

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 25 FEBRUARY 2014****REPORT OF: MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****LEAD OFFICER: CLAIRE POTIER, PRINCIPAL MANAGER ADMISSIONS AND TRANSPORT****SUBJECT: ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Following the statutory consultation on proposed changes to Surrey's admission arrangements for September 2015, Cabinet is asked to consider the responses and make recommendations to the County Council on admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and Surrey's coordinated schemes for September 2015.

This report covers the following areas in relation to school admissions:

- Auriol Junior School (Stoneleigh, Ewell) - Recommendation 1
- Reigate Priory School (Reigate) – Recommendation 2
- St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 3
- Meadowcroft Infant School (Chertsey) and St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 4
- Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools (Thames Ditton) – Recommendation 5
- Admission criteria for two year olds applying for nursery - Recommendation 6
- Esher CofE High School (Esher) – Recommendation 7
- St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School (Farnham) – Recommendation 8
- Published Admission Number for Year 3 at The Dawnay School (Great Bookham) – Recommendation 9
- Published Admission Number for Reception at North Downs Primary School (Brockham) – Recommendation 10
- Own admission authority schools to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 11
- Out of County schools not to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 12
- Published Admission Numbers for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 13
- Admission arrangements for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 14
- Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 15

Recommendations are set out on pages 1 to 6 and further details of each proposal are set out on pages 8 to 19.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that Cabinet make the following recommendations to the County Council:

Recommendation 1

That a feeder link is introduced for Auriol Junior School for children attending The Mead Infant School for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children attending The Mead Infant School
- d) Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder link and reciprocal sibling links
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within close proximity
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There was overall support for this proposal
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at The Mead Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Auriol Junior School

Recommendation 2

That tiered sibling criteria are introduced for Reigate Priory for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this would only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- There was overall support for this proposal
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children attending Meadowcroft Infant School for September 2015, in addition to the existing feeder link with Trumps Green Infant School, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School or Meadowcroft Infant School
- e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meadowcroft Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School

Recommendation 4

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School for September 2015 so that these schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 5

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools for September 2015 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety

for parents

- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 6

That criteria for admission to nursery for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision are introduced for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
- d) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for clear, fair and transparent criteria
- The criteria are consistent to those used for other years of entry
- They are lawful and comply with the School Admissions Code
- They will enable parents to understand how places will be allocated at nurseries which choose to admit children at two years old
- It supports the Government's agenda of extending free nursery provision to families on low income

Recommendation 7

That, subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to admission arrangements as they have proposed, the catchment area for Esher CofE High School is extended for September 2015 to include the whole of Claygate village.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for families in Claygate to have a greater opportunity of being offered a local Surrey school
- It coincides with an increase in PAN at Esher High thereby minimising the impact on other families applying for Esher High
- There was overwhelming support for this proposal
- This proposal is linked to a separate proposal by Hinchley Wood School to extend its catchment area and to introduce feeder links which, if not introduced in line with this proposal, would lead to an untenable increase in applications for Esher High. This recommendation is therefore conditional on the changes at Hinchley Wood being agreed before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- If Esher High School becomes an Academy on 1 March 2014, before ratification of the recommendation by Full Council, the school's Governing Body will need to ratify the recommendation of Cabinet in order to ensure the admission arrangements have been lawfully determined

Recommendation 8

That admission priority based on a catchment is introduced for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School for September 2015 so that, after siblings, children who live within the published catchment area for the school would receive priority for a place ahead of those who do not, as follows:

-
- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children living within the catchment area of St Andrew's CofE Infant School (see ANNEX 10 for new catchment map)
 - e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It helps to support the future viability of this school
- It provides for a joined up approach to admissions in the area of Farnham
- It helps to protect the existing feeder link from St Andrew's to South Farnham School
- It is supported by the Governing Body of St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School as it is recognised that this is a step towards formalising the links between these schools

Recommendation 9

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay is decreased from 30 to 15 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will provide for a better use of resources within the school
- It will reduce the impact of in year admissions on the school
- It will not lead to a pressure on school places because the number will better reflect numbers on roll
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 10

That the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School is decreased from 64 to 60 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will enable the school to meet its duty with regard to infant class size legislation
- It will enable the school to optimise the most efficient use of its sites
- It will reflect the number that the school is working to maintain after the initial offers are made
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 11

That Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic School and St Andrew's Catholic School are added 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 in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools which will be taken in to account when assessing 'nearest school' when applying the admission arrangements of community and voluntary controlled schools
- It ensures that there is equity in the application of admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools County wide

Recommendation 12

That Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex is discounted for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools

in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that families who live nearer to Camelsdale Primary School but who are unlikely to be offered a place there will not be disadvantaged in their applications for their nearest community Surrey school
- It is consistent with the approach taken with other out of County schools for which Surrey parents are generally unsuccessful based on catchment

Recommendation 13

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2015 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1 which include the following changes:

- Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN
- Bishop David Brown – increase in PAN from 120 to 150
- Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240
- Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60
- Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90
- Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- St Ann’s Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90
- St Mary’s C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30
- Stamford Green Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where a decrease in PAN is proposed the decrease has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- Where increases in PAN are proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2014 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 14

That the remaining aspects of Surrey’s admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2015, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey’s parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey’s sustainability policies

Recommendation 15

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2015/16 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2015 are similar to 2014
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

DETAILS:

Consultation

1. On 13 November 2013 the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning agreed to consult on proposed changes to the admission arrangements for some community and voluntary controlled schools. This consultation ran for eight weeks from 25 November 2013 to 20 January 2014.
2. After the initial consultation was released it was agreed to carry out two further separate consultations, one for Esher CofE High School and one for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School. These consultations ran for eight weeks from 12 December 2013 to 5 February 2014.
3. Full details of the proposed admission arrangements for Surrey's community and voluntary controlled schools and Surrey's coordinated admission schemes, including the arrangements for which there is no change proposed, are attached as Appendix 1 and its Annexes.
4. Documents which set out a summary of the main changes in each of the consultations and which were made available to schools and parents are attached at Appendix 2, Appendix 3 and Appendix 4.
5. The consultations were sent directly to Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and Parent Governors of all Surrey schools, Diocesan Boards of Education, neighbouring local authorities, out of County voluntary aided and foundation schools within 3 miles (primary schools) or 5 miles (secondary schools) radius of the Surrey border, Surrey County Councillors, Borough and District Councillors, Parish and Town Councillors, members of Surrey's Admission Forum, Early Years establishments and Surrey MPs.
6. Surrey County Council Members and Borough and District Councillors were asked to draw the consultations to the attention of any local community or resident groups in their area who may have an interest in responding.
7. Consultees were also sent a suggested form of wording for parents, which they were encouraged to put on websites, noticeboards and in newsletters, as appropriate.
8. Notice of the consultations was also published on Surrey County Council's website along with an online response form.
9. Details of the proposals have been shared with members of the Children and Education Select Committee.
10. With regard to the initial consultation, 83 responses were submitted by the closing date.
11. A summary of the responses to questions within that consultation is set out below in Table A.

Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation

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

12. With regard to the consultation on extending the catchment area for Esher CofE High School, 925 individual responses were submitted by the closing date.
13. With regard to the consultation on introducing a catchment area for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School, 26 individual responses were submitted by the closing date.
14. A summary of the responses to questions within these further consultations is set out below in Table B.

Table B - Summary of responses to admission consultation for Esher CofE High School and St Andrews CofE (Controlled) Infant School

Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
Esher CofE High School – extension of the catchment area to include the whole of Claygate village	ANNEX 5	827#	89	8
St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School – introduction of catchment area	Appendix 1 & ANNEX 10	10	16	0

15. Further analysis of the responses to each consultation is included at Appendix 6.
16. Details of recommendations have been shared with the local Members for each area, where appropriate.

Proposed changes to local admission arrangements

Recommendation 1 - Introduction of a feeder link to Auriol Junior School from The Mead Infant School

