

LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM

22 Feb 2010

Report of the Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

Admission Limits for Primary and Secondary Schools in York from September 2011.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek the views of the Local Admission Forum (the Forum) in respect of the proposed individual school maximum admission limits for the academic year beginning in September 2011.

BACKGROUND

2. It is the duty of the admissions authority to carry out a consultation each year on admission limits and arrangements. In the case of maintained schools, the admission authority is the Local Authority (LA), whilst in Voluntary Aided schools it is the governing body of the school in question.
3. In their role as admissions authorities, LAs must also consult other LAs with whom they share a border. For City of York LA, these are East Riding of Yorkshire Council and North Yorkshire County Council.
4. Admission limits are important because they relate to the maximum number of children who are able to enter schools (reception in Primary and Infant schools, Year 3 in Junior schools, and Years 7 and 12 in Secondary schools).
5. The views of the Forum will be reported to the Executive Member for consideration on 29 March 2010.

CONSULTATION RESULTS

Local Authorities

6. Both East Riding of Yorkshire and North Yorkshire LAs were consulted and had no comments to make on City of York's proposed admission limits.

Schools

7. The formal consultation period ran from 7 December 2009 to 12 February 2010. The list of school responses and proposals received are shown in Annex A. The analysis of these proposals is presented below.

Primary Schools

8. The first two proposals concerning Burton Green and Clifton Green Primary schools should be considered in tandem, as the schools admit pupils from the same area of the city.

School: **Burton Green Primary School**

Proposal: **Reduce from 45 to 30**

Background

9. Burton Green Primary is currently experiencing relatively high levels of surplus. A number of classrooms have recently been taken out of commission in order to reduce the capacity of the school, which now stands at 210.

NCYear	Jan-07	Jan-08	Jan-09	Jan-10	Jan-11	Jan-12	Jan-13
R	28	29	21	26	29	27	32
1	29	26	25	19	23	26	25
2	23	27	26	24	18	23	26
3	28	21	27	25	23	18	22
4	30	24	23	27	25	23	17
5	31	27	23	22	25	23	22
6	25	27	26	21	20	23	22
total	194	181	171	164	164	164	164
surplus	8%	14%	19%	22%	22%	22%	22%

10. The school currently have their classes organised around 1 form of entry. Intakes are forecast to be at or just under 30 for the next three years, although they may rise above this level if the proposed reduction of admission limit at Clifton Green Primary is approved. This increased demand would materialise in 2012/13, and would likely be sustained from this point onwards.
11. There is a proposed housing development slated for the 'Grain Store' site, within the school's catchment area. However, details of the proposals are vague (there is only outline planning permission at time of writing), preventing full assessment of potential pupil yield.
12. The school is expected to benefit from a proposed reduction in admission limit at the neighbouring Clifton Green Primary school.
13. The school are in agreement with the proposed reduction, but recognise that there may be a need to review the admission

arrangements again in the future should demand begin to increase, as predicted.

14. In the instance of high levels of demand, the school recognise that a number of classrooms may need to be recommissioned and the admission limit increased accordingly. In the meantime, they are keen to preserve the benefits of the existing 1FE class organisation arrangements.
15. The Authority are continuing to monitor the situation closely, and are working with new information relating to birth rates, pupil numbers, and trends in parental preference as and when it becomes available.

OPTION 1: support reduction from 45 to 30

16. Reducing the limit to 30 would bring the admission limit in line with the school's current class organisation, capacity, and forecast demand for places, for at least the next three years.
17. Demand is forecast to rise above 30 in 3 years time. The Authority will work with the school to assess the best way forward in dealing with this demand. The school are open to recommissioning classrooms should increased demand be sustained in the future.
18. Although the school is not currently forecast to admit over 30 children for the next 2 years, any unexpected demand for Reception places over and above the current 1FE model employed by the school would cause class organisation issues and potentially have a negative impact upon effective curriculum delivery due to mixed R/Y1 classes.
19. The school would have serious difficulty accommodating above 30 children using current organisational arrangements. Because the current school forecasts show demand at or close to 30, this demand may materialise if current forecasts prove slightly conservative.
20. Bringing the admission limit in line with the capacity and organisation within the school is good administrative practice, and helps the Authority strategically monitor the supply and demand of pupil places across the city more effectively.

OPTION 2: oppose reduction from 45 to 30

21. Leaving the admission limit at 45 makes it more difficult for the LA to strategically manage the supply and demand of pupil places across the city.
22. There would be a significant risk that the school would have class organisation and curriculum delivery problems should unexpected demand for places over 30 materialise in the next 2 years. A reduction in Clifton Green's admission limit may increase the likelihood of demand for over 30 places at Burton Green.

