



Education Select Committee  
28 January 2013

**ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY  
CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES FOR 2014  
ADMISSION**

**Purpose of the report**

1. Members of the Education Select Committee are asked to consider the proposed changes to the admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and coordinated schemes for September 2014.

**Introduction**

2. The School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 require all admission authorities to consult on their admission arrangements every seven years, unless they are proposing any changes to their arrangements, in which case they must consult each year they are proposing a change.
3. Consultation must take place for a minimum of eight weeks, between 1 November and 1 March, and all admission authorities must then determine their arrangements by 15 April, whether or not they have been subject to consultation.
4. Surrey County Council is proposing some changes to its admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for 2013 and has therefore consulted on those changes between 28 November 2012 and 22 January 2013.
5. Full details of the proposed admission arrangements are set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes as follows:

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Admission arrangements for Community & VC schools
<b>Annex 1</b>	Proposed Published Admission Numbers
<b>Annex 2</b>	Schools to be considered as adjoining/shared sites for sibling priority
<b>Annex 3</b>	Schools to be considered to admit local children
<b>Annex 4</b>	Coordinated Schemes
<b>Annex 5</b>	Catchment map for Esher High

<b>Annex 6</b>	Catchment map for Southfield Park Primary
<b>Annex 7</b>	Catchment map for Woodmansterne Primary
<b>Annex 8</b>	Catchment map for Oxted
<b>Annex 9</b>	Catchment map for Tatsfield Primary

6. Where changes are proposed text is highlighted in bold.
7. Local Authorities are also required to consult on their Relevant Area every two years. As Surrey last consulted on its Relevant Area in November 2010, it has done so again this year. The consultation is included at **Appendix 2** but proposes no change to the Relevant Area that was determined in 2011.

<b>Changes to Local Admission Arrangements</b>
--

### **Banstead Community Junior School – Reigate and Banstead**

8. Banstead Community Junior School currently has a reciprocal sibling link with Banstead Infant School but there is no feeder link from the infant school to the junior school. Instead the admission criteria for the junior school currently follow the standard criteria for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools in Surrey.
9. From September 2014 it is intended that both schools will have a PAN of 90 (please see paragraph 64 which confirms the proposal to increase the PAN for Banstead Infant School from 80 to 90).
10. It is therefore proposed to introduce a feeder link to Banstead Community Junior School for children at Banstead Infant School so that the admission arrangements would be as set out in **paragraph 8 e) i) of Appendix 1**, as follows:
  1. Looked after and previously looked after children
  2. Exceptional social/medical need
  3. Children attending Banstead Infant School
  4. Siblings not admitted under 3 above
  5. Any other children
11. This would bring the admission criteria in to line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder and reciprocal sibling links.
12. Whilst there is still no guarantee that all children at Banstead Infants 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.
13. 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**.

14. This proposal is supported by the Governing Body of Banstead Community Junior School.

### **Reigate Priory School – Reigate and Banstead**

15. Reigate Priory is an oversubscribed junior school in Reigate. Whilst historically most children who want to have been able to transfer to Reigate Priory from Holmesdale Community Infant School and Reigate Parish Church Infant School, with the increased pressure on school places in Reigate, increasingly, there are children who have found it difficult to access a local junior place.

16. It is therefore proposed to introduce a feeder link for children from Holmesdale and Reigate Parish. However it is intended to introduce this on a tiered basis so that priority would be given to children for whom it is the nearest school ahead of children for whom it is not. The admission criteria would be as set out in **paragraph 8 e) iii) of Appendix 1**, as follows:

1. Looked after and previously looked after children
2. Exceptional social/medical need
3. Children with a sibling attending Reigate Priory School at the time of the child's admission
4. Children attending Holmesdale Infant or Reigate Parish for whom Reigate Priory is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
5. Other children for whom Reigate Priory is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
6. Children attending Holmesdale Infant or Reigate Parish for whom Reigate Priory is **not** the nearest school with a Junior PAN
7. Any other children

17. This proposal ensures that both feeder schools would be considered equally in the admission criteria for Reigate Priory and as such, should not have a negative impact on applications for these schools. Whilst not offering a straight feeder link, this proposal offers some parents more certainty in the admissions process.

