

Consultation on Surrey’s admission arrangements for September 2015 for community and voluntary controlled schools and coordinated schemes

Outcome of consultation

Consultation 1 – Changes to admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools

Response to consultation

1. By the closing date, 83 individual responses had been submitted online.

2. The 83 responses were from:

School Governor	1
Headteacher	1
Local resident	1
Other family member	1
Parent	77
School Staff Member	1
Not defined	1

3. A summary of the responses to questions within the consultation that were received from all sources is set out below in Table A

Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation for September 2015

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree
1	Auriol Junior School - introduction of feeder link for children at The Mead Infant School	Appendix 1	27	2
2	Reigate Priory - introduction of tiered sibling criteria	Appendix 1	46	12
3	St Ann’s Heath Junior School - introduction of a feeder link for children at Meadowcroft Infant School	Appendix 1	7	3
4	Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann’s Heath Junior School - introduction of a reciprocal sibling link	Annex 2	6	4
5	Thames Ditton Infant School and Thames Ditton Junior School - introduction of a reciprocal sibling link	Annex 2	9	3
6	Admission criteria for two year olds entering nursery	Appendix 1	15	8
7	Decrease in Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay School from 30 to 15	Annex 1	1	5
8	Decrease in Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School from 64 to 60	Annex 1	1	5
9	Own admission authority schools in Surrey considered to admit local children	Annex 3	2	4

10	Out of County schools considered to admit local children	Annex 3	2	7
----	--	---------	---	---

Analysis of responses to questions within the 2015 admission consultation

4. **Introduction of feeder link to Auriol Junior School** - Overall, 27 respondents agreed with the proposal to introduce a feeder link from The Mead Infant School to Auriol Junior School, whilst two were opposed to it.
5. Of the 27 respondents who supported the proposal 26 were parents and one was a school staff member (unrelated school).
6. Respondents in support of the proposal indicated that it would:
 - Provide consistency as children will be able to remain in a familiar environment
 - Enable children to remain with friendship groups
 - Enable children to transfer to a junior school which is on the same site as the infant school
 - Provide continuity of education for children who do not attend an all through primary school
 - Minimise disruption
 - Reduce stress for parents
 - Prevent families from having to transport their children to different schools
 - Local and nearest infant school should be a feeder but some flexibility should be allowed for children who move in to the area
7. However several parents who were in general support of the proposal did also raise a concern that families who had moved away should not benefit from the feeder link. Another suggested that it might be unfair on families whose children don't get in to The Mead.
8. The two respondents who were opposed to the proposal were parents, although one did not live in the area of either school and declared that they would not be affected by the proposal. The reason given by the second parent for not supporting the proposal was due to concerns at the increased traffic that it might cause and that priority should continue to be given to local children.
9. **Introduction of tiered sibling criteria for Reigate Priory** – Overall, 46 respondents supported the introduction of tiered sibling criteria whilst 12 were opposed to it.
10. Of the 46 respondents who supported the proposal 42 were parents, one was a school staff member (unrelated school), one was another family member, one was a local resident and one was not defined. Of the respondents who supported the proposal, 32 indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
11. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
 - Fair that local children take priority over non local children
 - Not fair that families can move for a short time to obtain a school place and then move away and yet retain sibling priority
 - Makes parents/carers lives easier
 - Enable children to stay with friendship groups
 - Would prevent families from north of Reigate being allocated a school much further away when other families who already have a place at an all through primary school or have a nearer alternative school have been allocated a place at Reigate Priory
 - Prevents families with only one child from being penalised
 - Enables children to feel part of their local community
 - Would reduce car journeys and environmental 'footprint'
 - It's healthier for children to walk to and from school
 - Most equitable solution to the problem