Conclusion and Recommendations

23. Reducing the admission limit would mean the school could limit intakes to 30 in the event of higher than expected demand materialising, thus removing this risk and enabling the school to plan more effectively for the next two years.
24. If, in that time, additional demand is predicted, the Authority will work with the school to find the best way to accommodate these preferences.
25. The Forum are therefore asked to support the reduction in admission limit.

School: **Clifton Green Primary**

Proposal: **Reduce from 60 to 50**

Background

26. Historically, the school has had significant amounts of surplus space, and has not attracted Reception intakes at or near the level of the current admission limit of 60.

NCYear	Jan-07	Jan-08	Jan-09	Jan-10	Jan-11	Jan-12	Jan-13
R	40	45	48	53	53	50	57
1	53	38	49	50	55	55	51
2	38	50	39	49	49	54	54
3	36	43	46	39	48	49	54
4	46	38	42	46	38	48	48
5	42	47	36	42	45	38	48
6	34	36	46	34	39	43	36
total	289	297	306	311	328	336	348
surplus	20%	18%	15%	14%	9%	7%	3%

27. In 2004, the school donated two classrooms to a new children's centre based on the school site, reducing the capacity to its current level. The admission limit was not altered to reflect this reduction in capacity.
28. There are normally around 50 to 55 'R' eligible children within catchment at any one time. Of these, around 50% seek admission to the school. Most of the remainder of Clifton Green's intake comprises children living in the catchment area of the neighbouring Burton Green Primary school.
29. Clifton Green has become increasingly popular with local parents in recent years, an effect compounded by a recent outstanding OFSTED judgement. Because of this, the school is expected to face demand of between 50 and 60 places in Reception over the next 4-5 years.

30. The Authority have agreed to provide some additional accommodation in the form of minor in-fill work. This will enable relocation of the existing IT suite to bring an additional space into classroom use. The school feel that they are able to organise their classes effectively around intakes of 50, should the additional accommodation be provided.

OPTION 1: support reduction from 60 to 50

31. For the past four years, the school has organised its classes around 1.5 forms of entry (45). At the moment, the school cannot physically accommodate intakes consistently above 45. There are no ex-classrooms or spaces that the school can recommission into teaching use.
32. The proposed infill and internal reorganisation of space usage will help the school to a limited extent, but will still not provide enough space to enable intakes of more than 50. Reducing the admission limit would prevent physical overcrowding.
33. Although there are more than 50 children resident within catchment, around 50% of these currently choose to attend other schools. The high level of demand for places at the school is based upon large numbers of pupils seeking admission to the school from the Burton Green catchment area. Reducing the admission limit would also benefit Burton Green Primary school, which currently has a degree of surplus space.

OPTION 2: oppose reduction from 60 to 50

34. The LA would have to allocate up to 60 children in the school. As there is physically no space available (even with in-fill), the school would face severe overcrowding issues requiring placement of additional temporary accommodation on the site. This would have to be removed after three years as a result of planning conditions.
35. Temporary classrooms are now used as an intermediary measure prior to construction of permanent facilities. Construction of additional classrooms on the Clifton Green site is not a viable option, firstly because of physical site constraints, and secondly because the Authority would not provide significant additional accommodation unless demand for places could be demonstrated from within the school's catchment area.

Conclusion and Recommendations

36. The school will be able to physically accommodate 50 once minor in-fill work has been completed.
37. Reducing the admission limit to 50 would benefit Burton Green Primary, as Clifton Green currently attracts a significant number from the BG catchment area.

38. Providing significant additional accommodation on the school site is not a practical or strategic option in this instance.
39. The Forum are therefore asked to support the proposed reduction in admission limit at the school.

School: **Ralph Butterfield Primary School**

Proposal: **Increase from 45 to 50**

Background

NCYear	Jan-07	Jan-08	Jan-09	Jan-10	Jan-11	Jan-12	Jan-13
R	45	46	45	45	45	45	45
1	39	41	44	42	42	43	43
2	34	35	40	42	40	40	41
3	48	36	33	40	42	40	40
4	42	45	33	31	38	40	38
5	40	40	46	32	30	37	39
6	52	42	39	46	32	31	37
total	300	285	280	279	271	276	283
surplus	5%	10%	11%	11%	14%	12%	10%

40. The forecast numbers above represent intakes limited to the current admission limit of 45. The school is forecast to experience demand for places over and above this level.
41. The following table analyses the home catchment areas of all first preferences received for the school, during the normal admissions periods (i.e. there are no in-year admissions represented), over the last 4 years.

