be very limited, please please reconsider.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We wish to voice our objection to the removal of the current link school system. We have read the documentation provided by Richmond and have attended the meeting you held at St Mary's Junior school so do feel informed about the proposal and the reasoning behind it. We have two children, one in Orleans infant school and one at St Stephens's school. It is our opinion that the removal of the link school status will not make things fairer at all. It will further disadvantage children who live in North St Margarets and who have already experienced extreme difficulty in attaining both infant school places and then in many cases junior school places. We understand that your modelling shows that "the likelihood" is that children as far as the Hounslow border would gain access to Orleans Park School but we note that your modelling</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>was done on the year that has just entered the Orleans Park and on the current year five groups who will be affected first by the proposed change. However the years that follow that cohort, from the current year fours, are likely to have far greater difficulty because there are considerably more of them. We understand that if, as seems likely, the school is by then an academy, it will be able to make its own admissions criteria for this year group and we understand that the governing body have expressed some reservation about this plan because of the disadvantage to the children of North St Margarets. We would certainly like to see modelling done on the situation for North St Margarets children from year four onwards. We understand the legal requirement to make a change only one year in advance but in our opinion that is an extremely unfair requirement. People make decisions about where to live based on a number of criteria, amongst which are clearly the quality of the local schools and their accessibility from the local neighbourhood. On the whole a family home, the most expensive purchase any of us is ever likely to make, is not seen as a temporary measure. Decisions have to be made according to the information and the rules in place at that time. As families we might buy a family home within a catchment area for a primary and or secondary school and we depend on those rules staying the same. With the short time between proposal and implementation, even if the family ties were of no consideration, it is simply not possible to relocate within the time between the change of rules and the application process. This means that children who have gone through a primary school with a cohort of children and an expectation that they would stay together in secondary school will find themselves having to go to a different school with a different group of children. As we understand it one of the main reasons for creating link schools was to ensure this didn't happen. If some of these children are from North St Margarets one might assume that they will go the Twickenham Academy instead. Not only will they be isolated from their current peer group, but they will have a very difficult journey to school as it is too far to walk and there is no bus link. If no change is made the children from East Twickenham will continue on to secondary school with the cohort they have been with through primary school. We have heard clearly in your presentation that one of the gains would be that the school places will stay in borough. In reality it is not as simple as has been implied. There are children who reside in the streets running from the A316 up to Old Isleworth who are in Hounslow Borough but who live closer to Orleans Park than some of the children for example living in the Richmond Lock developments. The way that Hounslow allocates its places means that the children who live on these borders (either side) are disadvantaged. As both boroughs work to ensure they are only educating children living within their borders, children who live close to the borders seem to fall into a grey area and are at the end of the list in both areas. The children of East Twickenham do have other alternatives that they are able to reach on public transport. Indeed the girls in East Twickenham also benefit from being able to access Waldegrave Girls School. This is not the case for the girls of North St Margarets, despite Waldegrave being described as a resource for the whole borough. Finally it seems like a waste of money, time and effort to try to bring about change for one year, before handing over to the academies. Since this is the most likely prospect and since they will have control over other aspects of the schools (such as how many children should be admitted) it seems to me to be much more sensible to wait for one further year and let the academies make the decisions about admissions criteria in more co-ordinated way.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would just like to register my response to the removal of the linked school criteria. I do not agree with this as I feel it will have an adverse affect on myself and other children in the area. From my own perspective, we only have one child and live on Tudor Drive [in north Kingston] so would only be covered by the 'home to school distance' criterion which would mean we may not get a place. As there are so few secondary school places in the area this could potentially have a significant affect on our quality of life.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We write to <u>support the proposed removal of the link school policy</u>. As parents of a Vineyard School pupil, we feel that the current linked schools system is unfair. The current linked school system does not ensure that Vineyard School pupils have equal access to secondary schools in the borough to that of some of the other primary schools in the area. It seems completely wrong, in our opinion, that some out of borough applicants have more chance of getting into the borough's secondary schools than some in-borough applicants who attend the Vineyard school just because it is not linked to a secondary school. It would seem that distance from home to school is the fairest way to</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		allocate school places and this should be the adopted policy in the Richmond borough, as is the case in all other London boroughs. We hope that this view will be taken into consideration when coming to a decision and we ask that the proposal for the removal of the linked school policy is supported.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have to write to say that the links to Grey Court, Orleans and Teddington school should remain. I understand the concerns behind the number of children applying to these schools and that this is not a long term solution but if the links are removed in 2013/14 I believe it does not give schools and parents enough time. If a link is removed other solutions should be found and brought in over a longer period of time. Living in North Kingston Grey Court is our closest state run secondary school and until other provisions are made in North Kingston for secondary education, these links should remain. We can not all afford, or wish, for our children to go to Kingston Grammar or the likes of Tiffin. Grey Court, Teddington and Orleans Schools are very good schools which our children would be proud to go to.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing as a father of a son in Year 4 at St Paul's C of E school in Kingston, to express my concern about the plan to remove the linked schools criterion which currently gives pupils at St Paul's a chance of entry to Teddington school. Kingston is particularly hard hit by the distribution of secondary schools - especially since the only state school for boys in the area, Tiffin boys, has no distance criterion for entry at all, meaning that only one or two children a year from St Paul's gain entry there. For girls (we have two), the situation is little better, since apart from the oversubscribed Coombe Girls School, Tiffin girls has the same lack of distance criteria as Tiffin boys. The delay in progress of the establishment of a new secondary school for the area means the timing of this proposal is particularly unfortunate. I would be grateful if you would strongly consider delaying the change in criteria until the situation in Kingston borough's own schools improves.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to oppose the proposed removal of LINK status for St Mary's and St Peter's School in Teddington with Teddington School. Our son currently attends SMSP and one of our goals with him attending that school was to have the established benefit of continuity and stability in his move to secondary schooling. Transfer to secondary school is a difficult and often stressful time for young people and the reassurance of having an established peer group with him would be invaluable. By removing the LINK status our son would be extremely unlikely to get a place at Teddington School (based on the rising demand for places, proximity to school etc) and would thus be thrown into a new environment with children he does not know. I would respectfully request that you re-consider the proposed removal of LINK status.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of two kids, (year 5) and (year 2) who are studying at Chase Bridge Primary School in Whitton, Middlesex. I am very disappointed and sorry to hear that there is a proposition to disconnect Orleans Secondary School as a link school for Chase Bridge Primary School. We are totally against the proposition and believe that our school has every right both academically and location wise to be at most priority to be linked with the Orleans Secondary School. We as parents hope that your authority will grant our concerns and will make your decision on keeping Orleans Secondary School as our link school.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I write to contribute to the consultation on the potential removal of link schools in the borough of Richmond. I respond in particular to the position of Teddington School as a parent of children attending St Mary's and St Peter's (SMSP) primary school. First off I would like to express my concern over the analysis of the potential impact of the removal of link status presented in the consultation document. The analysis based on recent applications, presents the actual likely position erroneously and I consider it to be a misjudged presentation. Without considering the likely impact of additional applications from the parents of children who do not attend currently linked schools presents a position that would not be reflected in reality. As I am sure you are aware application behaviour is strongly driven by the likelihood of success and parents of children not attending currently linked schools living close to Teddington School would not bother to apply to Teddington currently as they stand no chance of receiving a place. Removing the link will mean that these numerous children will apply and stand a high chance of obtaining a place ahead of those currently attending link schools further from the school (such as ourselves). Without proper analysis of this impact I do not think the consultation is properly informed and therefore should be rerun. Any rerun would be likely to show that under a				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>non linked school situation children there will be a substantial shift in the location of children attending Teddington School. It is likely to show that my children would stand a substantially reduced (if any) chance of attending Teddington School without an attending sibling. Teddington School is the local school for the town and the basis upon which our housing decisions have been made. I see no compelling reason for such a dramatic intake shift breaking historical relationships between schools. The timing of the proposed change provides little opportunity for proper consultation and consideration and as such I would suggest any change be considered under an extended period providing the opportunity for more gathering of data, consultation and the ability of parents to plan for the change. A benefit of the link status is that it reduces the housing pressure directly around the school as the attendees are able to live over a wider range of locations related to the primary school intake. The prioritisation on location by secondary schools within link schools criteria ensures that current housing location is taken into consideration. I would therefore consider that the proposed change would have an increased negative impact on housing closer to Teddington School and reduce the opportunities of many children in the borough to attend Teddington School. Furthermore as a parent of both girls and a boy the removal of link status would highlight to us the problem of falling within the 'catchment' of both Waldegrave and Teddington. Under the new arrangements I doubt any family would qualify to get children to attend both of those schools further reducing parental choice. I recognise as legitimate any concerns over the preferential treatment of those attending local churches in the criteria for admittance into linked schools such as SMSP, which could be shown to lead to their ultimate preferential admittance on that basis to Teddington under the linked schools system. I consider the current SMSP religion based intake criteria to be indefensible and would propose that any such concerns be directed at correcting this position rather than denying the children attending SMSP from attending Teddington School. In summary I therefore consider the consultation to be misinformed, the proposed change to be inappropriately timed, I consider that the impact of the change will be very much more substantial than presented and that the ultimate impact in relation to Teddington School will be to replace places currently provided to children in Teddington to children in Kingston and Ham with no compelling reason for doing so put forward. For the record I currently have one girl attending Waldegrave (Y7), a girl in Y5 at SMSP and a boy in Y1 at SMSP. We have no religious affiliation and as a Charity sector worker and the sole breadwinner, we are in no position to relocate to further our school attendance wishes. I strongly feel that the current proposal should be rejected and the link school system be retained. I therefore do not support the proposed over subscription criteria for community mixed secondary schools.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to object strongly to the council's proposal to remove the link school status between St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School and Teddington School. There are a number of reasons for this objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Richmond Borough residents will lose places at Teddington School to residents from out-of-borough (specifically Kingston). In turn this will significantly alter admission patterns to other Richmond Borough schools, putting more pressure on already oversubscribed schools including Waldegrave. 2. Primary school decisions and decisions of where Richmond residents have chosen to live have been made on the basis of this linked school status. A change for 2013 is not enough time for parents to plan, particularly for parents like us of a child currently in Year 5. 3. Children moving up to secondary school together keep friendships and maintain better levels of community. This is especially true for children who are currently in Year 5 who have assumed throughout their Primary school education that they would be moving up as a group to secondary school together. It is unfair that a change this significant could be sprung upon them with so little notice. <p>We strongly believe that a removal of link status with such short notice is wholly unacceptable to so many residents of Richmond Borough who, like us, have made very important decisions on the basis that that link status exists.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We would urge you to reconsider the proposal to remove the link school status Latchmere has with Grey Court. As the only non selective secondary school serving North Kingston it leaves little option within a reasonable catchment area should the link be severed.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am not going to set out all the criteria; you know why you shouldn't abolish the link status between Chase Bridge and Orleans. Please don't do it.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As a Stanley Primary School parent and a Teddington resident dropping the Link to Teddington School, and the fact that I live over a mile away from the school. means that I will have a very slim chance of the newly built school being an option for my child. This will undoubtedly be compounded by the fact that many Kingston Borough schools will now perhaps be closer geographically to Teddington school, and if the new Kingston school doesn't get approval the pressure for places will be even greater. Is it right that Kingston residents could potentially have a greater chance of getting into a Richmond Borough School than Richmond Borough residents? By maintaining the link this problem would be overcome. You may argue that there is capacity at Twickenham Academy and that I should support other Richmond Borough schools, and you would have a point. But on the other hand why would the Council fund a Catholic VA school on the Clifden Road site creating even less potential options for 90% of Borough's children but significantly increasing the options for Catholic parents, i.e. a Community School, Catholic School outside of the Borough and a Catholic school in the Borough. In light of the expansion of so many of our Primary schools, the potential decrease in the number of parents being able to afford to send their children to private school, and as yet no real plans for further secondary capacity other than Catholic, the space pressure faced by schools if they are to have sixth forms and the potential impact of that Y7 capacity, I would strongly argue that either Clifden Road has an inclusive admissions policy or you maintain the link school policy.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have briefly read the document relating to the removal of linked status for Chase Bridge Primary School to Orleans Park. It mentions that this will be the only change to the admissions process. I do have a concern as I will be applying for my daughter to attend this school for 2014 and this will affect her chances of getting a place. She will have a brother at the school so the criteria will be taken into consideration but I am still worried.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As parents of children at or soon to go to St Mary's & St Peter's C of E primary school in Teddington, I would like to express my support for the School Governors' position which is against removal of the link between St Mary's & St Peter's primary school and Teddington secondary school.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: My wife and I are parents of children at Chase Bridge Primary School and we would like to register our objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for removing the admissions link between Orleans Park school and primaries including Chase Bridge. The link is a vital way of retaining some fairness and choice for parents and children in the borough; a moderating influence on the already crippling tendency of house prices near a good school to rise ever upwards. Without it, with distance as the only criterion after siblings and special needs, admissions will effectively be based on how much of a mortgage a child's parents can afford, turning state schools into de facto private schools, with the sort of exclusivity of entrance that is the antithesis of the comprehensive system. It is vital that the council acts to preserve fairness and choice in the education system by retaining the linked schools system in any review of admissions policy. Taking it away would be a dereliction of duty and would pull the rug out from under the feet of so many parents who have set up home, invested their money in houses in catchment areas and lived in the relevant communities for years on the basis of the linked school policy.