17. There was overall support for this proposal with 27 respondents in support and two opposed.
18. Most children attending The Mead Infant School do currently transfer to Auriol Junior School if they apply.
19. The Published Admission Number for both these schools is 90 and so, whilst there would be no guarantee that all children at The Mead Infant School would be given a place at the junior school, it is likely that in most years those who want to transfer would be able to.
20. In this way these criteria would provide continuity and a clearer transition for children and would reduce anxiety for parents.
21. Although siblings would be given a lower priority after the feeder link, for 2013 admission there were only three children who were allocated a place under the sibling criterion who did not attend The Mead Infant School. As not all children attending the Mead Infant School are likely to apply for a place at Auriol Junior, it is likely that all siblings would still be offered a place, although there would be no guarantee.
22. This proposal is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan which undertake to consider sympathetically the desirability of separate infant schools feeding into joint junior or primary provision where this reduces transport needs for young children.
23. In line with Surrey County Council policy, due to the reciprocal sibling link between the infant and the junior schools, the introduction of a feeder link would also enable sibling priority to be given to a child who is applying to start at the infant school in Reception even if they have a sibling who would have left the infant school by the time the younger child starts. This is because the admission criteria provides for them to be admitted to the junior school thereby retaining their sibling priority. This is reflected in section 11 of Appendix 1.
24. This proposal is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of Auriol Junior School.
25. Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attending the feeder school would not confer an automatic right to transport to Auriol Junior School.

Recommendation 2 - Introduction of tiered sibling criteria for Reigate Priory School

26. There was overall support for this proposal with 46 respondents in support and 12 opposed.

27. Reigate Priory is an oversubscribed junior school in Reigate. Despite having Reigate Priory as their nearest school some children living to the north of Reigate have found it increasingly difficult to access a place at this school. They are displaced in favour of siblings and other children who live closer to the school. However in many cases, children living to the north of Reigate live further away from their next nearest school and if they are not offered a place at Reigate Priory, they may have to travel some distance to another school.
28. This change in admission criteria would mean that places would be offered to children for whom the school was nearest ahead of other children for whom it was not, with siblings being prioritised in this way as well as applicants on distance. It is anticipated that this will help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance can be offered to all children living in the area.
29. It is anticipated that the impact of this change would be comparatively low. In the past three years, the number of children who have been admitted to Reigate Priory under the sibling criterion who did not have it as their nearest junior provision was as follows:
- | | |
|------|----|
| 2011 | 13 |
| 2012 | 6 |
| 2013 | 6 |
30. Whilst there is no guarantee that Reigate Priory would be able to allocate a place to every child who has it as their nearest school, this proposal lessens the disadvantage that might be caused to children living further away to the north of Reigate. These children may still have Reigate Priory as their nearest school but are currently displaced if children with siblings at the school apply, even if those children have another nearer junior provision.
31. For 2012 admission there were five children who had Reigate Priory as their nearest school who were not offered a place but all would have been offered if these criteria had applied. These children were subsequently allocated to schools which were further away.
32. Reigate Priory has a published admission number of 150 but took an extra class in 2013 and so admitted 180 pupils. With this extra class, all children who had the school as their nearest were offered a place, as well as eight children who did not have the school as their nearest.
33. However the proposed published admission number for Reigate Priory currently remains at 150 for 2015. Whilst Surrey County Council continues to explore options for expansion so the school might admit 180 pupils in 2015, if this is not realised then it is likely that, in 2015, siblings will once again displace other children who have Reigate Priory as their nearest school.
34. It is acknowledged that if this proposal is implemented, families with children already at the school may not get a younger child in to the same school if it is not their nearest school and if the school is oversubscribed with children for whom it is the nearest school.
35. Each year the admission intake for each school will vary depending on the number of applicants and where they live. Owing to this, when tiered sibling criteria are in use, it is possible for a family to legitimately get one child into a school but to fail to get a younger child in to the same school. This can create:
- uncertainty and anxiety for parents with one more than one child

- difficulties for families in getting their children to different schools
 - lack of continuity for families and schools
 - an increase in traffic as families have to drive their children to different schools
36. In Surrey, tiered sibling criteria are not part of the standard admission arrangements used by most community and voluntary controlled schools. This is because Surrey's general approach is that, as far as possible, admission arrangements should support families getting their children into the same school. However tiered sibling criteria have been introduced for some schools to respond to a very specific need, usually relating to pressure of places in an area or the introduction of extra classes which disproportionately increases the number of siblings in future years.
37. In recommending that this proposal is implemented immediately the following factors have been taken in to account:
- Reigate Priory has admitted an extra class in 2013 which may in turn lead to an increase in sibling applicants applying to the school in the near future
 - It has not yet been resolved whether the PAN for Reigate Priory will increase in future. Without an increase in PAN it is unlikely that all children who have the school as their nearest will be able to be allocated a place
 - The pressure on places in this area would mean that it will prove difficult to offer a reasonable alternative school to some families if they are displaced by siblings
38. During the consultation a number of parents asked the local authority to reconsider introducing feeder links from Holmesdale Infant School and Reigate Parish Church Infant School. However the proposal for tiered sibling criteria is currently recommended as an alternative to feeder links. If feeder links were to be proposed for use in a future intake, this would be a matter that the local authority would be required to consult on.