Home catchment	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10
non CYC			1	
Haxby Road Primary School	1			
Yearsley Grove Primary School				1
Scarcroft Primary School			1	
Burton Green Primary School		1		
Ralph Butterfield Primary School	25	33	38	29
Huntington Primary School	5	1		
Wigginton Primary School	4	4	4	2
Headlands Primary School	10	8	6	7
Robert Wilkinson Primary School	1		1	
New Earswick Primary School		3	1	
total 1st preferences	46	50	52	39

42. Around 90% of the children living in the school catchment area seek admission to the school.
43. The school have requested an increase in admission limit to 50 for the past two years running. The Authority have rejected these requests in the past as it was felt that:
- a) the level of catchment demand was well below the proposed admission limit,
 - b) increasing the admission limit would therefore increase the places available to children available from out of catchment

and that, therefore:

- c) increasing the admission limit would have a detrimental effect on admissions in neighbouring schools.
44. The number of children living within catchment is forecast to increase to around 50 by 2012/13:

Year	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14
RB catchment pupils	38	42	36	37	46	51	52

Option 1: support increase from 45 to 50

45. Increasing the admission limit would enable the school to meet demand from within catchment more easily in the future, as the number of in catchment children increases.
46. In previous years, catchment demand has not been deemed to be at level high enough to support an increase in admission limit, for the reasons described above.
47. However, the number of catchment pupils are forecast to increase to the extent where increasing the admission limit will enable the school to more easily meet catchment demand.
48. The school have informed the Authority of their frustrations with the “ad-hoc” and “reactive” way in which the Authority allocate places at the school for children that move into the area outside of the normal admissions round.
49. However, any increase in admission limit will not change the way the Authority has to deal with in year admissions. The school need to be made aware of this. If the school experience a relatively low intake of 45, for example, they will be expected to accommodate additional children up to their increased admission limit should more children move into the area in-year.

Option 2: oppose increase from 45 to 50

50. Opposing the admission limit could mean that the school are unable to admit children from within catchment in future years.

Conclusion and Recommendations

51. Available data now supports the school's request to increase. It is the Authority's view that increasing the admission limit will not have a detrimental effect on intakes at other schools.
52. It is therefore recommended that The Forum support this request.

School: **Haxby Road Primary**

Proposal: **Reduce from 45 to 30**

Background

53. The school's current capacity is 228. This represents a reduction on previous years following the donation of several surplus classrooms to Children's Centre and 'speech and learning unit' use.

NCYear	Jan-07	Jan-08	Jan-09	Jan-10	Jan-11	Jan-12	Jan-13
R	33	22	16	26	25	25	26
1	21	28	23	18	29	28	28
2	20	18	29	25	20	32	31
3	26	20	16	30	27	21	33
4	28	22	18	16	31	27	21
5	35	29	23	19	17	33	28
6	31	32	30	24	19	18	34
total	194	171	155	158	168	183	202
surplus	15%	25%	32%	30%	26%	20%	12%

54. The school currently organise classes around 1 form of entry (30), and operate 7 classes. Forecasts predict intakes of under 30 for the next 3 years.
55. There are normally between 50 and 60 children within the catchment area, but demand for the school from within catchment is low: the school normally attract in the region of 20% of their own catchment population.
56. Proposals to redevelop part of the existing Nestle factory site into residential accommodation are currently being discussed with city planners. This site is almost opposite the school (and as such is within the catchment), and would almost certainly result in increased demand for places at the school, although it is too early to say what the level of demand might be.

OPTION 1: support reduction from 45 to 30

57. The current of admission limit of 45 is too high for the capacity of the school, because the school no longer has enough classrooms to accommodate 45 children. An admission limit of 30 would be in line with the post-children's centre capacity of the school and yet still enable the school to accommodate forecast numbers in Reception.
58. Reducing the admission limit 30 would also reduce the percentage surplus space figure reported annually to the DSCF.
59. Although the school is not currently forecast to admit over 30 children, any unexpected demand for Reception places over and above the current 1FE model employed by the school would cause class organisation issues and potentially have a negative impact upon effective curriculum delivery.
60. It is the Authority's view that the school will be able to accommodate any additional demand from the redeveloped Nestle site, should the proposals come forward and be agreed. The Authority will continue to monitor the situation and work with the school once firmer details emerge.
61. It is good administrative practice to have an admission limit that corresponds closely with the capacity of the school. Reducing the admission limit would achieve this, enabling more effective strategic management of the supply and demand of pupil places in the city.
62. Although there are relatively high numbers of children within catchment, the fact that the school attracts a small proportion of these will not affect the school's ability to meet demand from within catchment should the admission limit be reduced.