18. 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 families who have chosen different infant provision or those who were unable to obtain a place at either of the feeder schools.

19. In proposing to give priority to children who have the school as their nearest ahead of those who do not the Local Authority is also ensuring, as far as it is able, that children living further away to the north of Reigate who still have Reigate Priory as their nearest school, would not be disadvantaged in favour of other children who live closer to Reigate Priory but who actually have another school which is nearer.

20. The PAN for Reigate Priory is 150, although arrangements are being made for the school to take an extra class in 2015 to ensure that there are sufficient places in the area to accommodate a 'bulge' class that was admitted to Holmesdale Infant School in September 2012. The PAN for Holmesdale Community Infant School is 90 and the PAN for Reigate Parish is 60.
21. Prior to consultation, this proposal received support from the Southwark Diocesan Board of Education, Holmesdale Infant School, Reigate Parish Church Infant School and Reigate Priory.

### **Southfield Park Primary School – Epsom and Ewell**

22. In 2011, after the admission arrangements had been determined for 2013 admission, the Local Authority received representation from parents living in the Parkview estate for the catchment for Southfield Park Primary School to be extended to include them. As a result the Local Authority undertook to carry out a review of the catchment prior to the consultation on the admission arrangements for 2014 admission.
23. The catchment for Southfield Park Primary School (**Annex 6 of Appendix 1**) was developed to ensure that children living in the Horton Park development could access their nearest school, as they had no reasonable alternative. Whilst the Parkview estate does also have Southfield Park Primary School as their nearest school, unlike the Horton Park development, it does also have another accessible school in Epsom Primary.
24. The existing catchment for Southfield Park Primary School is used as part of the oversubscription criterion to prioritise applicants when there are more applicants than places available, with priority being given to applicants who live within catchment ahead of those who live outside of it. If there are more applicants within catchment than places available, then priority is given to those who live the furthest distance from the school. This is to ensure that the children living in the Horton Park development are provided for.
25. Historically, the school is not oversubscribed by applicants from within catchment and each year the school has admitted some children from outside the catchment area. The number allocated from outside the catchment and the distance allocated to for the past four years is as follows:

2009	15 (2.93 km)
2010	21 (3.19 km)
2011	15 (0.85 km)
2012	7 (0.44 km)

26. Information provided by parents living on the Parkview estate indicates that there will be the following number of applications from that estate each year, although these numbers do not cover all properties on the estate and so the numbers are likely to be higher:

2013 intake	11
2014 intake	7

2015 intake 14  
2016 intake 19

27. This data has not been validated and perhaps not all parents would apply for a place at Southfield Park Primary School from the Parkview estate. However, it is clear that if the catchment for Southfield Park was extended to include the Parkview estate, the Local Authority would risk there being more applications from within catchment than places available. If this were the case, with priority currently being given to families who live furthest from the school, the children who would be displaced would be those who live nearest.
28. Whilst the Local Authority could give priority to those families within catchment who lived nearest the school, the families which would then be displaced would be those living furthest away on the Horton Park development. However it is these families which the catchment was developed to provide for, as they do not have another school within a reasonable distance.
29. As an alternative to amending the catchment for the school, it is therefore proposed to change the criteria so that after providing for children within the catchment, priority would be given to children for whom the school is their nearest ahead of those for whom it is not. The admission criteria would be as set out in **paragraph 8 b) i) of Appendix 1** as follows:
1. Looked after and previously looked after children
  2. Exceptional social/medical need
  3. Siblings
  4. Children living in the defined catchment of the school with priority being given to children living furthest away from the school
  5. Other children for whom the school is their nearest school
  6. Any other children
30. Whilst these criteria do not guarantee a place for children living on the Parkview estate, they would mean that those children would receive a higher priority than other applicants who perhaps have Epsom Primary or Stamford Green as a nearest school.
31. Currently there are proposals to expand Stamford Green Primary School by 30 pupils in either 2014 or 2015, depending on demand. If that expansion goes ahead there may then be a need to have a more fundamental review of the catchment area for Southfield Park.
32. This proposal has received support from the Governing Body of Southfield Park Primary School.