Recommendation 3 - Introduction of a feeder link to St Ann's Heath Junior School from Meadowcroft Green Infant School

39. The number of responses was low but seven respondents supported this proposal and three were opposed.
40. Meadowcroft Infant School currently has no feeder link to Year 3 provision. This can make parents anxious about Year 3 transition and has resulted in them taking their children out of the school at Year 2 or earlier, as soon as a place becomes available in a primary school or another infant school with clearer links to Year 3 provision. This can be disruptive for the school and for the children.
41. This proposal is linked with the decision to expand St Ann's Heath Junior School from a published admission number of 64 to 90 and a proposal to expand Lyne and Longcross from a one form entry infant school to a one form entry primary school. Currently, children at Lyne and Longcross predominantly transfer to St Ann's Heath Junior School, but if Lyne and Longcross becomes a primary school then some places at St Ann's Heath will be freed up.
42. Surrey County Council accepts that Meadowcroft Infant School is some distance from St Ann's Heath Junior School. However, as there is little local Year 3 provision, children in this area are increasingly likely to have to travel longer distances to access a school place. As such, the local authority believes this to be a positive development as it improves on the current arrangements.
43. Whilst there is no guarantee that all children at Meadowcroft Infant School who apply would be given a place at the junior school it is likely that in most years those who want

to transfer would be able to. In this way these criteria would provide continuity and a clearer transition for children and would reduce anxiety for parents.

44. This proposal is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan which undertake to consider sympathetically the desirability of separate infant schools feeding into joint junior or primary provision where this reduces transport needs for young children.
45. Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Trumps Green Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School.

Recommendation 4 - Introduction of a reciprocal sibling link between St Ann's Heath Junior School and Meadowcroft Infant School

46. The number of responses was low but six respondents supported this proposal and four were opposed.
47. This proposal is subject to the establishment of a feeder link from Meadowcroft Infant School to St Ann's Heath Junior School. If agreed, Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria (see ANNEX 2 of Appendix 1). Such an arrangement would mean that families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school.
48. In line with Surrey County Council policy, due to the reciprocal sibling link between the infant and the junior schools, the introduction of a feeder link would also enable sibling priority to be given to a child who is applying to start at the infant school in Reception even if they have a sibling who would have left the infant school by the time the younger child starts. This is because the admission criteria provides for them to be admitted to the junior school thereby retaining their sibling priority. This is reflected in section 11 of Appendix 1.
49. The introduction of a reciprocal sibling link between the two schools would provide a greater chance of families keeping their children together.

Recommendation 5 - Introduction of a reciprocal sibling link between Thames Ditton Infant School and Thames Ditton Junior School

50. The number of responses was low but nine respondents supported this proposal and three were opposed.
51. In line with Surrey County Council policy, due to the reciprocal sibling link between the infant and the junior schools, the introduction of a feeder link would also enable sibling priority to be given to a child who is applying to start at the infant school in Reception even if they have a sibling who would have left the infant school by the time the younger child starts. This is because the admission criteria provides for them to be admitted to the junior school thereby retaining their sibling priority. This is reflected in section 11 of Appendix 1.
52. The introduction of a reciprocal sibling link between the two schools would provide a greater chance of families keeping their children together or at schools in close proximity.

Recommendation 6 – Introduction of admission criteria for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision

53. The number of responses was low but 18 respondents supported this proposal and eight were opposed.
54. These criteria are principally in line with the criteria that apply for three year olds and would only apply to community or voluntary controlled schools or nurseries which decided to admit children at two years old.
55. Parents are not obliged to choose nursery provision for their child, but where they do wish their child to start nursery as a two year old and where they are eligible for the free extended provision, these criteria will enable them to understand how places will be allocated.
56. Once two year olds are placed on roll at a nursery, they would be automatically entitled to take up a three year old place and the number of places available for three year olds would reduce.
57. This supports the Government's agenda of extending free nursery provision to families on low income.