OPTION 2: oppose reduction from 45 to 30

63. Leaving the admission limit at 45 makes it more difficult for the LA to strategically manage the supply and demand of pupil places across the city.
64. There would also be a risk that the school would have class organisation and effective curriculum delivery problems should unexpected demand for places over 30 materialise.

Conclusion and Recommendations

65. Although there is little likelihood of future demand of over 30 places at the school, it is strategically helpful to both the Authority and the school themselves if the reduced admission limit is agreed.
66. The Forum are therefore asked to support the proposed reduction.

School: **St. Barnabas CE Primary School**

Proposal: **Reduce from 30 to 20**

Background

67. St. Barnabas is a relatively new PFI school, with a capacity of 150. The admission limit is currently 30, which should correspond to a capacity of 210.
68. The school has a relatively small catchment area, normally containing between 18 and 25 children within catchment. The school generally attracts around 70% of these in-catchment children, with remainder of their intakes comprising single children from other catchment areas. The level of children resident in catchment is forecast to continue over the next 3 years.

Year	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14
St. B. catchment pupils	26	21	19	22	15	23	24

NCYear	Jan-07	Jan-08	Jan-09	Jan-10	Jan-11	Jan-12	Jan-13
R	18	25	16	29	27	32	29
1	14	18	23	15	28	26	30
2	20	15	18	24	16	29	27
3	16	16	17	18	24	16	29
4	12	15	13	16	17	23	15
5	22	11	15	13	15	16	22
6	15	20	13	18	15	18	19
total	117	120	115	132	142	159	171
surplus	22%	20%	23%	12%	6%	-6%	-14%

69. Class organisation at the school tends to fluctuate along with the numbers in KS1. The school has 5 classrooms, and an open plan 'shared foundation' preschool area.
70. The school currently operate 3 classes in KS1 and 2 classes in KS2 thus occupying all 5 classrooms available. They are able to do this because of existing small cohorts in KS2.
71. This will not be possible in future years as the existing large KS1 cohorts move through the school and high intakes are sustained in the future, as forecast.

Option 1: support the reduction from 30 to 20

72. Reducing the admission limit to 20 would enable effective management of class sizes within the school, and would prevent severe overcrowding in KS2 should forecast numbers materialise.
73. A significant proportion of the demand for places at the school comes from out of catchment. Reducing the admission limit to 20 would mean that if current patterns of parental preference continue, the school will still be able to accommodate catchment based demand.
74. It is likely that Carr Infant School would experience an increase in demand should the proposed reduction be implemented. This would be beneficial to Carr Infant and Junior schools, which currently have surplus spaces available.

Option 2: oppose the reduction from 30 to 20

75. The level of forecast demand for places at the school, coupled with the limited physical space available to them, means that retaining an admission limit of 30 would mean potential KS2 class sizes of above 45 in three to four years time.
76. Adding permanent new accommodation to the school site may be an alternative option, there is no funding available to pay for any potential expansion. There is no guarantee that any funding could be found in time for 2012/13.

Conclusion and Recommendations

77. The current admission limit is too high for the physical capacity of the school. The school has no classrooms available with which to accommodate the forecast demand for sustained intakes of around 30.
78. There are no funds available for the provision of additional accommodation on the school site.
79. Reducing the admission limit would enable the school to run with sensibly sized (and legal) class sizes.
80. It is therefore recommended that the Forum support the proposal to reduce admission limit.

Secondary Schools

School: **Fulford School**

Proposal: **Increase admission limit from 200 to 208**

Background

81. Fulford School have expanded the amount of teaching accommodation in recent years, and their capacity for Y7-Y13 pupils now stands at 1349. Their admission limit has remained at 200.

82. There have been 210 places allocated at the school from within catchment for September 2010. This high level of demand is expected to continue.

Option 1: support proposal

83. The school have the capacity to admit the additional children. Increasing the admission limit would enable them to accommodate increased demand from within catchment.

Option 2: oppose proposal

84. Retaining the existing admission limit would mean that some demand from within catchment could not be met in future years.

Conclusion and Recommendations

85. It is recommended that the Forum support the proposal to increase admission limit, as it matches the capacity of the school, existing and future demand from within catchment, and will not have a detrimental effect on Y7 intakes at other schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

86. Members of the Forum are asked to approve the recommendations as laid out above.