

Consultation on Surrey’s Admission Arrangements for September 2014 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Coordinated Schemes

Outcome of Consultation

Response to consultation

1. By the closing date, 138 individual response forms had been submitted of which 134 had been submitted online and 4 had been submitted by email. In addition, 3 respondents supplemented their online response with more information within an e-mail.

2. The 138 responses were from:

Chair of Governors	3
District/Borough Councillor	1
Early Years Establishment	1
Family member (other than parent)	6
Governor	7
Headteacher	1
Parent	116
Parish Council	1
Parish Councillor	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 2014

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree
1	Banstead Community Junior School - introduction of feeder link for children at Banstead Infant School	Appendix 1	15	1
2	Reigate Priory - introduction of tiered feeder link for children at Holmesdale and Reigate Parish with priority being given to children who have the school as their nearest school ahead of those who do not	Appendix 1	80	23
3	Southfield Park - introduction of a higher priority for children who have the school as their nearest school when allocating places to children who live outside the catchment	Appendix 1	19	6
4	St Ann’s Heath Junior School - introduction of a feeder link for children at Trumps Green Infant School	Appendix 1	17	3
5	St Ann’s Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School - introduction of a reciprocal sibling link	Annex 2	17	5
6	Tatsfield Primary School - phased introduction of a catchment and a tiered sibling priority based on the	Appendix 1	23*	3#

	catchment			
7	Thames Ditton Junior School - introduction of tiered arrangements so that siblings, children at the feeder school and other children who have the school as their nearest receive priority ahead of those who do not	Appendix 1	17	7
8	Thames Ditton Junior School - reduction in PAN from 120 to 90	Annex 1	9	7
9	Primary Coordinated Scheme - increase to the number of primary preferences that a parent can name, from three to four	Annex 4	51	32
10	Relevant Area	Appendix 2	31	2

* including representation from Tatsfield Parish Council and Tandridge District Councillor for Tatsfield and Titsey

including representation from Chair of Governors at Tatsfield Primary School

Analysis of responses to questions within the 2014 Admission Consultation

4. **Introduction of feeder link to Banstead Community Junior School** - Overall, 15 respondents agreed with the proposal to introduce a feeder link from Banstead Infant School to Banstead Community Junior School, whilst 1 was opposed to it.
5. Of the 15 respondents who supported the proposal 12 were parents, 1 was a Governor, 1 was a Headteacher and 1 was not defined. However, none would appear to be affected by the decision and none lived within the area of Banstead or were representatives of either school.
6. Respondents in support of the proposal indicated that siblings should be kept at the same or in adjoining schools where through primary schools are not available and that the proposal supports established friendships, the sharing of educational needs and parents dropping children off at different schools.
7. The respondent who was opposed to the proposal was a parent. However they did not live in the area of either school and declared that they would not be affected by the proposal. The reason given for not supporting the proposal was that each child should be considered on how close they live to Banstead Junior School at the time of transition.
8. **Introduction of tiered feeder link to Reigate Priory** – Overall, 80 respondents supported the removal of tiered sibling criteria whilst 23 were opposed to it.
9. Of the 80 respondents who supported the proposal 66 were parents, 7 were governors, 4 were other family members, 1 was a Headteacher, 1 was a Chair of Governors and 1 was not defined. One of the parents also declared themselves to be the Chairman of a local Early Years establishment. 63 of the respondents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
10. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
 - Feeder links will foster continuity in a child’s education, ease the transition from KS1 to KS2 and will support community cohesion
 - Fair that children living close to the school will have priority which makes transport easier, children walking to school are fitter and healthier, less pollution caused by transport and parents save money on petrol and bus fares
 - Support proposals which puts living locally above church attendance

- Provides security to parents who live north of the town and who still have Priory as their nearest school
- Will help parents with siblings as Holmesdale and Priory coordinate start and finish times and inset days
- At present parents from other infant schools choose Priory leaving parents to the north unable to gain a place at this school or any other within three miles which is logistically impossible when there are siblings at different schools
- Both schools are equidistant to Reigate Priory and it is the closest school for the pupils from both schools
- Subject to Reigate Priory being able to take 6 classes each year and not 5
- Feeder links will enable children to stay with their friends
- Reigate Priory is the logical next school for Holmesdale and Reigate Parish
- A tiered system would give residents in the north of Reigate more choice and a greater chance of a place at their closest junior school
- Currently north Reigate children at Holmesdale are offered a place at Sandcross School whilst children living closer to Sandcross will instead be given a place at Priory, which is not equitable
- This would make both more like a Primary school and bring more certainty
- Will give clarity to the admissions process and thus alleviate the stress caused to parents
- Will alleviate the difficulties with childminding arrangements
- To the south of the town there is a greater choice of Year 3 places but the current policy favours children from the south of Reigate