Recommendation 7 – Extension of catchment area for Esher CofE High School to include the whole of Claygate village

58. There was overwhelming support for this proposal with 827 respondents in support and 89 opposed.
59. Esher High is an oversubscribed secondary school which currently only admits children of siblings and those living within its catchment area.
60. Currently the catchment area for Esher High only extends to cover half of Claygate, with the other half of the village falling within the catchment area for Hinchley Wood School. Whilst the children in the Esher High catchment are normally offered a place at Esher High, the children in the Hinchley Wood catchment are less likely to be offered a place at their catchment school. This can leave the community of Claygate divided with one half being offered their catchment school whilst the other is not.
61. It is recognised that Claygate has historically been served by two schools as there are good transport links from the village to both Esher High and Hinchley Wood schools. Due to these historic links, neither school would wish to remove Claygate from their catchment area.
62. However, even if they were to do so, placing Claygate in the catchment area for only one of these schools would be unlikely to resolve the issue. Hinchley Wood School is responsible for its own admission arrangements, but this school is not currently able to allocate many places to Claygate children. As such, if the whole of Claygate fell just within the catchment for Hinchley Wood an even greater number of Claygate pupils would be likely to be without an offer of a school place. Alternatively if the whole of Claygate fell solely within the catchment area for Esher High then the numbers who would be seeking a place at that school would be likely to have a detrimental impact on other families who live elsewhere but who could also claim a historic link with the school.
63. This proposal for Esher High is therefore in line with a change being proposed by Hinchley Wood School to extend their catchment to cover the whole of Claygate but also

to introduce feeder links with its four partnership junior/primary schools, which includes Claygate Primary School. These proposals, taken together, will ensure that neither school has sole responsibility for children living in Claygate which would not be sustainable for either school.

64. With regard to catchments, the School Admissions Code says that catchment areas 'must be designed so that they are reasonable and clearly defined'. In this regard the proposed catchment would appear to be more reasonable than the existing catchment as it does not divide the community of Claygate.
65. It is proposed that Esher High School will increase its admission number from 210 to 240 from September 2015. The addition of this extra class should negate the impact that this change to catchment area would have on other applicants to this school, including those within the Molesey area. If the school were oversubscribed by children living within catchment, priority would be given to those children living nearest the school.
66. There is no proposal at this stage to introduce feeder links for Esher High and if this were to be considered in the future any such proposal would need to undergo full consultation before it could be introduced.
67. Currently children living within the catchment for Hinchley Wood stand little chance of being offered a place at Esher High unless they qualify as a sibling. Other than the village of Claygate, the proposal for Esher High will not have a direct impact on other children living in the Hinchley Wood catchment area who wish to apply for Esher High School because these families would not previously have been offered a place at Esher High.
68. However it is recognised that this proposal is linked to the proposal by Hinchley Wood School to introduce feeder schools. Hinchley Wood School are expected to make a decision on their admission arrangements before the decision of Cabinet is ratified by Full Council. As such the recommendation that Cabinet are asked to put forward to Full Council will be conditional on Hinchley Wood proceeding with their proposed admission arrangements.
69. If Esher High School becomes an Academy on 1 March 2014, before ratification of the recommendation by Full Council, the school's Governing Body will need to ratify the recommendation of Cabinet in order to ensure the admission arrangements have been lawfully determined.
70. Whilst there are of course no guarantees that a place at either school will be available for pupils living in Claygate, it is believed that, taken together, these proposals provide a greater likelihood for children in Claygate to be offered a place at either Esher High or Hinchley Wood. They also provide for this area to continue to divide their applications between the two schools, thereby preventing an untenable increase in demand at either school.
71. Whilst it is proposed to retain the area of Cobham within the catchment for Esher High, this may need to be reviewed in future years if the proposal to open up a senior department at Cobham Free School goes ahead.