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I read with attention the various consultation papers, as well as the pros & cons of the proposals. I have two children, currently in Y1 and Y3, at St Mary's & St. Peter's, who would be directly affected by these changes. We, very unfortunately, live "on the wrong side" of Teddington Railways Line, i.e. in North West Teddington, (in our case in Winchendon Rd., TW11 0SX). Our home is less than 2 minutes walk from Stanley Primary School and around 5 minutes walk from SMSP. We do feel threatened by these changes. Distance-wise, most of the Ham				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>area (via the maintained footpaths around Teddington Locks Bridge), some parts of Kingston and of Twickenham, will become much closer to Teddington School than, for instance, the direct neighbourhood of Stanley Road, however still very much at the heart of Teddington. I do understand the Council's arguments to support the benefits of proximity/distance. However, we believe that there is a huge threat that, due to its specific location (river-side out-of-the-way from many Teddington residential areas), Teddington School will no longer remain a school for most of Teddington children. This is a feeling shared by most families living in the 'TW11 0' postcodes and on the West side of the railway line. With, first Collis, then SMSP, now Stanley, having, amongst others, all expanded/being expanded to rightly meet growing local needs, where will all these children go to secondary School? Has the recent full refurbishment of Teddington School strategically taken into account local growing needs? What are the Council plans to accommodate all these children in the coming years? What is supposed to happen to them in a few years time? We are paying much higher Council Taxes than the National Average, so having local expectations for our Teddington children seem absolutely fair. Unfortunately, not everyone can afford, as some of our neighbours have done recently, to move to the "right side" of Teddington (i.e. the 'TW11 8' postcodes, Teddington School direct catchment area like the so-called 'River Roads' or Collis' direct surroundings), for the sake of guaranteeing places for our children at Teddington Secondary School. These areas have become beyond the means of many of us. Also, private schools are not an option for many parents either. Not having any guarantee that my children, who have lived all their life in Teddington and who feel very much part of the Teddington Community, will be able to attend their local Secondary School – and dreading where they will have to go instead – is really worrying, and extremely stressful, believe me. These are the reasons why, I do strongly oppose the removal of the current 'linked schools' criterion for admission to Teddington School.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to express our deeply felt objections to the possibility of the 'linked schools' criterion being abolished. We are parents of 2 children currently in years 5 and 3 at Chase Bridge, a primary school with a long standing 'link' with Orleans School. It is important to us that the consultation process highlights that both the general Whitton and Chase Bridge school communities have, as one of their foundation stones, the expectation that there will be a year on year flow of local children joining Orleans. This expectation is based on the long standing link between the schools; a link which has been promoted on Richmond Council schools web-sites! A regular and meaningful number of children moving between 'linked' schools is of course beneficial to the children and the schools as it results in, amongst other things, ties between school stakeholders and a smooth transition for the children. In particular you may like to consider that a flow of children from Whitton, a relatively modest area, ensures a healthy mix with children from other more affluent parts of the borough. We are particularly dismayed by the proposed timescales as it is our belief that the notice period leading up to any such change should be sufficient to allow local families to make informed 'life choices'. By 'life choices' we mean decisions such as where to buy a property (within our limited financial resources) and which primary school to put as 1st choice. Should this change ever be imposed and go ahead then a notice period equivalent to the length of a child's primary school education would seem the minimum reasonable. Finally we would like to point out, as I am sure you are aware, the catchment area dynamic is like a complex system and if one variable is disturbed knock on effects will follow. It is our belief that the knock on effects of a change to the 'linked schools policy, will in every case be to the detriment of the Whitton community. For example Waldegrave will become less accessible as more girls, no longer with a realistic opportunity to go to Orleans, will put Waldegrave top of their list. In summary this change will have a detrimental effect on the Whitton community and over time this will be reflected in tangible indices such as house prices. The impact on one of the less affluent parts of the local area will be marked. We are therefore looking to our elected representatives to act in the best interests of those they represent and urge you to keep the 'school links' and the relevant admissions criteria in place.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my objection of the proposed abolishment of link status, please do not do it.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I live [in Teddington] and have one daughter in year 5 of St Mary's and St Peter's so this change will have a direct impact on my daughter's education. if the link is removed it is very possible that my daughter will not get a place at Teddington. Based on last year's intake</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		she will not either be offered a place at Waldegrave. If Grey Court is offered to us I would not be happy for her to travel independently over Teddington [Lock] and through a lonely wooded area in the dark morning and night in the winter. She would therefore have to take two buses to reach that school. This seems crazy when a good school is within safe reasonable walking distance. I think the fact that the borough is divided by a river makes it a very special case and that simple distance measure is not therefore fair.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to express our concern and opposition to this proposal as follows: The linked school system has worked successfully for many years providing continuity for children in their transition from primary to secondary school, particularly with friendships and peer groups established in those early years. In addition, it maximises the number of children going to their local secondary school and provides stable links between schools. We have lived in Teddington for many years and always assumed that our children would go to their local secondary school, regardless of reputation or Ofsted ratings. Teddington is our nearest school, but because of its location and where we live in the town, removal of the linked school criteria would make it impossible to secure a place and this would apply to a large proportion of children attending St Mary's and St Peter's school and others primaries in Teddington. Having reviewed the Consultation Paper, the statistics provided are based on the admissions made in 2010/11. This data suggests that more children within the Fulwell area would be offered places at Teddington. It does not indicate how many applications may come from Kingston and Ham if the linked school criterion be removed. At present parents of children attending schools in Kingston and Ham have not always put Teddington as a preferred school, but may well do so under the proposed changes and this would therefore increase the place uptake for children from these areas over children within the North and Western areas of Teddington .e.g. Fulwell. Recently, we have observed a trend developing of people renting properties temporarily to qualify for the catchment of local schools from as far away as Ealing. These children have been offered school places over local children through the home to school distance. Our concern is that these trends will continue to increase and make it harder for Teddington residents to attend their local school. There are too many unknowns which will affect pupil transfer in the next few years that need to be resolved before a decision is taken about the future desirability of the linked schools policy. Surely the council's recent proposals to create more schools will resolve the issues and once these schools are built, then if necessary, a review could take place thereafter. The link school system works very well and its removal will greatly affect the local school community. Children have a right to attend a school in the town in which they live.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are parents of children at Stanley school in Teddington. We have three children at this school who will apply for secondary schools in the borough in the coming years. My eldest son will be among those making the next applications in October 2012 for entry September 2013. WE ARE AGAINST THE REMOVAL OF THE LINKED SCHOOL SYSTEM. Because of our location it is unlikely that our son will now get at place at Teddington which is our preferred choice. We recently viewed Hampton and Twickenham Academies and were not satisfied that these schools will meet our children's needs and most immediately our son's needs. We moved to the borough and sent our children to Stanley school BECAUSE of this link with Teddington School. We feel entirely let down by Richmond council for this short notice and do not feel that, for boys, the borough provides a good enough alternative. If the link is ultimately to be removed (and we can understand the reasons why) <u>the council should ensure that Hampton and Twickenham Academies are already achieving better academic standards for boys which currently they are NOT</u>, or provide an acceptably high academically achieving alternative. These academies are still in transition. Why should we be treated like guinea pigs because the council has been too slow to respond to the educational needs of the growing numbers of families in the borough?</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing with concern to the link from St Mary's school to Orleans Park. I live in the Heathfield area (Heathfield North) & have been notified from another parent in year 5 that the school link will be abolished & people in my area will be affected!! I hope these changes will not go ahead & count my vote in on this concern.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent at St Mary's and St Peter's and I am writing to object about the removal of the link school status with Teddington</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		school. It being our local school I believe that it is important to be given the chance to attend a local school nearest to them and with their peer group. Therefore I am writing to object against this proposal.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: 1. I have heard that the education minister has given the go ahead for the Catholic school in central Twickenham. How will admission for this school work alongside the academies. It would seem highly unfair that children from Catholic schools can apply for this, if they do not get in then apply and get in to Orleans Park at the expense of St Mary's or St Stephen's children. Many children in central Twickenham from St James will be able to apply for Waldegrave and this new Catholic school and then still take a place at Orleans Park if they are not successful with the first two. Many of us from St Mary's and St Stephen's will not get in to Waldegrave due to the historical catchment area and are excluded as non catholic from the other school, but may lose a first choice place to a third choice place as above. This seems grossly unfair and inequitable and for this reason I am against the removal of the link schools. Please include this in your summary of responses.</p> <p>2. The council needs to be more specific and upfront in their wording re people renting flats closer to schools and still owing a property in the borough to ensure people are deterred from taking places from those who have built local community links/been going to the nearby schools. You mentioned at the meeting last week a case where it was found out 8 months down the line that this had happened yet no further action had been taken. I believe the council should have taken action to act as a deterrent and warning to other parents not to cheat the system at the expense of another child's place. Yes it would have been tough for that child however it was the parents who took that risk.</p> <p>3. If the link school criteria is to go, then so should the historic catchment system for Waldegrave. The argument that this still stands because its the only girls school is not sufficient as it means that a certain section of Twickenham is not accessible, it should be abolished and have the same criteria as Orleans Park</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my objection to the proposal to remove school links from the admissions policy of Orleans Park School. I hasten to add that this policy would probably <i>benefit</i> us in a financial sense, since we live very close to OPS, and the effect of the policy would probably be upward pressure on house prices in our area. However, I am concerned about the lack of diversity that would result from the policy. Hounslow schools are more diverse than those in central Twickenham, and it is entirely to the benefit of all pupils to have interaction with others from different socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. My grown children from my first marriage attended one of the best high schools in California, in an area even more 'white' than Twickenham, but they complained later that they missed the ethnic diversity that other pupils had, and that it put them at a disadvantage in understanding their society. These are broader issues that, it seems to me, have not been addressed in the debate, but should be. The last thing the Council should be proposing is a policy that exacerbates the rightly much-criticised 'post-code lottery' of school admissions and a de facto segregation by ethnicity.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We write to add our strong support to the plea from St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School and urge you to reconsider removal of the link status with Teddington School. We are parents of two children at the school, our son in Year 3 and our daughter attends the preschool. We feel the removal of the link will have an inadvertent negative effect on Teddington children, largely driven by the fact that Teddington school is located at the far end of Teddington, therefore a proximity catchment only approach is very likely to mean that many children living in Teddington will lose out on a place at their local Teddington secondary school, to applicants from outside the borough (ie from Kingston). As the primary schools in Teddington have grown significantly to meet local demand it is crucial that careful consideration is given to ensuring that Teddington children have the best possible chance to obtain secondary places at their local Teddington secondary school or that other plans are made to add to the local state school provision. Not least is the environmental argument that plans should allow children to</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		walk to school and avoid unnecessary car journeys between boroughs. One of the great strengths of our local area is the sense of community and pride in our local young people. We feel very strongly that weakening the local links between our Teddington schools risks changing the dynamic of the schools and the sense of local community, as increasing numbers of local children will be forced to travel to schools in other areas, while children from other areas (with other school options) will take more of the increasingly sought after Teddington places. We thank you for considering our views and hope you will listen to the many voices from Teddington who would like the link to remain in place, at least for the time being.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a Whitton resident with young children whom we hope will soon be attending Chase Bridge Primary, I am very concerned about the possibility that the historic link between Chase Bridge and Orleans School will be cut. My family and I have strong connections in the Whitton area. My husband grew up here and we have lived here together for some time. Having recently returned from a sabbatical in Australia, one of the key reasons that we decided to move close to Chase Bridge School is because we hope that our children might attend Chase Bridge and then go on to attend Orleans when the time comes. If you decide to cut Chase Bridge pupils off from their link to Orleans School, it is likely to have a detrimental impact on my family in the future. Indeed, many residents have developed certain expectations based on the historic relationships established between different local institutions. We make investments in property based on these relationships and develop our hopes and dreams for our children accordingly. The welfare of our families must be taken into consideration by you, our local governors. My family and other east Whitton families are just examples of who will be affected by what I see as a worrying trend in Richmond and in Greater London in general, a trend that the move to delink schools in the area would magnify. Living in the catchment areas for the primary schools you are planning to delink will become substantially less desirable. It will enhance the extent to which superior educational resources are more readily available to families living near these three secondary schools, families who are already enjoying some of the highest incomes in the borough, while closing off opportunities to those from poorer backgrounds. The move would therefore heap even more interest on to living in the already over-priced areas of east Twickenham, Teddington and Ham, pushing up high property prices even further, while diminishing the value of homes in lower income areas. A decision to de-link Chase Bridge and other local primary schools from Orleans Park, Grey Court and Teddington School would accentuate the gap between the rich and relatively poor living in different areas in the borough. It would impoverish the education of the poorer children in the area, while simultaneously reducing the value of their family homes. Such a move can only serve to further increase the resource gap between the rich and the poor in Richmond and surrounds. Needless to say, this is not in line with the equality of opportunity ideal put forward by the Conservative party. Nor is increasing the educational resource gap between the rich and poor a desirable outcome for Labour or Liberal Councillors seeking to rectify the social injustices created by un-checked market economics. All of you, of course, depend on the views of the many for their continued success in office, and would do well to remember this when considering the introduction of a policy that would create a more elitist system. The gap between the educational resources available for poor and rich children in London is already too big. Don't make it any bigger. As councillors, it is your job to ensure that there is some balance in the availability of resources for local residents in Richmond. I urge you to do what is best for everyone overall and keep the school links in place.