11. Other comments made by those in support of the proposal were as follows:

- Can there be some guarantee that from 2015 onwards the PAN for the Priory will reflect the PAN for Holmesdale and Reigate Parish together?
- It doesn't address the wider issue of school place shortages in Reigate, particularly at infant level
- It will exacerbate the desire for parents to get a place at Holmesdale and Reigate Parish

12. Of the 23 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 22 were parents and 1 was a Chair of Governors. 13 of the parents who were opposed indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

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

- Does not provide equal certainty or equal opportunity of choice for parents not attending the linked schools
- Has the potential for further increasing the number of children who have found it difficult to access a local junior place
- Children living nearer the school unlikely to be offered a place if not attending a feeder school
- Either both schools should be full feeder schools or there should be no feeder schools at all
- Will put increased pressure on the two infant schools and will disadvantage children living close to Reigate Priory who do not get in to one of the feeder schools
- Children who get a church place should not be able to queue jump local children for a place at Reigate Priory
- Surely all children close to the school should be treated fairly
- Unfair that parents were not fully informed when they made decisions for infant provision and policy changes should not be introduced for three years following their announcement
- Some pupils at the feeder schools will be driven to school whilst families living in walking distance will be driven elsewhere
- The proposal will discriminate on the grounds of religion and it would be logical for Reigate Parish to feed in to the nearest Christian junior school

- This will lead to an unfair allocation of places geographically around the town with a higher number of places being allocated to children living to the north of the town than in the centre of the town
 - All the proposal does is redistribute the allocation of places and shifts the uncertainty from one group to another in Reigate
 - Will indirectly introduce an element of religious selection in to Reigate Priory, with religious parents who get in to Reigate Parish receiving priority above other children who live closer to the school
 - Holmesdale and Reigate Parish are already difficult to get in to and have a very affluent catchment area
 - Too many families get a place at Holmesdale and Reigate Parish and then move out of the area and yet these would still get priority for Reigate Priory
 - Community schools should be for the community
14. After the end of the consultation period, letters were also received from the Accord Coalition for Inclusive Education and the National Secular Society expressing a concern that a faith school was being proposed as a feeder school to a non-faith school, albeit on a tiered basis, and suggesting that such an arrangement might be unlawful. This view was supported by Crispin Blunt MP who submitted an email, again, after the closing date.
15. **Southfield Park - introduction of a higher priority for children who have the school as their nearest school when allocating places to children who live outside the catchment –** Overall, 19 respondents supported this proposal whilst 6 were opposed to it.
16. Of the 19 respondents who supported the proposal, 17 were parents, 1 was a Governor and 1 was a Headteacher. 5 of the parents who supported the proposal declared that they would be affected by the decision.
17. Reasons given for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Proximity to school is important
 - More spaces should be created to limit disappointment
 - Drop offs at school and nursery will be easier as some children living on Parkviews currently attend the nursery next to the school
 - Wish for children living on Parkviews who attend the neighbouring nursery to progress to school with their friends
18. Other comments made by those in support of the proposal were as follows:
- The proposal does not go far enough as the catchment does not need to include Livingstone Park which is equidistant to Stamford Green
 - The catchment should be reviewed to include Parkviews or removed and priority given based on distance to the next nearest school
 - Southfield should service all hospital cluster group sites
19. All 6 of the respondents who were opposed to the proposal were parents and of those, 4 declared that they would be affected by the decision. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- The catchment is too small and should include Parkviews as Southfield Park is the nearest school and the only one within walking distance
 - Everyone should be able to get a place at their nearest school so they can walk to school and be part of local community
 - Surely school places was a consideration when planning permission for the hospital sites was granted
 - Difficult to travel a large distance to alternative schools which reduces children's enjoyment of school
 - Children from Parkviews unable to get places at Epsom Primary
 - Will Southfield Park be expanding to accept more children?