Recommendation 8 – Introduction of admission priority based on a catchment for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School

72. Overall there was some opposition to this proposal with 10 respondents in support and 16 opposed.

73. This proposal has been drawn up to secure the future viability of St Andrew's beyond the short-term and to end a period of considerable uncertainty. It is part of the process of formulating a joint working relationship with South Farnham School for the mutual benefit of the two schools.
74. Children at St Andrew's would receive education at a local infant school from which there is a feeder link to South Farnham at Year 3. This would ensure that continuity and clarity in admissions continues for the local area.
75. Concern was expressed through the consultation that the proposed catchment is too heavily dominated by an area south of the A31 bypass. However the catchment has been drawn up to reflect the existing feeder status that St Andrew's has with South Farnham School.
76. South Farnham School is a heavily oversubscribed primary school which admits children at Reception and at Year 3. South Farnham School operates across two sites, one of which is dedicated to KS1 education and the other to KS2 education. Currently there are children who live very close to the junior site of South Farnham School who are unable to access a place in reception at that school due to the distance they live from the infant site. These children may also not be eligible for a place at St Andrew's because they either live too far on distance or because it is not considered to be their nearest school. Due to the feeder links that South Farnham School has at Year 3, children living close to the junior site are then often displaced in favour of other children attending a feeder school.
77. Whilst South Farnham School intend proposing a change to their arrangements so that from 2015 they will measure to both sites for admission to reception and Year 3, it is still possible that not all children surrounding the junior site will be able to access a place at this school. However, due to the feeder link from St Andrew's Infant School to South Farnham School, this proposal is intended to ensure that the children who might be displaced from South Farnham School at reception and those in the local area who prefer St Andrew's are still served by a local infant school from which they can have a feeder link to South Farnham at Year 3. This should help to protect the feeder link that currently exists between St Andrew's and South Farnham School.
78. With regard to catchments, the School Admissions Code says that catchment areas 'must be designed so that they are reasonable and clearly defined'. It is the local authority's view that the catchment that has been proposed complies with the School Admissions Code in this respect. Whilst some concern was expressed that the proposed catchment boundary ran down the middle of the road, this is normal practice as it ensures that the boundary line is clear and it helps to avoid disputes when properties or land is developed.
79. Whilst this proposal does not prevent parents who live outside the catchment from naming St Andrew's as a preference, those areas are served by other local schools should St Andrew's not be in a position to offer places beyond the catchment area.

Recommendation 9 - Proposal to decrease the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay School from 30 to 15

80. Admission authorities are required to consult on any proposed decrease to the Published Admission Number for a school.
81. The local authority has consulted on a decrease in Published Admission Number for Year 3 for The Dawnay School by 15 places.

82. There were six responses to this proposal with one in support and five opposed.
83. Concern was raised that numbers would decrease at the school if this proposal went ahead. However The Dawnay currently has more than 15 vacancies in each of Years 3, 4 and 5 and as such the number will better reflect numbers on roll.
84. This reduction is supported by the school because it will give them an admission number which will be more stable and easier to maintain which in turn will enable them to plan and manage their resources better. It will also reduce the number of in year admissions to the school which can create instability within the classroom and can further exacerbate the pressure on resources.
85. The reduction is supported by School Commissioning as they are satisfied that it will be unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the demand for places or to lead to a pressure on school places in the area.
86. The Published Admission Number determines the number of external applicants that a school will admit as part of its normal intake. In this case the reduction relates to the Published Admission Number for Year 3. As such this proposal does not affect children who start at the school in Reception, Year 1 or Year 2 as these children will automatically transfer to Year 3 as internal students.

Recommendation 10 - Proposal to decrease the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School from 64 to 60

87. Admission authorities are required to consult on any proposed decrease to the Published Admission Number for a school.
88. Following a review by the school on the most efficient use of its Betchworth and Leigh sites, the school now provides for reception at the Betchworth site and Years 1 and 2 at the Leigh site. These sites operate in addition to the Brockham site which provides for children to attend from reception to Year 6, with children from Betchworth and Leigh attending the Brockham site from Year 3.
89. With a Published Admission Number of 64 this would mean that the school's infant classes would have more than 30 pupils. However, infant class size legislation sets out that no four, five or six year old should be taught in a class of more than 30 pupils with only one teacher.
90. As a result the local authority has consulted on a decrease in Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School.
91. There were six responses to this proposal with one in support and five opposed.
92. As no reasons were submitted for those who were opposed it is difficult to establish the reasons for the opposition.
93. In practice, with a Published Admission Number of 64, this school has vacancies in each year group and so this reduction in number is unlikely to have a great impact on the children who get allocated to the school.
94. Currently, after the initial intake, this school lawfully lets its numbers drop back to 60 so that it can comply with infant class size legislation. As such, for the KS1 year groups in particular, this reduction in number will reflect what actually happens within the school and will enable parents to understand how many places will be available.