### **St Ann's Heath Junior School - Runnymede**

33. Following a consultation with parents by St Ann's Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School, the Governing Bodies of both schools received strong support to make a change to their admission criteria.

34. On the basis that the proposed changes should not lead to children being disadvantaged, the Governing Bodies support the proposed introduction of a reciprocal sibling link between the two schools and also a feeder link from Trumps Green Infant School to St Ann's Heath Junior School.
35. The admission criteria for St Ann's Heath Junior School would be as set out in **paragraph 8 f) iii) of Appendix 1** as follows:
1. Looked after and previously looked after children
  2. Exceptional social/medical need
  3. Siblings
  4. Children attending Trumps Green Infant School
  5. Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
  6. Any other children
36. Historically, the majority of children wishing to progress to St Ann's Heath from Trumps Green Infant School do so. However St Ann's Heath does also admit children to Year 3 from other schools.
37. The proposed PAN for St Ann's Heath for September 2014 is 64 (although a separate consultation on expansion has determined that the school would have a PAN of 90 from September 2015) and the proposed PAN for Trumps Green Infant School for September 2014 is 60.
38. The schools supported retaining priority for siblings above the feeder link to ensure that families who had chosen alternative infant provision were not disadvantaged.
39. Subject to the number of siblings, the establishment of a feeder link is likely to mean that all children who want to would be able to transfer to the junior school from Trumps Green Infant School. In this way these criteria would provide continuity and a clearer transition for children and would reduce anxiety for parents.

#### **St Ann's Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School - Runnymede**

40. Subject to the establishment of a feeder link from Trumps Green Infant School to St Ann's Heath Junior School, it is also proposed to introduce a reciprocal sibling link between these two schools. In this way Trumps Green 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**).
41. 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**.

42. 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.

#### **Tatsfield Primary School - Tandridge**

43. Historically all children living in Tatsfield have always been offered a place at the school, even if other children from outside the village have been offered a place under a higher priority, e.g. if they had a sibling attending the school.
44. However in 2011/12 the number of siblings increased and the knock on effect was that three children with a Tatsfield postal address would not have been eligible for a place had the school kept to its Published Admission Number of 30.
45. Analysis of admission data and feedback from the school indicated that the number of siblings was unusual and this situation was not expected to repeat itself in 2012. As a result the Local Authority made a decision not to seek a review of the admission arrangements. This assessment was correct and the number of siblings who applied for entry in 2012 was 14.
46. However, although the sibling numbers were not unduly high, in 2012 there were still two children who lived within Tatsfield Parish who were not eligible for a place within the school's Published Admission Number of 30 on the date of the initial allocation.
47. In rebuilding Tatsfield Primary School it was the intention of Surrey County Council that it would serve the children living within Tatsfield village. As such, the Admissions team carried out a pre-consultation with parents within the school community and residents within the wider local community to ask their views on potential changes to the admission criteria.
48. The outcome of that consultation was that 68 out of 72 respondents favoured introducing a catchment with 27 of those in favour of retaining priority for all siblings and 41 in favour of giving priority only to siblings living within the catchment area.
49. Respondents felt that children living in Tatsfield should be able to get in to their village primary school. However a small number also expressed concern for families who might get one child in to the school but then be unable to get a subsequent child in if they lived beyond the catchment area.
50. It is the view of Tatsfield Parish Council and the District Councillor that in future years there will be more children requiring a school place from within the parish as new houses are built and large houses, previously occupied by single residents, are sold to families. Whilst this cannot be corroborated, it is the view of the School Commissioning team that the numbers in this area will at very least remain static.

51. Even a small increase in numbers is likely to lead to places being unavailable for children living within Tatsfield parish and, due to its bordering and rural location, the consequence of this is that Surrey will have difficulty in identifying alternative places for these children.