12. Other comments made by those in support of the proposal were as follows:
- Critical that Surrey also increases the PAN to 180 to ensure that all those who have the school as their nearest can access a place
 - Still need to consider making Holmesdale and Reigate Parish feeder schools to Reigate Priory
13. Of the 12 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 11 were parents and one was a school governor. Of the parents who were opposed, eight indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
14. However comments from at least four of the respondents who did not support the proposal, appeared to demonstrate that the proposal had been misunderstood. Despite indicating that they were not in agreement with the proposal one respondent indicated that if a child no longer lived in the area then siblings should not go to the school which is not in their catchment. Two other respondents were under the misapprehension that Royal Alexander and Albert would be considered their nearest school at Year 3 when in fact this school would be discounted owing to its requirement for boarding fees. A fourth respondent believed that the proposal would favour parents who had Sandcross as their nearest junior provision when in fact the opposite is true.
15. Other reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Important for siblings to attend the same school as this provides continuity and security for children
 - Parents who work already struggle with the logistics of work and childcare
 - Doesn't take account of reason for change in circumstances e.g. family break ups, bereavement, house move to accommodate growing family
 - Should only apply to families who have intentionally moved a significant distance and should not apply to families who have not moved since the child first started
 - Will create difficulties getting children to separate schools
 - Should only apply to families who have yet to make admission decisions
 - Should reconsider introducing feeder links from Holmesdale and Reigate Parish
 - Will create stress and emotional pressure on families
 - May lead to a split in parental responsibilities if siblings at different schools
 - Not just the individual child who is impacted but the family as a whole
16. After the end of the consultation period, an email was also received from Crispin Blunt MP indicating his opposition to the proposal based on the impact it might have on families who have moved slightly further away, for whatever reason, and that it is vital for siblings to be kept together wherever possible.
17. **Introduction of feeder link to St Ann's Heath Junior School** – Overall, seven respondents agreed with the proposal to introduce a feeder link from Meadowcroft Infant School to St Ann's Heath Junior School, whilst three were opposed to it.
18. Of the seven respondents who supported the proposal, six were parents and one was a school staff member (unrelated school). One of the parents who supported the proposal declared that they would be affected by the decision.
19. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Gives continuity of education for children not in primary school
 - Local and nearest infant school should be a feeder but some flexibility should be allowed for children who move in to the area

20. All three of the respondents who were opposed to the proposal were parents and of those none indicated that they would be affected by the decision. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Feeder links are unfair
 - There would be an increase in traffic
 - Priority should continue to be given to local children
21. **Introduction of reciprocal sibling link between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School** - Overall, six respondents supported this proposal whilst four were opposed to it.
22. Of the six respondents who supported the proposal five were parents and one was a school staff member (unrelated school). Of the six respondents who supported the proposal only one indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
23. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Want children to go on to St Ann's Heath from Meadowcroft
 - Local and nearest infant school should be a feeder but some flexibility should be allowed for children who move in to the area
24. Of the four respondents who were opposed to this proposal three were parents and one was not defined. None indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
25. Reason given for opposing this proposal was due to concerns at the increased traffic that it might cause and that priority should continue to be given to local children.
26. **Introduction of reciprocal sibling link between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools** - Overall, nine respondents supported this proposal whilst three were opposed to it.
27. Of the nine respondents who supported the proposal eight were parents and one was a school staff member (unrelated school). Of the respondents who supported the proposal two indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
28. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Local and nearest infant school should be a feeder but some flexibility should be allowed for children who move in to the area
 - Very difficult to get children to different schools in heavy traffic
 - These schools are within easy walking distance of each other so can drop off without a car
 - Shared links between the schools
29. Of the three respondents who were opposed to this proposal all were parents. None indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
30. Reason given for opposing this proposal was due to concerns at the increased traffic that it might cause and that priority should continue to be given to local children.
31. **Admission criteria for two year olds entering** - Overall, 15 respondents supported this proposal whilst eight were opposed to it.
32. Of the 15 respondents who supported the proposal, 13 were parents, one was a school staff member and one was a Headteacher of a Surrey nursery. Of the 13 parents who supported the proposal, six indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
33. Reasons submitted for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Not enough private nurseries to accommodate eligible two year olds