95. This reduction is supported by the school because it will enable them to meet the requirements of infant class size legislation.
96. The reduction is supported by School Commissioning as they are satisfied that it will be unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the demand for places or to lead to an increased pressure on school places in the area.

Recommendation 11 – Proposal to add Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic Primary School and St Andrew’s Catholic School to the list of schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools

97. Annex 3 of Appendix 1 sets out a list of academies and foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools which will be considered to admit local children as well as a list of some out of County school which are close to the Surrey border but which will not be considered to admit local children. Where a community or voluntary controlled school gives priority to children attending their nearest school, these lists will be used to assess which school is considered to be each child’s nearest school.
98. For September 2015 admission it is proposed to add the following schools to the list of own admission authority schools that are considered to admit local children for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools:

Mole Valley

St Andrew’s Catholic Secondary School

Spelthorne

Bishop Wand Church of England School
Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic Primary School

99. As part of the intake for the last three years (2011, 2012 and 2013), each of these schools has admitted children from the local area without regard to faith and as such can be considered to admit local children.
100. This will ensure that all academies, foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools are treated consistently in this respect.

Recommendation 12 - Proposal to add Camelsdale Primary School (West Sussex) to the list of out of County schools which will not be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools

101. It is proposed to add Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex as an out of county school which will **not** be taken in to account for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for any community or voluntary controlled school which gives priority to children according to whether or not the school is their nearest school.
102. Camelsdale Primary School operates a catchment area which does not extend in to Surrey. In the past five years only one Surrey child has been allocated a place at the initial allocation. However, there are a small number of Surrey families who live closer to Camelsdale than their nearest Surrey community school and who, as a direct result, fail to be eligible for a place at their nearest Surrey community school. As they have little chance of gaining a place at Camelsdale and as Camelsdale is an out of County school, it is proposed to discount this school when assessing nearest school.

103. This proposal does not affect parents who wish to apply for Camelsdale Primary School which will continue to consider applicants according to its admission criteria.

Recommendation 13 - Proposed Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for other community and voluntary controlled schools

104. Annex 1 of Appendix 1 sets out the proposed admission numbers for all community and voluntary controlled Schools for 2015 admission. Changes are highlighted in bold.

105. It is proposed to increase the Published Admission Number for the following schools in September 2015 but as admission authorities are no longer required to consult on any such increase these have not been subject to consultation:

Guildford

St Mary's C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30

Reigate and Banstead

Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120

Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90

Runnymede

Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60

Woking

Bishop David Brown School – increase in Year 7 PAN from 120 to 150

106. The following changes in Published Admission Number have been agreed through statutory proposals and as such these changes have not gone through further consultation but have been updated in Annex 1:

Elmbridge

Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN

Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240

Epsom and Ewell

Stamford Green Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Guildford

Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Runnymede

The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60

St Ann's Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90

107. The following changes in PAN are currently being consulted on through statutory proposals. The PANs have not yet been updated in Annex 1 of Appendix 1 but will be updated as decisions are made:

Elmbridge

Hurst Park Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60

Spelthorne

Ashford Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Woking

Brookwood Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60

West Byfleet Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

108. Where an increase in PAN is proposed, the school is increasing its intake to respond to the need to create more school places which in turn will help meet parental preference.
109. The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes.
110. It is proposed that the PANs for all other community and voluntary controlled schools for 2015 should remain as determined for 2014 and this would enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences.

Recommendation 14 - Surrey's Primary and Secondary Coordinated Admission Schemes

111. The local authority has a duty to determine its primary and secondary coordinated admission schemes by 15 April each year, even if there are no changes proposed.
112. The coordinated admission schemes are working well with all schools participating, as they are legally required to.
113. The coordinated schemes provide for all preferences to be named on one application form and for applications to be coordinated to ensure that each child only receives one offer of a place.
114. There are no changes proposed to the coordinated admission schemes.