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am concerned about the removal of the link status from the Teddington Primary schools. I know you have heard many of the points raised and I do worry about the situation. It seems unfair that we, who live in Teddington and go to Teddington primary schools, are being affected. There is no other secondary school, especially for boys; at least the girls have the option of Waldegrave Girls. There are so many more primary places in Teddington now due to recent expansion one does wonder where they will all go to secondary school. Especially if these plans to unlink go ahead thus giving priority to Ham and Kingston schools. I'm not sure but isn't that side of the River not even Richmond Borough but Surrey? We do pay a high council tax, and have no choice of a secondary school in the area! I can't trek to</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		Hampton every day for the Academy - traffic bad enough already and if I'd wanted to go to that school I'd have bought a house in Hampton which is much cheaper! Secondary school affects everyone on so many levels. I would be in favour of at least the decision being delayed until 2018, but am not keen for it to happen at all.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my concern at the proposal to remove the link between St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School and Teddington School. My son is currently in Year 5 and we've always planned that he would attend Teddington School. In reviewing the information available, my concern is based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teddington School has become increasingly popular, not least as a result of the rebuild and it's successful exam results. It is very possible that removing the link status would lead to an increase in demand from parents in Ham and Kingston, leaving many parents, in North Teddington like me, at a disadvantage • Alternative schools in North Teddington don't yet have a track record. I believe the nearest alternative state secondary schools for my son are Twickenham and Whitton Academies, both run by the Learning School Trust. The very distinct personalised learning / Kunskapsskolan model run by both of these schools does not yet have a track record (or Ofsted) and I am concerned that they would not be suitable alternatives. In the event that Hampton was a viable alternative for us, as you know, it is also reducing its intake to accommodate the proposed sixth form. • We've lived in Teddington for over 6 years and greatly value the sense of community here. It is important to us as parents that our son attends his local community school and has the continuity of friendships that he has built up and which give him so much confidence. • I accept that a consultation can be a valuable exercise but the proposed timeframe leaves parents of children in Year 5 with very little time to plan for alternatives. Should the proposals proceed, the implementation should at least be delayed to allow parents and schools sufficient time to assess the options. 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have 2 daughters who currently go to St Mary's & St Peter's School, Teddington and I'm writing to tell you that I am totally against their school losing the linked status to Teddington School. My main concern is that we pay our council tax to the Richmond Borough for our schools amongst other things and if we lose the link, there will be out of borough children that will have more right to go to Teddington as they live nearer than our own children whom we are paying towards their education. We use to live in Kingston and we moved to Teddington about 10 years ago especially for this reason so that our children had the choice as to which school they would like to go to and I am horrified that this is likely to be taken away. I'm all for schools outside the borough not having a linked status to Teddington as they should be firstly trying to go to local schools in the Elmbridge area. There should definitely be a priority to in the borough schools then if all the places are not taken, then places offered but only as a last resort.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my opposition to the removal of the link status to Teddington schools. I am the widowed single parent of a child in Year 3 at St Mary's & St. Peter's, who would be directly affected by these changes. We pay the highest council taxes in the area and therefore I do not see why our schools should be made available to those living in neighbouring areas, benefitting from the quality our money has paid for. Let our own children benefit please!</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to suggest that the use of linked schools remains a more sensible option for allocating places at secondary level as it ensures peer group continuity and reflects the communities in which we all live. This is particularly the case in Teddington where the catchments would be oddly shaped given the location of the river. I live close to Teddington high street and may well be geographically nearer to Orleans than Teddington, but I don't feel it is reasonable that my children would be split up from their primary school friends simply on that basis. I should point out that given the age of my children, the proposed changes will not impact them.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have reviewed the document. The key issue as far as I see it is described in 5.3</p> <p>5.2 It is also possible that some anomalous admission patterns would arise, e.g. some children in Ham may be living near enough to Teddington to gain admission there. However, the 'linked school criterion' already produces anomalies that are arguably more unfair</p> <p>In effect the document states that both systems can result in anomalies. The key issue is which system produces fewer anomalies? The document suggests by modelling that the numbers attending for instance Teddington school will be more Teddington school centric. However I think this modelling is inaccurate as it only shows how the same applicants would be allocated if the system were by distance. What it should do is to model the applicants plus those likely new applicants. For Teddington this could involve, as you point out a number of Children from Ham. You should remodel to take this important factor into account and surely do some sensitivity analyses about the number of Ham children applying and how this might alter the allocation of the 2011 population in the original model. It might make it worse it might not but the model should be realistic.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My son is currently in Year 5 at Latchmere school. I understand he could be impacted by the plans to drop link status from Latchmere school. I have read the consultation paper and have a few concerns regarding this proposal: Grey Court school is our closest (geographically) and preferred choice for secondary school. If the linked school status is removed I worry that Grey Court will no longer be an option and new applicants could increase rapidly. I do appreciate the stats show the children who applied would still get in, even if the decision had been based on location - but what it does not cover is how many new applicants could emerge from parents who would historically been discouraged due to prominence of link school status. I also understand Grey Court could become an academy and reinstate the link (which the Head as indicated she would do) could that mean that the admission process may only change for one year (the year my son applies). Is it possible to consider waiting for Grey Court to be granted academy status before dropping link status?</p>				
	Local resident	<p>Re Proposal 4: Having been a parent and now a grandparent of children in the borough I would be totally opposed to changing the linked schools policy. A local authority should have local schools serving the local community enabling primary and secondary schools to work together, identifying special needs and coordinating curriculum, and children to travel the minimum distance and maintain their friends.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing with regard to the proposal of scrapping the link between Chase Bridge Primary and Orleans School with which my husband and I (and our children) greatly disagree. When we moved to this area we chose it because of the schools for our children and the links that were already established and in doing so paid a higher price for our property in an area with sought after schools. My son who will be starting his secondary education in 2013 started his education at Chase Bridge Pre-School where he spent 2 years due to when his birthday fell so he has a number of friends who will be starting the year before him at Orleans and whom he is hoping to join at secondary school. Orleans has always been our first choice of secondary school and will remain so for both of our children unless the new secondary school being created in Clifden Road, Twickenham does not become a church school but is available for all as we believe it should be.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the proposal to remove the linked schools criterion from the oversubscription criteria for Orleans Park, Grey Court and Teddington Schools. This seems to be a pointless thing to do, in view of the fact that all three schools are likely to be setting</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		their own entry criteria from the following year anyway. In the meantime it will cause distress to many parents who have for years planned their children's' course through secondary school by moving to a particular area and ensuring their children attend a particular school. If you are going to change the rules then at the very least give a few years' notice so that parents can plan accordingly.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: 1. If the admissions criteria for 2013/14 are to meet the requirements of the Greenwich judgement for a number of pupils to come from out of borough, how can the LB of R assure home-school distance for residents is in fact the criteria and how do LB of R residents have genuine "parental choice"?</p> <p>2. There is a lack of transparency of information to put the consultation into context for residents. How Waldegrave and Christ's would respond to the proposed changes should be easily available in the public domain during this consultation process.</p> <p>3. Residents will have only 6 months (March admission criteria announced -October places to be applied), therefore removing any realistic opportunity for residents to respond.</p> <p>4. The costs and time of such changes in admissions can not be justified when there is a possible further change to the admissions landscape very soon afterwards if any of the schools adopt academy status.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We wish to register our objection to Chase Bridge losing its status as a linked school to Orleans Park. We have been given very little notice of this and feel it is not acceptable to push a change through. We have been confident of our children attending Orleans, once leaving Chase Bridge. We took two looked after children into our care in January three years ago and when investigating which junior school they should attend, a strong deciding factor was that Chase Bridge was a linked school to Orleans. Not only does Orleans have excellent academic success, but equally, if not more, importantly to us, it has excellent <i>pastoral</i> care. In the current economical climate and with little warning, it would be impossible to move nearer to Orleans. We were confident that our children would get into Orleans, having investigated previous admission maps and noted that children from Chase Bridge, and living in the surrounding roads to ours have been admitted to Orleans. When the school day ends, the neighbourhood is full of children wearing the Orleans uniform by children that our two children have known at Chase Bridge. It is grossly unfair to now change the admissions structure.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a mother to a boy in Year 4 at St Paul's C of E school in Kingston. I am writing to express my grave concern about the plan to remove the linked schools criterion which currently gives pupils at St Pauls a chance of entry to Teddington school. KT2 residents will be particularly hard hit by the absence of a viable alternative. The delay in progress of the establishment of a new secondary school for the area means the timing of this proposal is particularly unfortunate. I hope that you strongly consider delaying the change in criteria until the situation in Kingston borough's own schools improves.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I oppose the removal of the linked schools criterion. I live in North Kingston with children at Latchmere school. With regard to the statement: ' Regardless of which primary school they attend, children should stand a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest mixed community secondary school ', I believe Grey Court is our closest mixed secondary school. However, and in spite of this, without the linked criterion, distance alone is unlikely to be sufficient to guarantee entry. If Grey Court is no longer linked to Latchmere, I am extremely concerned that the demand for secondary school places in North Kingston will not be capable of being met.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I strongly disagree with the removal of the linked school criteria. My children are among many who in recent years have been able to gain admission to Stanley from Hampton Hill but would have absolutely no chance of gaining admission to Teddington School based on their home to school distance. Stanley's link to Teddington was an important factor for me and my husband in selecting Stanley for our boys, as it was for many parents we know, and it is totally unfair that the goal posts are now being moved, now that our children are fully settled at Stanley. If the linked school criteria are removed, it will mean children being separated from the friends and classmates they have got to know over seven years of primary education, an added stress to them at what is already a challenging time making the transition from primary</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>to secondary school. On the Richmond Council's own document about the introduction of the 1991 linked school criteria, it is stated that the LSC was introduced to 'ensure that a large number of year 6 pupils would reap the benefits of educational continuity by transferring with their peers.' This continuity is exactly what huge numbers of pupils would lose if the linked school policy were to be abolished. I recognise that due to oversubscription, some pupils attending Stanley did not gain admission to Teddington in the last intake, even with the LSC in place (and I know personally of the disruption and upset this caused to one family). However, the fact that a number of children were upset at not being able to join their friends and classmates from Stanley at Teddington is surely not a good reason for abolishing the linked school criteria altogether, and increasing the number of upset children and disruption caused to families who chose their primary school believing their child would have the stability and continuity of joining the majority of their schoolmates at the linked secondary school. Surely that would be a case of throwing the baby out with the bath water? I ask you please to reconsider the removal of the linked school criteria for Teddington, Grey Court and Orleans Park - or at the very least, to assure that the linked school criteria will remain valid for those parents with children already attending linked primary schools, as it is totally unfair to change the criteria after parents have already selected primary schools on the basis of the linked school criteria - and more importantly after their children have settled into school and established some firm friendships.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to oppose the proposal to drop the link for Latchmere to Grey Court. My son would love to attend Grey court in Sept 2013. We live in North Kingston and there are quite simply no other secondary schools within a reasonable travel distance – Teddington is geographically even further away. How can a link be dropped before a new school has been built surely Kingston council have a moral duty to give financial assistance if that is what is required?</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We oppose the current proposal to remove the “linked school” criterion for entry to Richmond borough secondary schools. We live in Teddington and see a number of issues for this community should that occur:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The link school status enables the local Teddington community to attend Teddington School, the only local state school option for boys. The link schools engage with Teddington and the children make the transition well as a result of this and the ability to attend with many Primary school friends. 2) Future secondary intake sizes are predicted to increase following on from the increase in recent years we have seen in local Primary schools to cope with growing demand in the area given the high quality of the schools. The analysis in the consultation document based on 2011 intake does not include that. That increase has seen catchments for Primary schools concentrated closer and closer to each school leaving groups of streets in Teddington with no guaranteed entry to a state Primary school. Primary school entry rules are close to those proposed to replace the link system. Given the proximity of Teddington school to the borough boundary and the local populations in Kingston and Ham the same effect is likely to occur at secondary level with removal of the linked schools system. This would potentially leave areas of Teddington with no guaranteed local secondary school option, particularly for boys who do not have the option to attend Waldegrave. 3) There is currently much uncertainty about secondary schooling in the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new secondary school is proposed and there is ongoing consultation about whether this will be a Catholic school or otherwise. - The existing secondary schools are considering Academy status. - The growing Primary population will start to enter secondary education in the next few years. <p>Whilst action will be needed, changing the admission criteria with this amount of uncertainty could cause unexpected consequences, potentially leading to a number of changes to intake rules in quick succession. This will be good for no-one and any changes should be left until the future situation is much better understood. Additionally, the current proposed change date would affect Year 5 onwards. At this stage those families have already set their circumstances to provide for secondary education based on current rules. Any change should give plenty of warning to</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		potentially affected families and would be best set for the current Key Stage 1 population.