- Catchment is outdated and warped and needs major revisions
- Twice as far to any other primary school from Parkviews
- Don't wish to clutter up the roads with more school run traffic
- Siblings should only retain sibling priority if they remain at the same address
- Plans to extend Stamford Green in 2014/15 were already planned to cater for West Park development

20. **Introduction of a feeder link at St Ann's Heath Junior School for children at Trumps Green Infant School** – Overall, 17 respondents supported this proposal whilst 3 were opposed to it.

21. Of the 17 respondents who supported the proposal 15 were parents, 1 was a Governor and 1 was another family member. 6 of the respondents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

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

- Impossible to take children to schools in different areas
- Enable children to be awarded a school place with their peers
- Supports proximity to school and cooperation between infant and junior schools
- Will avoid having to remove daughter from Trumps Green before the end of Year 2 to ensure she moved to a Junior school with existing friendships
- Makes sense as they are the closest infant and junior school and most children apply for St Ann's Heath from Trumps Green
- Gives parents confidence of having a junior place near by
- Will help siblings be in schools close by in the absence of a through primary school

23. All 3 of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents with only one indicating that they would be affected by the decision.

24. Reasons given for opposing this proposal were as follows:

- St Ann's should continue to have a mixture of feeder schools as creating set feeders will disadvantage other infant schools and children
- The closest should be given priority

25. **Introduction of reciprocal sibling link between St Ann's Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School** - Overall, 17 respondents supported this proposal whilst 5 were opposed to it.

26. Of the 17 respondents who supported the proposal 15 were parents, 1 was a Governor and 1 was another family member. 6 of the respondents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

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

- Essential that older child transfers to a school nearby to avoid siblings at different schools being late for school or the need for morning and after school childcare
- To avoid worry of siblings being in split schools
- Relationship between the two schools is strong and this will enhance the sense of community
- Makes it easier to obtain a place for a younger sibling at Trumps Green

28. All 5 of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents with only one indicating that they would be affected by the decision.

29. Reason given for opposing this proposal was that children attending other schools will be disadvantaged when it comes to the junior transfer

30. **Phased introduction of a catchment and a tiered sibling priority based on the catchment at Tatsfield Primary School** - Overall, 23 respondents supported this proposal whilst 3 were opposed to it.
31. Of the 23 respondents who supported the proposal, 20 were parents, 1 was another family member, 1 was a Borough Councillor and 1 was Tatsfield Parish Council. 3 of the respondents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
32. Reasons submitted for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Children living in Tatsfield should be able to attend Tatsfield school
 - Seems fairer to those children who live close to the school
 - Helps bring the community together
 - Logical as it does not force Tatsfield residents to travel significant distances to other schools
 - Phased introduction is essential to ensure children already in school retain places for younger siblings
 - Prevents parents from having to drive to other schools
 - Children outside the catchment have other schools within their area
 - When Tatsfield school was re-built it was the intention that it should serve Tatsfield children but this is not being fully achieved by the current arrangements
 - Strong evidence that new housing developments and changes in Tatsfield will mean that there will be more children needing a school place from within Tatsfield in the future
 - Unlikely that viability of the school will be affected because of good reputation and popularity of the school, increasing number of Tatsfield children who will be applying and continuing pressure on primary places in the area
33. Of the 3 respondents who were opposed to this proposal 2 were parents and 1 was the Chair of Governors at the school who responded in a personal capacity. Neither parent indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
34. The Chair of Governors at Tatsfield Primary School was opposed to the proposal in a personal capacity due to the local difficulties and distress that a change to admission arrangements would create and felt that applications to the school would be threatened and future viability affected.
35. **Introduction of tiered arrangements at Thames Ditton Junior School so that siblings, children at the feeder school and other children who have the school as their nearest receive priority ahead of those who do not** - Overall, 17 respondents supported this proposal whilst 7 were opposed to it.
36. Of the 17 respondents who supported the proposal, 15 were parents, 1 was a Governor at another local school and 1 was a Headteacher. 2 parents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
37. Reasons submitted for supporting the proposal were as follows:
- Critical that children can attend their nearest local school
 - It helps community bonds and takes traffic off the road
 - Enhance integration with the infant school
 - Supports local feeling and fair distribution of school places
 - Ties in with proposals at Long Ditton St Mary's Junior School to establish a priority link with Long Ditton Infants to ensure continuity
38. All 7 of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents of which 4 indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
39. Reasons submitted for opposing the proposal were as follows:

- Having siblings at different schools is complex and difficult for parents
- Children moving in to the area who live closer should not take priority over existing siblings
- Wrong to bring in these changes after a parent has accepted a place at the infant school having taken in to account the current admission arrangements for the junior school
- To move a child unnecessarily from a school can be a major psychological upheaval for children
- Increase in PAN at the infant school has created problems as it has provided places to children from Surbiton and other areas who should not be given priority as they have other nearer schools. Need to invest in increasing the size of other sub 3 form entry schools in the area
- Siblings might have to be taken to different schools.
- Want children to share in their education and attend the same schools and not be separated from their friends
- Would not happen if it were a primary school

40. **Proposal to decrease the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for Thames Ditton Junior School from 120 to 90** - Overall, 9 respondents supported this proposal whilst 7 were opposed to it.

41. Of the 9 respondents who supported the proposal, 7 were parents, 1 was a Chair of Governors and 1 was a Governor. 3 parents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

42. Reasons submitted for supporting the proposal were as follows:

- Without this the junior school will become too large for the site and what is appropriate for a junior school
- The facilities and funding cannot cater for a continued 4 form PAN
- 90 is more than enough to cater for local children for whom it is the nearest school.
- If the PAN is not reduced then the community feel, strength and support will be lost
- Like to see it increased again to accommodate further bulge year from the infant school

43. All 7 of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents of which 3 indicated that they would be affected by it.

44. Reasons submitted for opposing the proposal were as follows:

- Dropping to 90 will cause huge disruption and anxiety to parents and children as Thames Ditton Infant School has a PAN of 120
- Will preclude 30 children from attending the junior school from the infant school which will cause unnecessary psychological upheaval for children and parents
- Enough resource and sufficient grounds to take the extra children

45. **Increase to the number of preferences that can be made for a primary school from three to four** – Overall 51 respondents supported this proposal whilst 32 were opposed to it.

46. Of the 51 respondents who supported the proposal, 44 were parents, 2 were Chairs of Governors, 2 were Governors, 1 was a Headteacher, 1 was another family member and 1 was not defined. 25 parents who supported the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

47. Reasons submitted for supporting the proposal were as follows:

- Many parents have to look for a school place outside the traditional catchment areas of Chertsey and this increase would hopefully allow greater choice
- To help avoid a completely unwanted school being offered
- Right to give as many choices as possible
- There is effectively no choice but higher likelihood in getting a place in a school I would choose

- To not have a say in a fourth choice would cause further upset
- Increase the chance of a child going to a local school and a school parents are happy with
- Should be compulsory for parents to fill out all preferences
- Allowing parents more options is good
- Support any measure that increases a parents chances for their child to attend particular schools
- With school places being more competitive this seems sensible
- In principle yes, although does not solve the problem that there are not enough places for children to attend their nearest school
- If we had been able to put down a 4th we would probably have got in to that school. It stops this horrible stressful situation happening to others
- It will increase parental choice

48. Of the 32 respondents who were opposed to this proposal, 31 were parents and 1 was a Parish Councillor. One of the parents also declared themselves to be the Chairman of an Early Years establishment.

49. 16 of the respondents who did not support the proposal indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

50. Reasons submitted for opposing the proposal were as follows:

- A person who even gets their third choice will be dissatisfied
- Forces parents to include schools which are not local and therefore could result in having to travel much further distances
- Generally too many preferences already and changing them from three to four will only add to the uncertainty and make administration a challenge
- My second and third are always the back up
- The whole system is flawed
- Don't need a more complicated system we need a simpler system
- There are not 4 choices available to us
- Would increase pressure on 1st preference schools especially if locality was a key player
- Will give The County Council more scope to claim that parents have been offered one of their preferences when in reality most parents want only their first or second choice schools
- Wouldn't it cost the Council more in admin?
- What is the point when it all comes down to catchment?
- Surrey should be able to fill one of three fairly

51. **Proposed Relevant Area** - Overall 31 respondents supported this proposal whilst 2 were opposed.

52. Of the 31 respondents who supported the proposal, 24 were parents, 2 were Chairs of Governors, 2 were Governors, 2 were another family member and 1 was not defined.

53. Both of the respondents who were opposed to this proposal were parents but no reasons were given.