Recommendation 15 - Admission arrangements for which no changes are proposed

115. The local authority has a duty to determine the admission arrangements for all community and voluntary controlled Schools by 15 April each year, even if there are no changes proposed.
116. Consistent admission arrangements that do not change enable parents to have a historical benchmark with which to assess their chances of success in future years and provides some continuity for schools and parents.
117. The admission arrangements are generally working reasonably well.
118. The admission arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces the need for travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies.
119. The existing admission arrangements provide for, on average, 85% of pupils to be offered their first preference school and 95% to be offered one of their named preference schools.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

120. The risks of implementing these changes are low and the majority of local residents are likely to welcome the proposed changes. However, any parents who feel unfairly disadvantaged by the proposals can object to the Office of the Schools' Adjudicator.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

121. The admission criteria for the majority of community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey conform to Surrey's standard criteria. The more schools that have the same

admission criteria the more the processes can be streamlined and thus present better value for money. However, where required, the admission criteria for some schools vary from Surrey's standard but these can currently be managed within existing resources.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

122. The Section 151 Officer confirms that the proposed changes to admission arrangements do not have any significant financial implications.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

123. The admission arrangements comply with legislation on School Admissions and the School Admissions Code.

Equalities and Diversity

124. The Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed in full and is attached in APPENDIX 5. The adoption of determined admission criteria is a mandatory requirement supported by primary legislation. The policy relating to community and voluntary controlled schools does not discriminate according to age, gender, ethnicity, faith, disability or sexual orientation.

125. Measures have been taken to reference vulnerable groups both in terms of exceptional arrangements within admissions, the SEN process and the in-year fair access protocol. In addition a right of appeal exists for all applicants who are refused a school place.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

126. The proposed admission arrangements give top priority to children who are Looked After by a local authority and to those children who have left care through adoption, a residence order or a special guardianship order.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

127. The efficient and timely administration of the schools admission process coupled with the equitable distribution of school places in accordance with the School Admission Code and parental preference contribute to the County Council's priority for safeguarding vulnerable children.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

128. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change.

129. The admission arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest school and in doing so reduces travel and supports policies on cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- The September 2015 admissions arrangements as agreed by the Cabinet will be ratified by the full County Council on 18 March 2014.
- The new arrangements for September 2015 will be circulated to all Surrey schools via a bulletin in the early Summer Term 2014.

- Schools will be advised of the wording of these arrangements so they can publish them in their school prospectus.
- These arrangements will be published in the primary and secondary Information on School Admissions and Transfers booklets in July-August 2014, which will be made available to parents in September 2014.
- The Information on School Admissions will be circulated to the Contact Centre, Surrey County Council Libraries and Early Years.
- The Information on School Admissions will also be published on Surrey County Council's website in September 2014.

Contact Officer:

Claire Potier Principal Manager Admissions and Transport (Strategy)
Tel: 01483 517689

Consulted:

Nick Wilson, Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families
Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director - Schools and Learning
Sarah Baker, Legal and Democratic Services
School Commissioning Team
School Admissions Forum
Headteachers, Chairs of Governors, Parent Governors of all Surrey schools
Early Years establishments in Surrey
Diocesan Boards of Education
Neighbouring local authorities
Out of County voluntary aided and foundation Schools within 3/5 miles radius of the Surrey border
Surrey County Councillors, Parish Councils, Local MPs,
General public consultation via the website/schools/contact centre

Annexes:

- Appendix 1** Admission arrangements for Community & VC schools
Annex 1 Proposed Published Admission Numbers
Annex 2 Schools to be considered as adjoining/shared sites for sibling priority
Annex 3 Schools to be considered to admit local children
Annex 4 Coordinated Schemes
Annex 5 Catchment map for Esher High
Annex 6 Catchment map for Southfield Park Primary
Annex 7 Catchment map for Woodmansterne Primary
Annex 8 Catchment map for Oxted
Annex 9 Catchment map for Tatsfield Primary
Annex 10 St Andrew's Proposed Catchment
Appendix 2 Proposed changes to admission arrangements – consultation document
Appendix 3 Proposed changes to Esher CofE High School – consultation document
Appendix 4 Proposed changes to St Andrew's CofE School – consultation document
Appendix 5 Equality Impact Assessment
Appendix 6 Outcome of Consultation

Sources/background papers:

- School Admissions Code
- Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning report and decision - 13 November 2013

This page is intentionally left blank