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to express our objections to the proposals, in particular that to remove 'linked' status from St Mary's C.E Primary School to Orleans Park. The linked school system is one way of prioritising families who have lived in the area for a while and have shown a long-standing commitment to the area by putting their children through the primary schools. In our case, we have lived in Grimwood Road in Twickenham for 10 years and both our children have been at St Mary's since reception. We are much much nearer Orleans Park than Twickenham Academy, have no links with Whitton at all, and yet there is a risk that when we come to apply for our older daughter to start secondary school in 2014 she will not get into Orleans Park. (You said that the cut off distance for admission in 2013 was likely to be around 1.8km, but accepted that it would shrink over following years, particularly given the rising school population in Richmond Borough.) Meanwhile there will no doubt be a rush of families moving into the vicinity of Orleans Park who have no previous connection with the area whatsoever, who will take priority over our children and may well end up effectively denying them a place. The proposed large number of new apartments to be built at Twickenham Station will certainly not help the situation. There are also bound to be families living in the borough already who take out short-term rentals on dwellings in the vicinity of the school. I know you said at the meeting that your team are experienced in tracking down such cases and then refusing to accept the temporary addresses, but all parents of junior age children in the borough know this goes on and people simply get away with it. Could I suggest that your team at the very least automatically compares <u>all</u> addresses submitted with secondary school applications with your Council Tax records, and wherever there is a change of address you look into it. I would have thought the comparison of addresses could be done by computer programme so would not be at all resource-heavy. A final point I would make is that if our daughters do get offered places at Twickenham Academy instead of Orleans Park - though given our distance from the Academy I don't think we can even rely on that - they would have a much longer journey from home to school. They could easily walk to Orleans Park but would have to have some kind of transport to Whitton, which seems contrary to the Government's / Council's 'Living Streets Walk to School' campaign. I'm not even sure there is any easy public transport from our area to Whitton.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to the proposed removal of linked schools affecting Orleans Park. Our son is in year 3 at Chase Bridge. We chose this school due to its links with Orleans Park and as residents in Craneford Way we assumed that with the link status and our proximity to the school we would then be able to move onto Orleans Park. We are very angry and disappointed to hear that not only is the link status being removed but also that the catchment area of Orleans Park is being redefined meaning that many Twickenham residents (including ourselves) will not be able to attend a school in Twickenham. This seems inherently unfair. Surely any child already in the junior system who has been enrolled in a school on the assumptions made above, should be allowed to continue to the school they believed they had a right to attend?</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would urge you to consider maintaining the link with Latchmere School. It has worked very effectively for several years and hundreds of children have successfully continued their education at Grey Court having commenced at Latchmere. Latchmere children contribute significantly to the success of the school. Grey Court is currently the closest all ability secondary school for children at Latchmere, there is no other choice locally.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As the parent of 2 children who have recently started at The Vineyard I would like to voice my strong support for the abolition of the linked schools policy. As my children are so young I hadn't been fully aware of the consequences of this policy until fairly recently, but it does appear to quite seriously put Vineyard school students at a disadvantage. Not all Vineyard families move country or educate privately – we are long-term Richmond residents and our children will need to stay in the state system. Further, we live in East Twickenham and I was surprised to discover that out of borough families would be able to attend Orleans Park, while my children would not, even though we live quite near the school. I really do urge Richmond council to abolish this system.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed removal of the link status between Teddington and SMSP school.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We would like to object to the removal of linked status as a criterion for admissions to borough secondary schools. As parents of children at St Mary's and St Peter's junior school, we feel that the current system works well. We don't feel that the model as laid out in the consultation documents is realistic, in that it implicitly assumes people will go to their closest school, rather than the best school that they can get into; if this assumption proves (as seems likely) false, then the numbers of future out-of-borough placements are likely to be underestimates. The uneven spatial spread of schools (both junior and secondary) within the borough would mean that continuity and community within classmates, which is somewhat assisted under the current linked scheme, would suffer if the proposed changes are implemented.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I live in North Kingston, and have one son in Year 11 at Teddington School and another in Year 5 at St Paul's C of E Junior. Obviously on a personal level I am very concerned because if your proposal comes into force my younger son will not get at a place at Teddington, but on a wider scale nor will the majority of his class mates. This is a problem because we find ourselves geographically at the bottom of any "local" secondary school's admission list, which will result in our children having to travel out of area to less popular schools - bad for them and bad environmentally. We had been promised that a new school was to be built in North Kingston but with the current economic climate this is looking increasingly unlikely, but if this is still a possibility PLEASE consider delaying your decision until this provision has been made. I understand this doesn't fall within your borough but surely there needs to be some joined up, cooperative, thinking about this matter. It seems totally untenable to me that at such a time of crisis there is a local authority school, Tiffin Boys, which is allowed to continue with such an elitist entrance policy which in no way provides local education for local children.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to you in relation to the link school policy. With two children at The Vineyard School, secondary school policies are of high importance to us. As a family with no strong religious ties and living on one salary, private schools are out of our reach and thus, we feel this puts our children in a terribly vulnerable position when in the future they will be restricted from good state education. To summarise, I would like to request the abolition of the link school policy.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing with reference to the LSP consultation and would like to object to the link school policy. This type of selection criteria is outdated and appears to discriminate against local children. Local children should be able to attend local schools and the LSP prevents this. - parent of 2 children attending a Richmond Primary School and 1 child attending secondary school in Kingston.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to register my opposition to the proposed removal of 'linked school' status for St Mary's and St Peter's Church of England Primary School (SMSP) in Teddington. My son is currently in Year 3 at SMSP and we are massively disappointed that there is a proposal to have this link removed. Had we known about this when he was enrolled, we could have made an informed decision. One of the main reasons he was enrolled at SMSP, was the linked status with Teddington school. We have worked hard over the years to positively locate, to help enhance our sons schooling progression. This will inevitably be a huge blow.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As the parent of three children (the oldest of whom is currently in Year 5) and a resident of North Kingston, I feel I should let you know of my concern about the possible removal of the "linked school" criterion for entry into Richmond's schools and with particular concern, in my case, regarding the link between St Paul's C of E Junior School in Kingston and Teddington School. In North Kingston our choices are already fairly limited - the Tiffin Schools are closest but are effectively ruled out to what feels like 95% (at least) of the pupils in the local area. Our next closest schools are the Coombe Schools and schools which are in the Borough of Richmond (Teddington and Grey Court). If the chance of my children getting into Teddington is taken away, the chance of getting into the Coombe Schools will become less likely due to the increased number of children applying to them - St Paul's children who can't get into Teddington and children from Latchmere, Fern Hill and St Luke's C Of E schools who can't get into Grey Court. I wonder what our option will be then.				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are parents of a child at St Paul's C of E junior school and living in North Kingston we are extremely concerned about the propose removal of the link school system by Richmond borough. This system has long been in place and greatly increases the chance that our children have a quality secondary school place available to them. There is at present no non selective secondary school in North Kingston. Children from St Paul's junior school have long been moving on to Teddington secondary school. This link has been nurtured, highly valued for many years and should not be dismissed at this time. We ask that the link school system be left in place until the new secondary school open in North Kingston.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: In general terms we support a review of this policy as having a more distance based approach seems logical but we have two significant concerns over the timing of this:</p> <p>1) Notice is too short: Making changes for 2013/14 entry means that we and other parents who had selected primary schools on criteria including expected secondary school places will have less than 12 months to evaluate our options and take any action we deem necessary before school applications are made for the 2013/14 year. This is insufficient time given the importance of making the right choices for secondary education. For this reason there should be a longer time period between any decision and its implementation.</p> <p>2) Clarity needed on all important changes to secondary admissions: The Council is currently making a number of very significant decisions about secondary schools in the Borough. Many of these generate strong opinions from residents both for and against, namely the setting up of a Roman Catholic Secondary School, the intention that Orleans Park, Waldegrave and other schools convert to academy status in the near future (possibly in 2014) and the re-introduction of sixth forms to Borough secondaries. These are major changes to the way secondary education is provided in LBRuT. A Roman Catholic secondary and any new academies will set their own admissions policies, whilst the introduction of sixth forms (or not) will also affect school choices. Making changes to the link status for admissions in 2013/14 only to see further, more significant school changes from 2014 seems wrong. It will mean 2013/14 is a one-off when it comes to choosing schools. The Council should wrap all its proposed changes into a single, clear strategy for secondary schools so that we and other parents can make informed choices based on all the relevant criteria relating to the Council's education strategy and not just a one year policy.</p> <p>So, whilst I generally agree with ending the links in the future, I am strongly opposed to this before there is clarity on the types of secondary schools we have in our Borough and what their admissions criteria are.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I have 2 children at Vineyard. I feel linked the school policy should now be abolished in that it does not allow for children to go to their local secondary school. My children have a healthy 15 minute walk to Vineyard and could have the same to Orleans Park. To bus or drive our children to a different school is not good for the children or the environment. Schools are part of a community and should be available to the children of that community.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We live on Craneford Way, but given the number of additional classes created in 2007 to cope with the rise in the number of applications, we are greatly concerned that many extra pupils will now be eligible in terms of distance compared with us; added to that number will be those parents who will rent properties close to Orleans Park to guarantee a place before returning to their permanent residence; there is already talk by some parents of 'doing whatever it takes' to secure a place. We failed to get a place at any of our three choices for primary school in 2007 and face similar uncertainty yet again. Being unable to prepare our children as they head towards the second, and crucial, stage of their education is already creating anxiety for parents.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I write to you to let you know of my support for the proposal to remove the 'linked school' criterion when considering secondary school admissions. My children currently attend an independent school in the borough but strongly feel that we should not be discriminated</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>against when choosing a secondary school if we feel that that school best suits the needs of our child and indeed, if it is our closest school. As the situation stands, none of my sons would have a chance to attend our closest secondary school because they do not attend a link school. Circumstances can change dramatically, particularly in the current economic climate, and I feel that as tax payers, we should maintain the right to have a choice of a state secondary education for our children if we fulfil all the other admission criteria. Removal of the 'link school' criterion would ensure that children who live closest to the school will gain places which will in turn foster a community spirit amongst local families. It will also encourage parents who currently attend a link school to remain close to that school and not to move away just because they have 'secured' their place.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I would like to vehemently oppose the removal of the linked school status of St. Mary and St. Peters primary school with Teddington School. In addition, although my children are at St. Mary's, I also view the removal of linked status with Collis, St Johns and Stanley schools as unpalatable. Primary schools are the firm basis of the community in Teddington and it seems wholly wrong to enact a change which would no doubt lead to the fragmentation of community bonds between not just children but whole families, who would be very likely to be split from another when their children reach secondary school age. So much strength and support, built up over many years, would be removed. The pressure on school places is clearly very great in many areas but I do not see that removing the choice of a local school in one area justifies a minor benefit in another. The plans in the borough (and in Kingston) for new schools and expanded capacity should be the focus, not the removal of all hope of a local education for Teddington children. As well as pressure on school places, there is also much pressure on our local travel system, please don't add to this by encouraging more people to attempt to struggle across the river somehow during school drop off. I have friendships still with those I attended school with from age 4 to 18 and I hope for the same for my two boys. It's reasonable to expect them to be able to walk or cycle to school not need to spend hours sitting in traffic in a car or bus (which they no doubt will if educated elsewhere). If they can't even choose to continue their education with those important to them and at what is obviously our local school, then why live here at all.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Further to the consultation on the proposal that the linked school status of St Mary and St Peter primary school with Teddington School should be removed; I wish to oppose the proposal in the strongest terms. The proposal seems to be unfair to the residents of Teddington in that it would invite, one might say encourage pupils from outside the borough to apply for places at Teddington School to the detriment of those who live in the town and have made it their home. The geographical location of Teddington School means that many local children would be effectively excluded from attending a school in the place where they live and this can not be proper nor a fair proposal. It is likely to result in a weakening of the feeling of community within Teddington and would do much harm to the bonds which make this community work. The proposal would be likely to result in additional traffic volumes across the already congested river crossings and through Kingston, Richmond and Twickenham increasing pollution at every turn. Whilst I appreciate that the proposal is an attempt to deal with the increased demand for school places, in my view it will simply lead to the problem being moved from other areas into Teddington, making the proposal short sighted and not a credible solution. As a resident of the Borough, I wish to register my opposition the proposal in the strongest terms.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Our children go to St Mary's CE Primary school in Twickenham and one reason we chose this school was the link to Orleans Park School. The children have formed strong relationships with all the other children at St Mary's school. In Teenage years peer group is particularly important and I had hoped the children would go through those years together. This is the underlying rationale for linked schools and one we should maintain. I strongly believe that it's best to keep the link criteri[on] to ensure that our children can attend Orleans together. As the criteria for Waldegrave remain unchanged with its dual catchment area would result in East Twickenham/ Richmond Hill having almost guaranteed access to Waldegrave and Orleans, whilst West and North Twickenham would have access to neither, and be left with only secondary school available to them being Whitton Academy. A suggestion is to introduce the change for reception children who starts in</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		September 2012 (in effect that link school status is scrapped from 2018) and keep the link for existing St Mary's children admitted before and in 2011. This might potentially avoid any legal action to prevent the change in link school rules from existing parents that has been admitted under current rules and regulations and allow time for parents to re-evaluate their situation. I can't see that there is a reason for a rush decision and implementation since this has been the status quo for many years now.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I want to say that I think it's wrong to take the link system away. So a big NO from me. If you take the link away you need to start before people look for their primary school. My son is in St Mary's and will go with all his friends to Orleans Park, but maybe now all his friends would go to Orleans and he might not get in !! so you think it's then right that he should go somewhere else. To a school and a part of Twickenham where he doesn't know anyone. But if I had known this before he started school I would have put him in Chase Bridge for example or another school in that part of Twickenham. I have always believed in community and went to St Mary's because it's our closets school. ..And I think that it is very important for children to go with their friends to school and be happy teenagers. So you can not suddenly take the link away without giving people a change to choose their primary school different. Very bad and cruel decision.