52. It is therefore proposed to introduce a catchment and to give priority to siblings and other children who live within the catchment before other children who live outside the catchment. However in order to protect those families with children already at the school it is proposed to phase in these criteria. The admission criteria would be as set out in **paragraph 8 h) ii) of Appendix 1** as follows:

1. Looked after and previously looked after children
2. Exceptional social/medical need
3. **Transitional criterion** - Children who will have a sibling on roll at the school at the end of the 2013/14 academic year and that sibling will still be expected to be on roll at the school on the date of the child's admission
4. Siblings who live within the catchment area
5. Other children who live within the catchment area
6. Siblings who live outside the catchment area
7. Other children who live outside the catchment area

53. It is proposed that the Tatsfield parish boundary will form the catchment for the school, as set out in **Annex 9 to Appendix 1**.

54. The Governing Body of the school are concerned that the introduction of these criteria might act as a deterrent to families living outside of Tatsfield from applying. On the basis that just less than 50% of the school population is made up of children from outside the area, they are concerned at the impact this might have on the school. However Tatsfield Primary School is a successful and popular school that is oversubscribed. Whilst there is no evidence that families would cease to apply for the school from outside the area, the phasing in of the amended sibling rule would mean that the impact would be gradual and during that time the Local Authority could monitor any unintended consequence of the change if application numbers from within Tatsfield parish do not increase.

### **Thames Ditton Junior School - Elmbridge**

55. Thames Ditton Infant School admitted an extra class in 2012 and due to previous extra classes in 2009 and 2010, has admitted siblings from beyond the normal catchment of Thames Ditton Junior School.

56. As a result of these 'bulge' classes, the admission criteria for the Infant school were changed in September 2012 to give priority to children who have the school as their nearest school ahead of children who do not.

57. Currently, after providing for looked after children, exceptional social/medical cases and siblings, Thames Ditton Junior School provides for all children at the infant school to transfer to the junior school.



58. However, due to the pressure of places in this area, in order to ensure that families living locally to Thames Ditton Junior School are not disadvantaged if they choose a different infant provision or if they are unable to obtain a place at the Infant school, it is proposed to align the criteria for the two schools. The admission criteria would be as set out in **paragraph 8 a) iv) of Appendix 1** as follows:

1. Looked After and previously looked after children
2. Exceptional social/medical need
3. Children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
4. Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
5. Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
6. Other children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
7. Other children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
8. Any other children

59. This proposal has the support of Thames Ditton Junior School.

60. 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, thus helping to ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children living in the area.

61. It is not currently intended to introduce a reciprocal sibling link between the infant and junior school but this may be considered for 2015 admission.

### **Changes proposed to the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for schools**

62. **Annex 1 of Appendix 1** sets out the proposed admission numbers for all Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools for 2014 admission. Changes are highlighted in bold.

63. Admission authorities are no longer required to consult on proposed increases to PANs but are required to consult on any decrease to PAN. As such the Local Authority has only consulted on a decrease in PAN for the following school:

#### **Thames Ditton Junior - Elmbridge**

The PAN for Thames Ditton Junior School was increased for one year only for September 2013 to accommodate a 'bulge' class moving through from the Infant school. However the school cannot sustain the admission of 120 pupils each year and as such it is proposed to decrease the PAN from 120 back to 90 from September 2014.

64. For information, the Local Authority intends to increase the PAN for the following schools in September 2014 but these increases **have not been subject to consultation**:

**Elmbridge**

Bell Farm Primary – increase Reception PAN from 60 to 90 as agreed by statutory proposals

**Epsom and Ewell**

West Ewell Infant – increase Reception PAN from 90 to 120

**Reigate and Banstead**

Banstead Infant – increase Reception PAN from 80 to 90

Earlswood Infant – increase Reception PAN from 90 to 120

Earlswood Junior – increase Junior PAN from 90 to 120

Salfords Primary – increase Reception PAN from 45 to 60

**Runnymede**

Trumps Green Infant – increase Reception PAN from 30 to 60

**Spelthorne**

Spelthorne Primary – increase Reception PAN from 60 to 90

65. The following decreases in PAN have been subject to consultation through statutory proposals and as such these decreases **have not been subject to consultation**:

**Elmbridge**

Bell Farm Primary – decrease Junior PAN from 120 to 30 (as agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school)

Grovelands – decrease Reception PAN from 90 to 60 (as agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school)

**Mole Valley**

Charlwood Village Infant – decrease in Reception PAN from 30 to 15 (as agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school)

**Changes proposed to the Coordinated Schemes**

66. **Annex 4** sets out the proposed primary and secondary coordinated schemes.