- Must be set up to cater for needs of qualifying families
 - Helps child adapt to school life
 - Assist families to find work
 - Minimises disruption as provides for all nursery provision to be provided in same setting
 - Puts the needs of child first
34. All eight of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents of whom none indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
35. Reasons submitted for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Two year olds shouldn't be in nursery
 - Too young to be in school environment
36. **Proposal to decrease the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay School from 30 to 15** - Overall, one respondent supported this proposal whilst five were opposed to it.
37. The one respondent who supported the proposal was a school staff member (unrelated school). No reasons were submitted.
38. All five of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents although none indicated that they would be affected by the decision and none appeared to be local to the school.
39. The only reason submitted for opposing the proposal was a concern as to why the number was decreasing and where the children would go if this went ahead.
40. **Proposal to decrease the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School from 64 to 60** - Overall, one respondent supported this proposal whilst five were opposed to it.
41. The one respondent who supported the proposal was a school staff member (unrelated school). No reasons were submitted.
42. All five of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents. Whilst none indicated that they would be affected by the decision four lived within approximately five miles of the school by straight line distance. However no reasons were submitted for not supporting the proposal.
43. Proposal to add Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic Primary School and St Andrew's Catholic Secondary School to the list of own admission authority schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools - Overall, two respondents supported this proposal whilst four were opposed to it
44. Of the two respondents who supported this proposal one was a school staff member (unrelated school) and one was a parent. No reasons were submitted.
45. Of the four respondents who were opposed to this proposal three were parents and one was not defined. The only comment that was submitted was that priority should be given to children in the County and then those living closest could be considered, even if this is Surrey families
46. Proposal to add Camelsdale Primary School to the list of schools which will not be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for Surrey's community and voluntary controlled schools - Overall, two respondents supported this proposal whilst seven were opposed to it

47. Of the two respondents who supported this proposal one was a school staff member (unrelated school) and one was a parent. Only one respondent submitted a reason for supporting the proposal and they indicated that priority should go to those living in the County first and remaining places could then be allocated to those living closest.
48. Of the seven respondents who were opposed to this proposal six were parents and one was not defined.
49. Reasons submitted for being opposed to this proposal were as follows:
- Local children should be admitted to local schools
 - Camelsdale is closer than Surrey schools and will cause disruption if younger child was to attend a different school
 - Don't want a place at Shottermill or St Barts
 - Deemed out of area for Camelsdale despite it being nearest school
 - Don't know how we will be able to get to Shottermill if this goes ahead
 - Priority should be given to children in the County and then those living closest could be considered, even if this is Surrey families

Consultation 2 - Extension of catchment area for Esher CofE High School to include the whole of Claygate village

Response to consultation

50. By the closing date, 924 individual responses had been submitted with 320 being submitted online, 600 on paper and four further responses being submitted by email.
51. Of the total number of responses, 827 were in support, 89 were opposed and eight either expressed no opinion or did not state whether or not they supported the proposal that had been put forward.

Analysis of responses

52. Overall, 827 respondents agreed with the proposal to extend the catchment area to include the whole of Claygate village.

53. Of the 827 who were in support respondents categorised themselves as follows:

Parents	541
Another family member	51
School staff members	12
School governors	7
Borough/district councilors	4
Chairs of Governors	2
Headteachers	2
Parish Council member	2
Surrey County Councillor	1
Local action group	1
Early years establishment	1
Admissions Forum member	1
Other	147
Unknown	55

54. Of those in support 581 declared that they would be affected by the proposal.

55. Those in support included the headteachers and Chair of Governors of Claygate Primary and Esher Church School. Each of these respondents commented that this proposal would benefit families living in Claygate. However the Chair of Governors of Esher Church School indicated that the governing body did not support the associated proposal put forward by Hinchley Wood School to alter their catchment and introduce feeder schools.
56. In addition the Surrey County Councillor for Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott, an Elmbridge Borough Councillor for Weston Green, three Elmbridge Borough Councillors for Claygate and two councillors from Claygate Parish Council indicated their support for this proposal.
57. The Claygate Class Action Group wrote in support of the proposal and in addition submitted 596 individual response forms that they had collected.
58. School staff members who were in support declared themselves to be from Claygate Primary School (5), Esher Church School (6) and undeclared (1).
59. School governors who were in support declared themselves to be from Claygate Primary School (5), Esher High School (1) and St Lawrence School (1).
60. Although one respondent declared themselves to be an Admissions Forum member, that individual is not a member of Surrey's Admissions Forum.
61. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Fairer for local children
 - Gives local children a chance to attend a local secondary school
 - Staff live in area and may affect their journey times if they have to move to access a school
 - Prevents children from having to travel long distance to secondary school
 - Prevents the division of the village and local community
 - Currently children are split up from friends
 - Better serve the local community
 - Families will move out of Claygate
 - Increase in population of school age in Claygate
 - Transport and community
 - Social and economic benefits
 - Reduce the stress for families
 - Allows children the healthier option of walking or riding their bikes to school
 - Only two schools (Esher High and Hinchley Wood) are practical to get to by public transport from Claygate
62. Of the 89 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 82 were parents, one was a headteacher, one was a Chair of Governors and five declared themselves as 'Other'. Of these 84 indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
63. The Chair of Governor's from St Paul's Catholic Primary School in Thames Ditton opposed the proposal and indicated concern that it would not alleviate the current lack of secondary school places for children in the parish of Cobham.
64. The Headteacher of Cranmere Primary School expressed concern that, if implemented, the proposal might make it more difficult for Cranmere pupils to obtain a place at Esher High School and asked that feeder schools be considered for Esher High.
65. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Esher High School needs to have a feeder link with Esher Church School to mirror the changes that Hinchley Wood is proposing
 - Children attending Esher Church School but not in the catchment unlikely to be admitted