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my concern over the proposed removal of the linked school status for future admissions to Orleans Park Secondary School. Whilst I appreciate the reasoning behind the proposal I believe that it will be detrimental to many of the pupils of St Mary's primary school who currently progress onto Orleans Park, their neighbouring school, with their friends and peers. Under the linked school system our children, who have gone to their local primary school and live within the Twickenham community get to progress on to their local community secondary school, but if the link were to be removed there is a strong possibility that some of those children will fail to get a place at Orleans Park, forcing them to go to a school without their friends and that is not part of their local community. I live in Court Way which used to be within the catchment for Waldegrave Girls school, but over recent years, with the increasing numbers of pupils in the borough, there have been no girls from Court Way accepted at Waldegrave. This has not been of too much concern to me as I feel that Orleans Park is an equally good school, but I fear that with the removal of the linked system and the continually increasing numbers of children in each year group (as demonstrated by the increasing number of bulge classes across the borough's primary schools) will result in Court Way being edged out of the Orleans Park catchment in the not too distant future. I have a daughter in year 4 and a son in year 2 which are both large bulge years within the borough, which along with the 'credit crunch' will put extra strain on the local secondary school places, inevitably reducing the catchment area of Orleans Park. The removal of the linked status is therefore likely to result in Court Way and the surrounding roads being on the edge of or outside the shrinking catchment of Orleans Park. With the removal of the linked system my children will be in direct competition for places with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children in East Twickenham who attend the Vineyard primary school • Children across Twickenham who attend St James' Catholic Primary School <p>Both of these schools have no link to Orleans Park and as such pupils from these schools do not progress on to Orleans Park Secondary School. Parents choosing to live in their catchment areas and send their children to these primary schools are aware of this on applying to those schools and on accepting the primary places. However, my family moved into our house 8 years ago on the basis that our children would attend their local primary school, St Marys, and progress onto their local secondary school, Orleans Park. As the system stands at present this will happen but the removal of the linked schools status is likely to result in this no longer being the case. Whilst I appreciate that Twickenham Academy is likely to be the alternative and is an improving school, I am not so much concerned about the standard of education at that school as I am about the fact that it is not our local community school. I am very concerned that there is a real possibility that my daughter in year 4 will end up being one of a small minority of children who do not progress on to Orleans Park from St Mary's with her friends – a prospect that is</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>really not appealing and one which she would find very stressful. Progressing onto secondary school can be difficult enough without having to do it without any of your friends. The current linked school system enables children to progress to secondary schools with their peers/friends, and in the case of St Mary's and Orleans Park enables them to progress to their neighbouring school which they have a strong association with. In addition to the above concerns I also feel that the removal of the linked schools system would open Orleans Park applications up to the same situation that Waldegrave Girls is currently subject to, i.e. the renting of properties close to the school to enable entry into that school. Although this happens every year for some families applying for Waldegrave school, this is currently not an option for applications to Orleans Park, keeping the school places available for local children at local schools. On the subject of Waldegrave Girls school you mentioned that this was seen as a borough wide resource and that the current admissions system reflected this but girls in Court Way and surrounding roads no longer have any realistic hope of being offered a place at Waldegrave. The system favours Teddington, West Twickenham and Richmond. So again Twickenham children do not get the opportunity to go to a Twickenham school. I would therefore like to suggest that admission to Waldegrave be done on random allocation, giving girls across the whole borough equal chance of entry. I would like to thank you for taking the time to speak to some of us at the meeting at St Mary's last Thursday and for presenting the information very clearly. I have reviewed that information and the information on the borough website and for the above reasons I would urge you not to remove the linked schools system from our borough.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Having read the council's two documents on the removal of linked school criterion for admission to Teddington School, I am writing to register my opposition to the proposal. The oldest of my children is currently a year three pupil at St Mary's & St Peter's Primary School. I have a number of particular concerns, the most important of which are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i - this is a very sudden change given that parents plan their choices years in advance: is this fair or reasonable? The current system may have problems but they do not justify the upheaval that the proposed changes will cause. ii - if the community secondary schools concerned change to Academy status, most of the proposed arrangements could be subject to another round of revisions: won't the proposed changes increase the period of uncertainty for all concerned? Surely it would be fairer to at least delay changes to the admissions system until we know what the Academies intend to do? A "coordinated abolition of the LSP" may seem convenient for the council but it comes at considerable cost to the families whose long-term plans are being ruined. iii - council models are based on this year's application distribution: if the changes go through, the pattern of applications will correspondingly alter, making the models speculative at best. This will be compounded by families who can purchase homes closer to the school, effectively pushing existing residents off the admission list, as their choice of address would be informed by awareness of the new system, should it be implemented. iv - based on direct routes by road and footpath, Stanley School is further away from Teddington School than County Hall in Kingston (using Google Maps to measure the distances), putting parents in Kingston ahead of many who would consider themselves Teddington residents; this will also affect many parents at SMSP. v - the consultation document states that the school to home distance "by road or maintained footpath" will be the fourth criterion for admissions. If this includes the crossing at Teddington Lock, then families living on the western side of Ham Common will be considered to live as close to Teddington School as those living next to SMSP. I have some concerns about unintended consequences on this point, particularly as Grey Court seems less popular with its local residents than Teddington School. vi - the Council argues that the proposed changes will help more children in Teddington to gain admission to Teddington School but this is not guaranteed and nor does it mean that children who may expect to be admitted under the current system will continue to do so. It seems to me that, given Teddington School's location, the proposed changes would benefit families in the Teddington's south-western areas, Hampton Wick 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		and perhaps Ham and Kingston at the expense of those elsewhere in Teddington.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to register my objection to the planned removal of the linked school status from St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School. While I understand the reasons for pursuing this course of action I have to object most strongly to the timing of this. Many, many parents, ourselves included, have made enormous life changing decisions based on the knowledge that our school has linked status to Teddington school and to remove this with so little notice, my eldest child is in Year 5, gives us no opportunity to plan or make alternative arrangements.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We have lived in North St Margarets, North of the A316 since 1998 and, like so many of our immediate neighbours, have experienced first hand over that time considerable struggle and anxiety regarding the placing of our children into local primary schools. We have seen, under successive administrations, a frustrating political reluctance to plan sufficiently far ahead, an inability to grasp opportunities to build when they did arise (the Brunel site being a case in point, lovely though the ballet school is), and a depressing lack of foresight, apparently, in predicting an increasing population of primary age children. No doubt much of this reticence to spend taxpayers' money was based on lack of funds, but the determined work of the current Local Authority administration in tandem with St Mary's, St Stephen's and Orleans Infants illustrates well what might have been done in the past if the collective will had been there. I heartily welcome and am grateful for this imaginative work; these schools are bending over backwards to ensure that young children in my road will, I hope, no longer be asked to start their education at schools which are literally miles away from where they live or, even worse, told they do not have any school to go to at all. Such uncertainty in admission to schooling is stressful at an important time in the lives of young families, obviously, even if the end result is that a place becomes available at the eleventh hour. As a consequence of such experiences with primary provision for many North St Margaret's residents, I hope you can see why we are in turn fairly sceptical when it comes to reassurances about future provision in the secondary sector in the face of the current proposals to remove Link School Status. We are about 1 mile from Orleans Park as a walking distance, and note that sensible public transport to Whitton does not seem to be on offer for those living in this neck of the woods. Neither should driving be forced on those who have cars - if public transport is not available we want to be able to walk to school, a policy I am sure the Local Authority supports. Predicting the future when it comes to education in SW London is evidently far from a trivial matter, and this is perhaps especially so now, as new types of secondary school (academies, free schools, new sixth forms) loom large on the horizon and considerably more new housing is being built in Twickenham. There is a degree of uncertainty ahead regarding secondary age pupil numbers and therefore we are doubly worried about the secondary provision for local people. So although I do appreciate the good intentions of what is being proposed, I have reservations regarding North St Margaret's residents in particular (which I gather are shared by Orleans Park School themselves), given the struggles for sufficient Primary provision that people living here have felt over recent years. Whatever is decided there will be anxiety in North St Margaret's for at least a few years as the larger numbers in our primaries move up the system. This uncertainty would be compounded if the Link status which our excellent local primaries have with Orleans Park were removed. I therefore do not think that now is the right time for such a decision, especially given that similar moves have apparently been blocked two times in recent years because of the strength of opposition - I can hardly think the views of local people have changed in its favour since then. Rightly or wrongly, Link School Status reassures residents - let's keep it a while longer and allow Orleans Park School and others to decide for themselves if and when they take on Academy status.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: The link school status allows year groups from the same school to move up to secondary school together. There is evidence that this enables children (especially boys) to make the transition more smoothly and that it prevents children from going backwards academically at a very crucial point in their educational careers. From a practical point it also allows children who live near one another to travel to and back from school together which makes travel safer. I am also concerned that this decision is being made when there are so many				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		changes being proposed and implemented which we don't yet know the impact of e.g. if the schools that are thinking about becoming academies at the moment, become academies they will have control over their own admission policy and this may impact on the places available at those schools. There are also 3 new academies which are still in the early stages and the prospect of new schools being developed. There is so much change afoot it seems it would be better to wait until the impact of the new academies and the result of the academy consultations are complete to make this very important change to school admissions.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I object in the strongest most possible terms: Education for many families in the vicinity is now continually undermined. This creates unnecessary anxiety for parents who put in considerable time and resources in securing a primary school place with a view to preferred secondary schools, on the understanding of the existing system. If you had been a parent at St Mary's in the last 12 months you would know the parents successfully staved off the proposal to reform the intake criteria by promoting the foundation places above sibling places. Once again the uncertainty continues again for the same parents. The proposal is unreasonable and does not seem to be based on objective criteria. Once again, education and community needs to be put at the forefront of the mind of those wielding the axe. Furthermore, the evidence in support of the rationale for the proposal is unclear from your consultation paper. You must revisit this and set out exactly the points and the supporting evidence (surveys etc...) to build your argument. Give the wider malaise where individuals locally, nationally and globally are driving callous change either for their own personal reasons such as selection, job security and securing bonus schemes, this proposal is unsurprising.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to let you know that I oppose the Council's proposal to cease the 'linked school' criterion from the oversubscription criteria for Teddington secondary school. As a parent of a daughter in Year 5 at St Mary's and St Peter's C of E primary school (SMSP). I am extremely disappointed that we have been given so little time to consider this proposal (8 weeks!), which will affect our children this October on application to secondary school. Given that several of the Teddington/Twickenham schools are being considered for Academy status this year, we will have enough potential changes to the admission system as it is, without confusing parents even further by this rushed-through proposal. A removal of the linked status would allow parents of children from neighbouring Kingston upon Thames to choose Teddington school as a first priority, thus reducing the number of "local Teddington" children from both SMSP and Stanley schools, both of which may be further away from Teddington school on the map, but whose children have grown up in Teddington and feel very much a part of the Teddington community. It is these children, living in North West Teddington and Fulwell who will be disadvantaged by this change and it is these children who are truly Teddington citizens. I do not understand the council's point that a new system would give more Teddington children the opportunity to go to Teddington school, as this is simply not the case based on distance (many parts of Kingston and even Ham Common are both closer). I am also very concerned about the knock-on effect of this proposal to the admissions at Waldegrave school for girls. There would be many children living in Fulwell and North Teddington who would be unable to get into Teddington school, thus creating an influx in Waldegrave as a first choice of secondary school. Potentially, this would mean a number of girls in these areas would not be accepted either Waldegrave OR Teddington and would potentially be left with a school as far away as Whitton. This decision requires much further consultation and debate, especially given the potential changes occurring from the impact of the increasing borough population (and thus increasing size of primary schools) and proposed new-build secondary schools in the borough. I believe a period of at least 5 years for such data gathering and consultation is appropriate.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: The location of Teddington school at the far end of town will enable more Kingston and Ham children to apply successfully. Given the reputation of Teddington, more residents are likely to apply from these towns. It is likely that applications from the other side of Teddington may lose out which doesn't seem fair, given the proposal is intended to address the perceived unfairness of the current system				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As parents of a child at St. John the Baptist CE Junior School we are concerned about the proposed changes described in the consultation document. We believe that overall the proposal to remove the link school status will have detrimental outcomes for all concerned.				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>Moreover our response to you is personal, as we feel strongly that our son's education will be disrupted by these changes. He has been through a similar situation before so we have first-hand experience of how being split up from his core friendship groups has a negative effect on our son. We are therefore anxious about his long term education in Richmond. As your document states in point 2.3 "The 'Linked School' criterion was felt to be a lawful way to encourage a fair degree of stability in the borough's admission patterns and to ensure that a large number of Year 6 pupils would reap the benefits of educational continuity by transferring with their peers". The consultation document does not offer any great insight as to how the proposed change would add any significant educational benefits. The change therefore will just cause distress to those affected, whilst they would feel strongly that the goal posts had been changed after their school choices had been made under the current system. No parent wants to take their child out of a school that their child likes, performs well at and where they have strong bonds with their peers. Some of those in their school support group they will have known for 8 school years or more by the time they get to senior school, which is undeniably a critical time in their academic career. The continuity aim logically seems sensible and would help deliver an education to our son and those like us uninterrupted by significant peer group changes. There was upheaval just moving from Infant to Junior School for our son where he just moved from one class to another in a small class 'shuffle. It took over one academic year for the more serious downsides of this to abate (unhappy, unsettled and did not perform to the best of his abilities). We have also experienced the negative sides of not having continuity with peers when our son was not able to attend Collis School having been to the nursery and instead went to Hampton Wick Infant and Nursery School. The affects of this were felt by him for a long while and these had to be closely managed by us and the school. It is essential that when he starts senior school and beforehand completes his SATs that his performance is not hampered by a change in the admissions. We fear that more disruption could really hamper both these and affect his on-going performance. Our son has been to both Hampton Wick and St. John the Baptist so he and indeed his family have a great deal of time, energy and money invested with this part of the Teddington community and would like to see this investment continued. In short, we urge you not to change the admissions policy as there seems to be no real educational advantages in what is being proposed, consideration for the welfare of those affected or indeed their long term academic success.