67. Paragraph 2 of the draft primary scheme proposes to allow parents to name up to four preferences. To date Surrey has only allowed parents to name three preferences as part of their application for admission to primary school. This is the minimum requirement under the Coordination Regulations. However with the current pressure on primary school places, parents are faced with a difficult choice if they expect their local schools to be oversubscribed.

68. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that in each of the London boroughs parents are allowed to name up to six primary preferences. This is especially significant because it means that parents who live in London and who name

a Surrey school as their fourth, fifth or sixth preference must have it considered, even though Surrey parents do not have the opportunity to name that many schools.

69. Surrey does not propose to introduce six preferences for primary school as given its mixture of rural and urban areas and the generally high primary preference satisfaction rate it is not felt that six preferences are needed. However an increase in the number of primary preferences to four would increase a parent's opportunity to get a school of their preference at the initial allocation and may reduce the number of parents wishing to add additional preferences after the allocation date or appeal for other schools.
70. Parents would not be obliged to name four preferences and many would not wish to do so, but it would give those parents who wish to, the opportunity to apply for an extra school. This in turn is also likely to support undersubscribed schools, as parents might be more willing to name those schools lower down in their preference list.
71. In the 2012 admission round 8,157 parents (62.8% of applicants) named three preferences, demonstrating that there is likely to be demand for four preferences.
72. Paragraph 32 of the primary and secondary schemes now provide for parents to name additional preferences after the offer day so that a parent's right to name a preference for a school is not restricted. This wording has been updated following a successful complaint to the Ombudsman.

### **Consultation**

73. A paper setting out some of the proposed changes was passed to the School Admissions Forum on 28 September 2012.
74. On 21 November 2012 the Cabinet Member for Children Schools and Families approved for public consultation the proposed admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and Coordinated Schemes for 2014, including the changes set out in this report.
75. The School Commissioning team has been involved in considering the proposals for change.
76. All schools directly affected by the proposed changes have been consulted.
77. Parents, schools and other stakeholders have had the opportunity to comment on the proposed admission arrangements, including any changes being proposed, throughout the eight week consultation that has run between 28 November 2012 and 22 January 2013.

### **Financial and value for money implications**

78. There is no significant financial impact.

## **Equalities Implications**

79. An Equality Impact Assessment is attached. The adoption of determined admission criteria is a mandatory requirement supported by primary legislation. The policy as it relates to Community and Voluntary Controlled schools does not discriminate by age, gender, ethnicity, faith, disability or sexual orientation.

80. 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 place at a particular school.

## **Risk Management Implications**

81. The risks of implementing these changes are low. There may be some local opposition to some of the proposals from those cohorts or groups that may be disadvantaged by the proposals, but the consultation will allow that feedback to be captured so that differing viewpoints might be taken into account by Cabinet when they consider the proposals.

## **Implications for the Council's Priorities or Community Strategy**

82. 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 council's priority of protecting vulnerable children and young people.

83. 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.

## **Recommendations:**

It is recommended that Education Select Committee considers the proposed changes to Surrey's admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2014 so that any comments might be taken into account by Cabinet when it considers the admission arrangements on 26 February 2013.

## **Next steps:**

- A paper setting out the proposed changes to admission arrangements will be passed to Cabinet on 26 February 2013. This will include a summary of the responses to the consultation.
- Full Council will ratify the decision of Cabinet on 19 March 2013 so that the admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and the Coordinated Schemes can be determined before the legal deadline of 15 April 2013.

- The admission arrangements for September 2014 will then be published by 1 May 2013 on Surrey's website and a notice will be sent to all those consulted with.

---

**Report contact:** Claire Potier

**Contact details:** 01483 517689 / [claire.potier@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:claire.potier@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Sources/background papers:** All consultation documents attached as appendices.

This page is intentionally left blank