- Molesey children already losing out on places and by extending the catchment this area will be disadvantaged further
- Children should be able to attend their closest school and some of Claygate has Hinchley Wood closer
- Current division of Claygate is clear and makes geographical sense
- Proposal will disadvantage families living in Hinchley Wood catchment
- Unfair on Cobham residents who struggle to get in to Esher which is their nearest school by road
- Gives residents of Claygate a biased choice of two good schools
- 30 places will not be enough to make up for the shortfall if Claygate residents apply to Esher High
- The proposal overloads Esher High with additional pupils despite having the lowest capacity
- The proposal appears to be driven by Hinchley Wood's exclusive nature and selective entry criteria
- The catchment smacks of social segregation based on class or wealth
- St Lawrence CofE Junior School should be established as a feeder school to Esher High
- Changes have not been coordinated with proposal at Hinchley Wood
- Does not solve underlying problem of insufficient secondary school provision
- Children living to the east of Claygate will be disadvantaged if they do not attend a feeder school

66. Other comments made throughout the consultation were as follows:

- Both secondary schools need expanding to cope with new estates being built
- Catchment should be further extended on the north eastern edge to include the north part of Thames Ditton as families living in these roads have also struggled to get in to Hinchley Wood and instead have been allocated schools some distance away
- Feeder schools should be considered for Esher High School

67. In addition a number of respondents commented on the admission proposal put forward by Hinchley Wood School. Although the proposals for Esher High and Hinchley Wood are linked, as Hinchley Wood School is an academy it is responsible for determining its own admission arrangements.

Consultation 3 - Introduction of admission priority based on a catchment for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School

Response to consultation

68. By the closing date, 26 individual responses had been submitted online. Of those 10 were in support and 16 were opposed.

Analysis of responses

69. Overall, 10 respondents agreed with the proposal to introduce admission priority based on a catchment for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School and 16 were opposed.

70. Of the 10 respondents who supported the proposal, eight were parents, one was a school staff member at St Andrew's and one was a school governor at St Andrew's. Of these, eight indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

71. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:

- it provides more stability to the school
- gives opportunity for properties further out to secure a place

- fairest for children of South Farnham for whom South Farnham junior school is the nearest school and who live too far from the infant site and Potters Gate to be given a place
- families to South East boundary of catchment previously in black hole as too far from St Andrew's to be allocated a place, despite this being nearest infant provision
- children outside catchment served by a good all through primary school
- schools need stability on a long term basis

72. Of the 16 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 14 were parents, one was a family member and one was a local resident. Of these 10 indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

73. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:

- catchment does not serve the town
- catchment unfairly excludes children living close to St Andrew's
- local children will need to be driven to other areas increasing traffic and impact on environment
- catchment affects social mix of the school
- catchment is a mockery as it takes in predominantly business and retail premises whilst skirting around residential areas
- catchment would be a detriment of the mutual benefit of the children of Farnham town centre
- there is already continuity for children at St Andrew's because a feeder link already exists
- the option to attend the most local schools will be removed
- don't understand why catchment is so dominated by south of the Farnham bypass
- catchment is unreasonable and unfair as it excludes children from less affluent areas in and around the centre north of Farnham
- busy A31 will need to be crossed by majority of pupils thereby reducing the number of children walking to school and increasing traffic through Farnham
- reduces choice for parents
- catchment should do more to replicate, as far as possible, the parish footprint
- catchment boundary goes down the middle of Firgrove Hill
- catchment will exclude families for whom St Andrew's is the nearest infant school and South Farnham is the nearest junior school
- catchment excludes children from less wealthy areas of town

This page is intentionally left blank