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I think the current policy of linking schools is highly unfair as it prevents children going to the local school which is nearest and most convenient for them. This is also divisive, as I think it is extremely important to have a local community based around a school. This can not be achieved if children who live near to the school can not get in, solely because of the primary school they have attended. I have heard that Richmond is the only borough in the London area that has this blatantly unfair admissions procedure, so I would call on the council to overturn it.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: Our children currently attend St Mary's and St Peter's C of E school which is one of 7 linked primary schools and we disagree with the proposed change. Firstly, the linked school status gives children the benefit of remaining with their peer groups that have been established at Infant/Junior school and which can then carry on into Year 7/8 at Senior school at a time when some children struggle to adjust. Taking the link status away would mean that potentially less children from within the borough would be able to gain entry, due to the geographical location of Teddington School within Teddington i.e. it is situated on the outskirts of the town closer to Kingston/Ham and further away from those living to the north and west of Teddington. At the moment, only one school outside the borough has a linked status but should this status be removed, it will provide more options for Kingston/Ham parents whilst reducing the choice for Teddington parents. Secondly, we have been informed that Teddington School has recently undergone a consultation process to enable it to become an Academy and that the decision on this will not be made until Spring 2012. As we understand it, academies are responsible for their own admissions criteria and so, should this be granted, the criteria could change again for 2014/15. If the Council wish for schools to become self governing then surely it would be better to wait to see if permission is granted and allow the school to set it's own agenda. Thirdly, we believe that there has been</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		insufficient notice that a change could take place which means that many parents of children in Year 5 and below will have made decisions on school places based on the current system. We believe that the notice period needs to be increased before any changes are put in place, so that parents can better understand the implications that this will have for their children and begin to plan accordingly. With much talk about a new Twickenham Secondary school, possible new free schools, and with the three new academies still working to establish themselves, surely it would be better to wait to see what effect these changes will bring before introducing more. A review could then take place in a few years time once sufficient data has been gathered. We appreciate that the Council has a very important role to play in providing all children with the best possible education available but do not agree that the above proposal will enhance the work that it is currently doing. We would therefore like our views taken into account and would appreciate an acknowledgement that you have received this correspondence.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to add my voice to those objecting to the removal of linked status. My interest is as follows: I teach at a single form entry Catholic primary school in Kingston. My three oldest children went to the Tiffin schools. I have a child in Y2 at Latchmere School. I live in North Kingston. My analysis may be unflattering to Grey Court but it is realistic. Grey Court has been able to improve in recent years because parents in North Kingston have found it increasingly difficult to secure secondary places for their children at other secondary schools and many have sent their children to Grey Court, not by choice, but by default. The 'outstanding' education that the linked primaries give, along with a new headteacher, has provided the required boost to Grey Court. The school now has a steady stream of confident learners who, with parental support, are getting good qualifications and tipping the balance of the school. I wanted a comprehensive education for my older children - At the time Grey Court did not meet the needs of children academic enough to get into the Tiffin Schools. Now the school has improved as a result of its linked status, the lack of an alternative comprehensive and the greater confidence of parents, I would like my Y2 child to be able to attend Grey Court. The children from the linked schools are the bedrock on which the school can continue to improve. If the links are removed the school will revert to the school it was before.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As a parent with 2 children in St. Paul's C of E school, Kingston, I am extremely concerned at the proposal to remove the link for children in St Paul's to go to Teddington school. As you know, we here in Kingston, are in a no man's land when it comes to Secondary schools, and with the setbacks & delays in the proposed new Kingston secondary school, this will cause absolute havoc with where our children are able to go. If the link is to be removed, then surely this should wait until we finally have our new secondary school? Our primary schools are bulging, and now with this further threat to the follow on secondary choice, there will inevitably be a backlash.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing in support of the campaign to abolish the link school system between primary and secondary schools in Richmond borough. My child goes to a primary school in Richmond and I find it extraordinary that secondary schools should be allowed to discriminate against prospective pupils on the basis of which primary school they attended. I understand that at my child's school, The Vineyard, a high proportion of its students go onto secondary schools either in the private sector or move away from the area, and as a result the school is not likely to meet the link criteria. I consider this to be very unfair on those pupils who are in our situation - that is that we are not in the position of being able to send her to a private school or likely to move from Richmond (I attended the Vineyard myself as a child). In the Vineyard's case this may not be the case of the majority of their students, but does that mean the council has the right to discriminate against those that are not at the "right" school, when it comes to moving on to secondary school? I cannot understand Richmond council's current position that they are not able to give places at local schools to local children in some cases due to their previous schooling, or that I understand to be the case in some instances that they offer places at secondary schools to children who live much further away from a school in a different borough purely for historical reasons. In our own case we have several years before our daughter will be looking for a secondary school, but I am concerned now that she should have as good a chance as any other child to go to a school that has a good teaching record and is reasonably nearby. I therefore wish to state my objection to the current policy and hope that the council sees that it is inequitable and changes it for the better. I hope				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		you will consider my objection favourably.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to register our opposition to the proposed removal of 'linked school' status for St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School (SMSP) in Teddington re Teddington Secondary School. We have sons in Year 1 and 3 at SMSP and we strongly feel that the proposal to have this link removed is unfair and unreasonable. It is not an over exaggeration to say that the link has been a key part of nearly 10 years of forward planning on the part of our family. The proposed change seems rather sudden and as best we can tell it seems highly questionable that the alternative arrangements provide a better solution, or failing that being the case at least the benefits of the alternative are not enough to justify the upheaval involved. For example, as best we can understand the possible replacement arrangements might benefit Kingston residents to the detriment of Teddington residents in the SMSP area and that seems to us to be a significant and unfair change to the detriment of the reasonable expectations of such Teddington families with children approaching secondary school age. The unfair situation would be compounded due to the prevailing economic circumstances, being a time when house moves to the traditionally more expensive part of Teddington, which is close to the secondary school, are an unrealistic financial commitment for many families.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: The purpose of this e-mail is to express my strong objection to the proposed change in admissions policy for entrance to Orleans Park School which if implemented would almost certainly preclude my children from attending if we continue to reside at our current address. I attended Orleans Park School leaving in 1983 and had wishes that my children would attend there too. The foundations of the education that I received as well as the peer group that I formed have influenced my life ever since including the values that I try to instil in my children.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I write in support of the abolition of the link school policy. I have 2 children currently in Year 2 and Reception at The Vineyard School, Richmond. When they reach secondary school age, I hope they will attend a local secondary school and am very concerned that under current LSP rules, they may not have this opportunity. I believe secondary schooling should be allocated on the same basis as primary school places - i.e. based on distance from home to school. I believe it is important for children to attend school close to home for community, child safety and logistical reasons. I do not feel that school places being allocated on the basis of historical numbers of children transferred from a particular primary to school to secondary school is fair. - This rationale seems arbitrary and discriminatory for a school such as The Vineyard where it is almost impossible for the school to achieve the 25% cohort required to develop a 'link' with a secondary school. I understand that Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP and believe from an equality perspective for all London children, it should be consistent with the other London boroughs. I look forward to a positive outcome from the consultation process.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to support the abolition of the link school system and applaud the council's decision to launch this debate. My children attend The Vineyard School which is, as you may know, in a tight spot on this matter. The link school system may have served a purpose at inception but it is now outdated. The system is anachronistic and, because it is applied inconsistently (e.g. not all borough primary schools have links), it is ultimately unfair. It becomes clear how unusual and convoluted it is when I try to explain its workings to people that don't have children at school in Richmond. As the borough doesn't have the luxury of having excess secondary places for local children, it is thus particularly relevant that this obsolete system is replaced by a simpler and more rational and transparent system such as distance to school.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: For reasons outlined in the response by Governors of St Mary's and St Peter's Primary School I oppose the removal of the link school status. Having been a teacher myself, I firmly believe that a school's success is partly based in its sense of community. I feel this sense of community and the pastoral well being of the children would be undermined if the link school status were removed from the proposed schools. I cannot see how it would relieve any issues with over subscription to the schools either - if a school is successful then parents naturally want the best for their children and will apply to that school. In addition, some parents may have based the decision to send their</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		children to certain primary school based on the current link school status. To remove this in the proposed timescale seems very unfair. I hope that this is a true consultation process and the views of parents and governors are taken into consideration in this matter.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing this in response to the information that I have received that the linked school status between St Mary's and Orleans Park is potentially being abolished. I obviously totally oppose this idea along with pretty much most of the parents from St Mary's. This is a ridiculous thing to do to when the schools are literally next door to each other and share so many facilities. It has always been the natural progression from St Mary's which the children have grown up relying on. It gives them security at a time when moving from primary to 'big school' can be so frightening. To split up groups of friends who have known each other all their school lives seems actually cruel to me. Personally, I live in Tennyson Avenue and back in 2008, was one of the parents who didn't get a place in <u>any</u> primary school in the borough at all until near the end of term. An incredibly stressful time for everyone – and now it looks like we are going to have to go through that hell yet again. I would like our children to be able to attend Orleans along with their class mates and continue being part of the community we have built, rather than them having to be part of the few that have to go elsewhere and be part of the experiment to see if that will lift a lower performing school. The teenage years peer group is particularly important and I had hoped our children would go through those years together. This is the underlying rational for linked schools and one we should maintain. Not to mention the obvious effect it will have on house prices. And what is Richmond Borough's other solution to the school crisis in the Twickenham area? – to open a purely Catholic school in Clifden Road – just madness! I hope you receive enough objections to this proposal to maintain the linked school status – you would be causing so much distress if you abolished it.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am a parent with two older children in Years 10 &11 at Teddington School, and a son in Year 5 at St Mary's & St Peter's. I am extremely concerned about the potential plan to remove the link status for Teddington School. Whilst I appreciate the need for children to attend their local secondary school, to remove this status with such short notice seems totally unfair. It gives no time for families to make long term plans for their children's education. Surely, no other major council/governmental decision is ever implemented so quickly. This plan gives parents in central Kingston and Ham an unfair advantage over local Teddington families. It seems totally unreasonable that families in Teddington cannot even get into their local school, yet children in a different borough could get a place. I feel this has been thrust upon us very suddenly and potentially, we as a local family, who have supported our older children at Teddington and been active in this role, might not now be able to get our youngest child into the school. I urge you to take note of Teddington families' concerns and reconsider this status.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am not in favour of the removal of linked school status for St Mary's & St Peter's Primary school, for the reasons set out in the response of the SMSP Governors dated 6th January. My main concern is that the removal of linked school status with Teddington School would provide more options to children based closer to the school living in Kingston and be unfair to children based in Teddington by reducing their options. I also agree that the timing of the proposed change is undesirable given the important unknown factors such as the impact of the proposed new secondary schools, the prospect of academy status and the longer term impact on admissions resulting from the significant expenditure on Teddington School.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to register our support for the proposed abolition of Richmond Council's linked school policy. We have a son who is a pupil at The Vineyard Primary School and another who will start infant school in one year. The Vineyard is our nearest primary school and so felt that it was appropriate for us to apply for a space there for our child. As children we had both attended our nearest primary schools and subsequently attended local (distance) secondary schools. We are now disappointed to learn that by accepting the place at The Vineyard our child is at a disadvantage when applying to a state secondary school because the Vineyard is not 'linked' to a secondary school. We have now found that we are limited in our options for secondary schools because, on the basis of historic numbers, out of borough pupils have access to the Richmond secondary schools that are denied to borough families. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing local authority nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools. This is a worrying statistic. We understand Richmond is the only London borough to operate a linked school system. Harrow Council, who previously also had this system in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate this unfair system as it discriminates against children in its own borough. Please consider abolishing the linked school system for the sake of children at all Richmond primary schools.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my disappointment and concern over the proposal to remove the link status for Teddington School. I feel it is unjust to make this change with minimal notice. It will have profound effects on families and children who are already settled in primary schools and who have therefore already made decisions about their future including where to live etc. We moved to the area and chose SMSP as we were informed that it has link status to an excellent secondary school. If you remove this link, we will not be in the "right" area of Teddington to be able to send our children there. As they are both boys, we are then left with a far inferior option. I would like my concerns to be noted and that my husband and I are in total disagreement with this proposal.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: In response to your consultation in a change to the admissions policy, I would like to add our support for not changing the admissions policy. Our son has been at a link school since he was 6 years old which is next door to Orleans Park secondary school, careful integration and support to transfer into the school has been taking place over the last few years. We have completely moved our home and put our previous home on the market in order that he may attend the secondary school he has been nurtured and prepared to go to. Just common sense says if you have spent years at the school next door, been prepared and gently integrated into some of the activities of the school next door it is understandable that the children will having growing expectation and confidence in going to that school. It is what they have been preparing for, in removing that surely those children on the wrong side of the boundary will be unnecessarily excluded. Although I do not believe he will be affected by this change, many of my son's friends would not have the opportunity of going to the same school with him. Our son is already in the system and we hope will be happily attending Orleans, that others may not have that option or choice seems to go against the common sense of the system already in place. I hope that you will rethink this change to the policy.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: My two children, aged nine and seven currently attend the Vineyard School (in years four and two respectively). It is an excellent primary school, and I feel very privileged that my children were able to obtain places at it and have been able to benefit from all that it offers. When [my children] were four and two, I breathed a huge sigh of relief that living in the house I myself grew up in meant that we were lucky enough to be well within the catchment area, and had secured my children's future until the age of 11. But as we face secondary school options, I realize that I should have been thinking way ahead to 18 when my children were barely out of nappies, and frankly juggling work, babies and home was about as much as I could cope with. Due to the "link" schools policy, their choices are now severely limited. As we are not regular church-going Anglicans, they may not secure a place at Christ's, and they are not guaranteed a place at Grey Court either. [My son], who is strongest in maths, science and technology, would probably be best off at Orleans Park – but doesn't, apparently, have a chance of getting in there. The only new option being discussed in the area is a Catholic School. While I think there are flaws in the postcode "lottery" as a route to school success (I don't think parents' relative ability to pay a mortgage should determine children's educational future), I do think it is unfair that children are unable to study at a school on their doorstep, while children from out of the borough get in easily. This applies even more strongly to families in East Twickenham, many of who battled to get into the Vineyard, after not being offered a primary-school place at all, only to be told now that their children cannot go to the secondary school just down the road. While I think there is still a lot to be done to improve all secondary schools across the borough (and the country – why can't we get it right?), I am very pleased that local schools are all on an upward trajectory at the moment. I am especially pleased to hear that Christ's and Grey Court will be gaining a sixth form soon. However, I</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		think it would be only fair to make all borough secondary schools accessible to all children in the borough, rather than basing admissions on the percentage of previous admissions from primary schools as is the case with the bizarre “catch 22” of the “link” schools policy. LBRuT is the only London borough that still operates this policy. There must be sensible reasons why all other boroughs have abandoned it. Just because some Richmond parents are wealthy enough to take their children out of the state system in year seven (or before) does not mean that the rest of us don't care passionately about giving our children the best possible education in state schools. Please do abandon this absurdly out-dated policy and give our kids a fair chance.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like to voice my objection to link school in this borough. I believe it discriminates against pupils from Vineyard School who do not have an adequate cohort to achieve link status. I believe secondary schools in this area would benefit from having Vineyard pupils in their school and the enthusiastic parents that the vineyard also delivers. Please reconsider. We would like to further educate our three children at our choice of secondary school that is local to us.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have a child in Year 4 and a child in Reception at St Mary's and St Peter's school. It is possible my children will not be offered a place at Teddington School purely because of the removal of the link. I believe this is unfair because one of the reasons for selecting St Mary's and St Peter's school was because of the link to Teddington School. In order to ensure any changes don't affect the secondary school applications of any existing primary school pupils and next year's reception pupils, whose parents will have already selected their preferred primary school, an implementation date of any changes should be at earliest for September 2020 entry to secondary school. The Council's consultation document makes projections based on recent historic patterns. This is unreliable as the pattern of applications is likely to change significantly if the links are removed. In the case of the removal of the links to Teddington School this will likely mean there are more successful applications from Kingston than currently. Currently, some Kingston parents would not apply to Teddington School because it is near certain that their child would not be offered a place. If the links were removed these parents would be much more likely to apply to Teddington School as their child would likely be successful in being offered a place. This would result in fewer places at Teddington School for Richmond pupils and more for Kingston pupils than there would be if system was left unchanged.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: We currently have 2 boys (one in the Vineyard School and one about to start) and believe the linked schools policy that is currently in existence is very unfair, especially towards schools such as the Vineyard that are not linked to any secondary school. When leaving the Vineyard school to move into secondary education many of the parents choose the private schools. For this reason the Vineyard will not have a linked secondary school, however for those of us who are unable to consider private education when our children leave the Vineyard are being discriminated against due to the linked school rules. We appreciate it is illegal to discriminate against out of borough applicants to secondary schools however pupils that live within a few minutes' walk to the secondary school are being discriminated against due to the primary school their children attend. The fact that all other London boroughs have now scrapped the linking system shows this is not a fair way to allocate secondary school places.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As the majority of parents from SMSP school I strongly object to removing it as a link to Teddington School. SMSP has every right to be a link school to the Teddington School. The children and parents should have a strong idea when they join a school as to what the link school will be. If such a change is going to be made then it should be done with the proper notice, meaning it should be honoured that those who joined SMSP knowing there was the link to Teddington School continue. Possibly stating that new children starting in reception in 2012 will no longer have the link. But to honour the link for the children at the school now. Though it does not make sense to drop it as a link school as it should be the right of Teddington residents to go to their closest school. I am surprised and disillusioned by the idea of these possible changes. Where are the rights of the Teddington families!				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As parents of children at Latchmere School, we see an extremely positive effect of continuity from year to year in terms of the consistently large numbers of Latchmere pupils in who subsequently go on to attend Grey Court School in Year 7. It has always felt very encouraging that such a link exists as it gives a large proportion of Latchmere pupils a feeling of confidence and security resulting from surety of knowing they are highly likely to be with friends when they move on to their secondary education. We therefore see no reason to remove the current 'linked school' criterion from the admissions policy for entry into Grey Court etc. Indeed, so supportive are we of the current system that we wish to make plain our strong opposition to the proposed removal of this criterion for future years.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I strongly support the removal of the 'linked schools' policy for the following reasons: 1) The LSP is no longer working as intended. There are more applicants from linked primary schools than available places and parents of 'linked-school' children are deeply disappointed when the linked secondary school is unable to offer their child a place. 2) Parents with children in 'non-linked' schools are effectively prevented from applying to their closest and most logical choice of local secondary school. To most fair-minded people this is plainly wrong. 3) My children attend a 'non-linked' school and because of the LSP there is no practical chance of gaining entry to Teddington despite the fact that it is our closest and preferred secondary school. 4) The conditionality of admission and giving recognition to the pattern of previous application from primary schools for secondary school places is fundamentally unfair. 5) The 'proposed alternative, to use <i>proximity to the school</i> as the main criterion, would allow a more natural geographic spread of admissions from the immediate locality of each secondary school thereby promoting community cohesion and harmony. 6) 'Home to school distance' is a clear and simple admissions policy to apply. The 'distance' criterion is instinctively fair, simple to apply and straightforward to understand. It would offer local children a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest secondary school.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4 and Proposal 5: I am a parent at St Mary's CE school in Twickenham and am writing to follow up on one of the issues which arose following your recent presentation there. I fully understand your reasons for the proposed removal of the linked schools system and believe that efforts to impose "fairness" on school admissions with schemes such as these are often overtaken by the reality of demand for school places and ultimately fail to meet the goals or are even counterproductive. Your presentation demonstrated this fact perfectly. As ever the most appropriate solution is the stable provision of sufficient school places of appropriate quality. Like you, I hope that recent efforts to liberalise the provision of secondary education can make some headway in balancing the supply of secondary places with demand. While I appreciate the argument that Waldegrave school is the only state-funded all-girls school in the borough I do not see how the current scheme of two distinct catchment areas achieves the stated aim of making it a borough wide resource. The reality is that it is a resource for two small areas at either end of the borough and not for either St Margarets or central Twickenham. If the borough is keen to see an all-girls school as a resource available to all Richmond residents then I'm afraid we simply need another one. If indeed the demand really is for the single-sex status of Waldegrave as opposed to its academic excellence then the establishment of a second single-sex school in Richmond town is now a much more realistic process in the current regulatory environment. All entry criteria for schools have problems but, for better or worse, we have as a country adopted distance as the best compromise. I applaud your efforts to rationalise and simplify the current system through the abolition of the linked schools scheme. However I urge you to extend the same simple scheme to all state funded schools in the borough including Waldegrave.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We wish to voice our disapproval of the proposed cancellation of the link between Archdeacon Cambridge Primary School & Orleans Park School. We have a son currently attending Archdeacon. We selected Archdeacon not only because it is a good school but for the future progression of our son to Orleans Park. We live in Crane Rd, Twickenham, so therefore – according to your proposal – our son will be excluded from attending Orleans Park due to your new catchment area zone. In other words, the quality of our son's education will be greatly hindered by this proposal. As Richmond residents, voters & tax payers, we feel let down and misled by these inconsiderate proposals and wish</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		to complain in the strongest possible terms and urge you and the council to: Keep the link between Archdeacon Cambridge Primary School & Orleans Park School.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a parent of a child in Year 4 at Chase Bridge I object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This should be in place at the start of reception, not when your child has spent 4 years already at a linked school. As a parent you are then aware of the implications of applying for a certain primary school. 2. It seems this would be in place for 1 year before Orleans becomes an academy and things may change again. A complete waste of taxpayers' money in my opinion. 3. There are already so many changes and proposals regarding education at all levels in this borough right up to 6th form and removing the link from Chase Bridge to Orleans when we as parents are struggling to keep up with all that is going on seems so unnecessary. 4. It just seems so unfair to suddenly change the status quo now when there is so much up in the air regarding the use of Clifton site. Couldn't you wait until that matter at least had been decided? 				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to object to Richmond Council's link school policy and to support its proposed abolition. My daughter was allocated a primary school place at the Vineyard School and started there in September 2011. Under the link system, a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined by whether 25% of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. I do not think it is fair that my daughter's eligibility for a place at one of the secondary schools in the borough should be based upon decisions made in previous years by families with children at the Vineyard School. As I understand it, the Vineyard has a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/country after year 6, so it is highly unlikely the school could ever establish a link under the current rules. As a parent who intends their daughter to continue her secondary school education in the state system, I believe it is fundamentally wrong that my daughter is discriminated against simply because others have chosen in previous years to send their children to private schools. My understanding is that Richmond is now the only London borough to operate a linked schools policy. I can see no justifiable reason why Richmond should continue to operate such a policy which clearly benefits children allocated primary school places at certain schools over others. I support the proposed abolition of the link school policy and very much hope that my response to the consultation will be taken into account.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing this letter to you as one of the parent and Richmond Borough resident to express my objection to Richmond Council's LS policy. I have one child who is the reception class student at the Vineyard School. One may think that there are many years ahead to be faced with the negative consequences with the current LS Policy but as we all know time flies and I support the Richmond Borough families who are currently facing with this problem. I believe the current policy is inequitable and which has discriminated against our pupils and their families for several years. My objections of the current policy can be rationalised under the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The link system is fundamentally flawed in that it determines a child's eligibility for places at a secondary school on the basis of decisions made in previous years by families totally unrelated to that child, as that is the basis on which a primary school's link to a secondary school is determined; whether 25%+ of previous cohorts have transferred to that secondary school. For a school such as The Vineyard with a high proportion of pupils transferring to private schools, and many leaving the area/ country after Year 6, it is almost impossible for 25% of a cohort to move to any one secondary, and therefore highly unlikely that we can ever establish a link under the LSP rules. Those of 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>our pupils who wish to transfer to the state secondary system are discriminated against by these rules. The Link School Policy is a mechanism supposed to ensure fairest possible allocation of state secondary places to those who want them. It does not do this for Vineyard pupils.</p> <p>2. It is illegal for a borough to discriminate against out of borough applicants to its secondary schools in favour of its in borough students. However, the LSP positively discriminates in favour of out of borough pupils, with many children from Hounslow schools being allocated places at Orleans park for example, on the basis of historic numbers transferring to that school, while children who live in the streets surrounding Orleans Park are unable to obtain places there simply because they have been previously allocated primary places by the council at the unlinked Vineyard school. If distance were made the only admissions criterion, Richmond secondary schools close to the borough boundaries would be as accessible to out of borough families as in borough, just not more so as is the case under the LSP.</p> <p>3. In 2011, 10.3% of Y6 children in the borough were not offered a secondary place at any of the schools on their application form, ranking Richmond as the fifth lowest performing LA nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools.</p> <p>4. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond Borough to continue to operate an LSP.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We would like to register that we are wholly opposed to the removal of the linked school criterion for Grey Court, Orleans Park and Teddington schools as proposed in the recent consultation document. We are extremely concerned because we live in the neighbouring area (North Kingston) and have very few, if any, options available to us in terms of secondary schools in our immediate surroundings. We are at risk of our children (aged 8, 4 and 4 months) only being offered a school a considerable distance away with poor transport links if the link school criterion is removed (due to the only available places being in 'undesirable' schools on the outskirts of the borough).</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As a parent of a child going to Latchmere school, I have reviewed the above consultation document. Although my child will not going seeking Secondary School admission until after 2013/4, I would like to express my opposition to removing the 'linked school' criterion for the above secondary schools. I understand Richmond upon Thames Admissions Forum's desire to make the criterion more straight forward. However, I feel removing the criterion will disrupt the continuity offered to groups of children transferring from the same Junior school to a linked Secondary School. Offering continuity to cohorts of school children aids what can be a stressful and anxious transition period from Junior to Secondary School. I believe that removing the criterion may also reduce the chances of my child being able to attend Grey Court Secondary School, our preferred choice.</p>				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: As the parent of children born in Teddington and of a son currently at Teddington School I would wish my daughter who is in year 4 of St Mary's and St Peter's C of E Primary School to attend Teddington also. The sibling link will not apply (even though my son may still be at the school if the new sixth form is in place) and the proposals will make it more difficult to obtain a place at the school. In response to the point's made by Richmond when putting forward its proposal:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Using 'home to school distance' as the principal criterion would be more straightforward and easier for parents to understand, in accordance with the underlying principles of the Schools Admissions Code.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p>Response – this is clearly not a major issue as the current arrangements have been in place since 1991 and have been reviewed and kept in place since then. Also Waldegrave's admission arrangements are significantly more complex and seem to be acceptable.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Basing children's chances of admission on preferences made by the parents of previous Year 6 children is unfair.</p> <p>Response – this was also true for the review back in 2006 and it was not considered significant or the arrangements would have been amended at the time. Current arrangements are certainly no more unfair than a distance criterion enabling wealthier parents to buy houses closer to the school to secure a place. It could also be argued that the schools on the link kept faith with Teddington school when it was not so popular and other schools did not want the places.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Although the criterion enables a degree of continuity for cohorts of children transferring from a good number of the linked schools, the original purpose of the LSP – to <i>guarantee</i> that children from particular primary schools could obtain places at particular secondary schools – no longer pertains, as not all 'linked school' children are able to obtain places at Orleans Park or Teddington.</p> <p>Response – this was also true at the last review in 2006 when it was stated in your document that both Teddington and Orleans Park were oversubscribed with pupils from linked schools. The link still improves the chances of getting a place at the linked secondary school.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regardless of which primary school they attend, children should stand a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest mixed community secondary school.</p> <p>Response – given that Richmond has significantly more primary than secondary places in the borough I am not sure that this position holds. Also for people at the edges of the catchment area for Teddington removing the link reduces their chances of getting their nearest secondary school.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 10 (29%) of the 35 junior and primary schools in the borough do not have a linked secondary school.</p> <p>Response - All but 3 of these are VA schools where parents have traditionally chose mainly Catholic secondary education. This will still be available to parents and enfranchising this group will disenfranchise parents who will not have the option of alternative provision outside the borough.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Modelling of how the 2011 intakes would have looked had the LSP not been in place indicated that a net total of 33 in-borough children – 29 more for Orleans Park, 16 more for Teddington, but 12 fewer for Grey Court – would have obtained places at the three schools; albeit that parents may have made different preferences, or ranked them differently, and that some parents whose children did not attend linked primary schools and who therefore hadn't applied may have done so, had 'distance' been the main criterion.</p> <p>Response – parents at linked primaries may also have made different choices and may have chosen a different primary option if the link hadn't been there. They are now trapped by a decision taken after they have made their choice.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LSP can make parents whose children attend linked primary schools feel that places at the linked secondary are guaranteed, which can make it difficult for them to accept subsequent refusal and places that are allocated at the academies.</p> <p>Response – This is a weak argument. Parents understand the oversubscription arrangements, even within the link. There are however strong community links between Teddington and its linked primary schools which will be weakened if the link is broken.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All three mixed community schools were consulting on converting to academy status and would, if they became academies, be able to set their own admissions arrangements for 2014/2015 onwards; so this could be the last opportunity for the local authority to propose a coordinated abolition of the LSP – albeit that it was highly probable that the schools would continue to set their admission arrangements in close consultation and cooperation with the local authority.</p> <p>Response – the authority is promoting academy status which encourages schools to take their own decisions. It is inconsistent to try therefore to impose a pattern of admissions on them before they do. It is also creating more upheaval on parents if schools subsequently decide to make further arrangements.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Removing the criterion could lead to a more natural geographical distribution of the borough’s children at entry to Year 7.</p> <p>Response – I don't understand this statement. Parents nearer the school will have more chance of getting in but the response from the Governors of St Mary's and St Peter's C of E Primary suggest that more Kingston children will too.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Whether the LSP were to be in place or not, there would be ‘winners’ and losers’ and not all parents could be satisfied until all the secondary schools and academies in the borough were graded by Ofsted, and in parents’ eyes, as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’</p> <p>This is not an argument for changing the arrangements.</p> <p>In short:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – this proposal if implemented could be devastating for parents of children currently at linked schools. The link will have given them reassurance as to their choice of secondary which will be more uncertain with this proposal. Parents of KS2 children have very little time and few options for their primary children unless they are wealthy enough to move house; – As suggested by the Governors of St Mary's and St Peter's C of E Primary a decision should be delayed so that parents deciding on their choice of primary school are clear about how this impacts on their secondary options; – it will cause more upheaval if academies then want to make further changes. <p>If this proposal is accepted the LA should consider mitigating the effect for parents with children at the linked secondary school by extending the coverage of the sibling link to those previously and not just currently at the school. This is permissible under the new admissions code.</p>				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I have lived in Twickenham for 5 years. When we decided to move to Twickenham we were attracted by the excellent primary and secondary schools. My children now attend St Mary's CE Primary School and our plan was to send them to Orleans Park Secondary. They have made great friends in school and it would be such a shame if they were not able to go to Orleans Park or if some of their friends were not able to go. We therefore oppose the proposed abolishment of linked school status.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to express my strong objection to the council Link School Policy, on the basis that it discriminates against borough parents putting their children at a disadvantageous position in obtaining a secondary school place within the borough. Richmond is the only London borough to operate an LSP. Harrow Council, who previously also had an LSP in place, abolished this from September 2010 in favour of allocation of places by distance from home to school. There seems to be no reason for Richmond borough to continue to operate an LSP.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am a parent of 3 children at the Vineyard School and am writing in support of the abolition of the link school policy (LSP). The LSP is inherently unfair and discriminates against pupils at the Vineyard when it comes to applying for secondary school. Richmond Council is the only London Borough that uses the LSP and in 2011 it was the 5th lowest performing authority nationally in terms of meeting parent preferences for secondary schools which I find quite shocking. Given the high number of pupils moving away or to the private sector from the Vineyard School it is almost impossible for the school to establish a link to a secondary school under the 25% rule. It seems nonsensical that the remaining children who are not able to move away or to private schools should be so adversely affected as to their choice of secondary school and have no possibility of improving the situation. The system seems to positively discriminate in favour of out of borough students to the detriment of those children living in the borough. If distance is made the admissions criteria there will still be access to Richmond schools from outside the Borough but not to the detriment of children in the borough. I see no good reason for the borough to continue the LSP system and have been disappointed to learn more fully the consequences of the policy on children who live in the Borough of Richmond.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am the mother of two boys aged 6 and 3. Last year we (my husband and I) took the decision to move house from Twickenham (where we were happily living, and our eldest son was happily in primary school – Trafalgar), to Teddington. One of the main reasons for this was so that we would be in a good catchment area for a good secondary school for our boys (Teddington.) We also moved our son to a Teddington primary school (St Mary's and St Peter's). I feel that our boys are disadvantaged as it is, as girls have the choice of 2 good secondary schools if living in Teddington (Teddington and Waldegrave). We cannot afford to send our children to private school. Now we are being told that the primary school link is to be removed. Where are we going to send our boys??? I live in Teddington, have a Teddington postcode and now it seems that if we had moved to Kingston it would have been better. We can not afford to move again but our boys deserve the best education we can give them and we are trying our hardest.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I am writing to support the removal of the linked school system and criterion to enable children to attend the school of their choice closest to their home.				
	Parent	<p>Re Proposal 4: We are writing to object to the proposal to remove link school status to Teddington School, which will affect both of my daughters (currently in years 4 & 3). Our objections are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Teddington residents we expect Teddington School (which is our closest secondary school) to be the most appropriate local school for our children to attend. Being part of a local community is extremely important to a young person's development and belonging; and in today's society this is not always easy to achieve. Teddington is a close community and it does achieve this. The same would certainly not be achieved by going to school in Whitton or Hampton where there is no obvious local connection for our daughters. 				

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are very concerned that by removing the link status, it will mean that many Kingston residents and Ham residents will be more likely to get into Teddington School than Teddington residents (even though Kingston & Ham residents are very close to other schools that have a more natural affinity with their local community). The removal of link school status will give them more choice and Teddington residents less choice. Out of borough schools should not have link school status. The timescale suggested for the removal of link school status (from 2013) is not appropriate. When our children started at St Mary's and St Peter's school there was a link school status with Teddington School and we did not expect this to change. If it is removed, it should not impact those already at the school. We feel that the impact assessment is too simplistic, as it is based on historical data when demand for school places was smaller. With the considerable influx of people into the borough and massive increase in demand for reception places since 2006, we know that this is going to have considerable impact on demand for secondary school places. Your impact assessment model needs to take this into consideration, so that we can have a better impression of the "real impact". As part of this process, wouldn't it make sense to use the data to more accurately assess demand in Teddington and to expand Teddington School's year 7 intake. <p>In summary, if removing the linked school status is introduced, it should be done with sufficient forward planning to allow parents to make informed choices about the primary school for their children.</p>				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: I would like you to take my email into consideration as a parent of a child at the Vineyard school. I support the removal of the linked system to allow children to attend the school closest to where they live.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: As the mother of a year 3 pupil in St Mary's & St Peter's school I am against the removal of linked status to Teddington School. It is a good school and if it was based only on distance he may be excluded as we live in Hampton Hill. There are not enough secondary schools in this area and we are not able to move nearer. Many of his friends will probably go to Teddington School and you they will be split up.				
	Parent	Re Proposal 4: My children stand to be disadvantaged by the 'linked schools' policy and I would strongly support its abolition. I also believe that the proposed oversubscription criteria, which includes 'home to school distance' as the main criterion, would better serve the community at large. My family reside in neighbouring Kingston near the border with Richmond. Our nearest secondary school is Teddington which would be an obvious choice of local school. However under the present rules we are prevented from applying. This is because there are more applicants from linked primary schools than available places. My children attend a 'non-linked' school and hence there is no practical chance of gaining entry to Teddington despite the fact that it is our closest and preferred secondary school. The system as presently operated has the effect of preventing the admission of children to their local school serving the local community, which cannot be right. Giving recognition to the pattern of previous application from primary schools for secondary school places is inherently unfair. No system can satisfy all the vagaries of where schools are situated, their finite capacities and where applicants live. However, I believe that implementing 'home to school distance' as the main criterion is intuitively fairer, simple to apply, can easily be understood by all and would offer local children a realistic chance of being admitted to their closest secondary school.				
	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes: We are supportive of the plan to remove the	

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
					linked primary schools. We have two children at a Richmond Borough primary school which is not linked to a community secondary school. This is cause for concern for us in knowing where our children will be going after Year 6 as there is no clear choice available. If Teddington is not linked then based on distance, our children have a better chance of gaining admission. Our preference would always be to have our children attend a local school with at least some peers from primary school.	
	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes: I support the abolition of the linked school system as: 30% of junior and primary schools in the borough do not have a linked secondary school; basing chances of admission on preferences made by the parents of previous Year 6 children is unfair; [and] children should have a chance of being admitted to their closest mixed secondary school.	No: Why is distance not used for Waldegrave too? It will be the only exception.
	Parent			Yes	Re Proposal 4: Yes: Using closest proximity rather than link school as a selection criterion is much fairer	

	Type of respondent	Proposal 1: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate primary admissions within the borough	Proposal 2: to retain the 2012/2013 criteria for admission to community primary schools	Proposal 3: to retain a scheme to co-ordinate secondary admissions within the borough and with other LAs	Proposal 4: to introduce new criteria for admission to community mixed secondary schools	Proposal 5: to retain the 2012 criteria for admission to Waldegrave School for Girls
					and will promote parent choice. It is unfair that with the current oversubscription criteria the choice of secondary school is largely determined at the entrance to the infant/ primary school, and that a child living in close proximity to a popular secondary school will have little or no chance to obtain a place at that school if they are not in one of the link schools. This makes it very difficult for parents who are moving into the area, or who have moved during the time their children are attending primary school, or whose children have attended fee paying primary schools, to obtain a place in the local secondary school. Also the proposed changes will stop the practice that has occurred of transferring children between primary schools solely for the purpose of ensuring that they are in the correct link school for the parents preferred secondary, a practice which is very disruptive to the child's education and affects the schools funding levels in an unpredictable way. I have two children who are currently in SJB School (linked to Teddington School) who may be affected by the proposed changes.	
	Local employee	<p>Re Proposal 4: I am writing to convey my feelings against the removal of the current linked school status. I work for Dexters Estate Agents showing houses to Clients on Saturdays - I have done this job for 3 years and I am based in Twickenham and St Margarets. I have encountered many parents who buy flats/houses in school catchment areas to get their children into schools. Once they have their sibling on the roll, they then move to more affordable areas in the Boroughs of Hounslow and Richmond. If you remove the Linked School status, this will only enhance this problem with parents trying to move nearer to their desired high school, push up the prices in an already expensive area to buy and make Orleans, Grey Court and Teddington Schools elitist and only available to those who earn a salary well over 100K per year. In effect this means that the school will not be accessible to all - especially those who are on lower incomes. To live near any of those 3 high schools is not achievable for many first time buyers with many flats starting at well over £250k per year for a 1 bedroom (45-60 sqm). Removal of the linked school status will only make these prices higher as parents battle to get as near to their chosen high school as possible regardless of size of property. Linked schools also do a good job of preparing a year 6 child for their transition to High School. For example at St Stephens, teachers from Orleans Park come to the school and vice versa in the course of year 6. The child also feels safe in the knowledge that many of their class friends will be moving with them to their linked school. It does make sense for a high school to have its closest primary schools feeding into it regardless of where that particular child may live. I urge to leave the current linked status in place and not make these High Schools inaccessible to those parents with lower incomes.</p>				