

LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.

Date: Thursday, 5th July 2007

Time: 10.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 29th March, 2007 (copy herewith).
(Pages 1 - 10)
4. Matters Arising
- Membership (verbal report)
5. In Year Fair Access Protocol (report herewith) (Pages 11 - 13)
6. Wath Housing (report herewith) (Pages 14 - 17)
7. Consultation on Admissions Arrangements for the Admission Year 2009/10
(verbal report)
8. Co-ordinated Admissions (verbal report)
9. Admission to Secondary School (booklet and letter to be circulated)
10. Choice Advice (verbal report and leaflet to be circulated)
11. Any Other Business
12. Date and Time of Next Meeting
Thursday, 15th November, 2007 at 10.00 a.m.

**LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM
THURSDAY, 29TH MARCH, 2007**

Present:- Councillor St. John (in the Chair); Councillors Austen and Barron, Clare Thorpe, Mr. B. N. Sampson, Mr. G. Lancashire, Mrs. I. G. Hartley, and Mr. P. Robins.

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr. F. Hedge, Mrs. H. McLaughlin and Mrs. G. Atkin.

20. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Agreed:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 16th November, 2006 be received as a correct record.

21. ANNUAL CONSULTATION AND THE NEW ADMISSIONS CODE

Martin Harrop presented a report which covered issues that had arisen as a result of the annual consultation exercise with and between schools and other LEAs. (All admission authorities must determine their arrangements by 15th April, 2007). This year the information related to 2008-2009 admissions.

Part of the new Admissions Code meant that all Schools and Governing Bodies had to look at their admission criteria because the option of "first preference first" had been abolished.

In addition, the report gave an update on the outcome of the DfES' consultation on the new Schools Admissions Code, the final version of which had now been published.

Annex 1 gave details of the LEA's consultation document, which was considered by governing bodies during the Autumn Term 2006. This had also been accessible on the Authority's website between 1st February and 1st March 2007.

All feedback received by the Authority is summarised in Annex 2, which also included an update on the final version of the new Schools Admission Code and its main implications.

The situation with regard to Bramley Sunnyside Infant School was outlined. Governors had requested the Authority give consideration to increasing the admission number from 80 to 90, which would be a better organisation tool in respect of infant class size legislation, and as a result of anticipated pressure from new housing.

Although the point about infant class size legislation is well made, the net capacity assessment would indicate a maximum possible admission

number of 88 rather than 90. The school currently has year groups of 74/76/74. Governors had been informed that the admission number of 80 will remain in place but that the position in relation to the number of preferences will be monitored and that officers will contact the school for any potential year group of 80+ in order to ascertain whether exceeding that number would actually prejudice efficient education or not.

With regard to St. Bernard's Catholic High School, the indicated admission number is now 158 (not 162 as stated in the report now submitted). However, the governors wish to retain the current admission number of 140. This can be done, subject to the publication of a notice with scope for objections to the Adjudicator.

The Local Admissions Forum (LAF) was reminded of its need to consider its future membership and the requirements in relation to an 'in-year fair access protocol' (already on the agenda for the meeting at Agenda Items 5 and 6).

Reference was made to recent media coverage with regard to "overcrowding" at Aston Comprehensive School.

A discussion also took place with regard to the potential for numbers to rise at Wath Comprehensive School in view of the extension of new housing within Dearne Valley. Martin Harrop was asked to submit a report to the next meeting on this matter.

One member felt this was a particular issue in terms of future impact on communities after the planning process when problems can occur which had not been anticipated during the planning process. It was suggested that work on this type of planning, and looking at facilities in terms of what may be gained from new regulations, ought to be smarter as a result of the current re-negotiation of Local Area Agreements and input from LAF.

Martin Harrop gave advice with regard to population changes in both primary and secondary numbers. In general, secondary numbers are reducing. Funding from a Developer in one area had already been secured in anticipation of the need to provide additional school accommodation.

The Chair raised an issue with regard to the newly built Westfield School in Sheffield as to whether this had affected children living in Beighton. Martin Harrop outlined the position with regard to numbers for Aston Comprehensive and clarified that numbers in Sheffield's secondary schools were also decreasing.

Agreed:- (a) That, in accordance with a resolution made by the Cabinet Member, for Lifelong Learning, Culture and Leisure on the 13th March, 2007, the proposed admission numbers contained within Annex 1 for community and controlled schools be confirmed for 2008/09, subject to the clarifications/amendments contained in Annex 2 Ai.

(b) That the proposed admissions criteria for community and controlled schools be agreed, subject to the following clarification on the treatment of twins/triplets/multiple births and those resident in flats or equidistant from a school:

- i) all twins/triplets/multiple births will continue to be treated equally, even where this results in an admission number being exceeded, and
- ii) where places are being allocated based on the distance criteria or as part of the distance tie-breaker, and there are insufficient places within the admission number for two (or more) pupils living in the same building (e.g. flats) or otherwise equidistant from the school, then any final place will be allocated by the simple drawing of lots.

(c) That changes relating to voluntary aided schools shown at Annex 2 b i) and ii) be noted.

(d) That the appropriate notice be published in respect of the proposed admission numbers for schools named in Annex 2, 4, where the current admission number will be less than that indicated by the current net capacity calculation.

(e) That this report be placed on the Authority's website, all appropriate admission authorities be informed of the determinations and the appropriate notice on final determination be published.

(f) That the co-ordinated schemes for Primary and Secondary preferences be confirmed.

(g) That the 'relevant area' for 2009/10 admissions be confirmed as the whole of the Rotherham borough.

(h) That Martin Harrop submit a report to the next meeting on the impact, if any, on admission numbers as a result housing growth in Wath.

22. MEMBERSHIP AND FUNCTION OF THE LAF

Martin Harrop reported on the Membership and Function of the Local Admissions Forum in accordance with section 85A of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 as contained in the new Admissions Code.

The meeting considered the appropriate Extracts from the new Admissions Code relating to:

- Statutory role of Admission Forums
- Ensuring fair access
- Reports on effectiveness of local admission arrangements

Attention was drawn to the sentence which stated that "Admission

authorities of all maintained schools and Academies, when exercising their functions, must have regard to any advice offered by the Forum”. It was felt this was of particular relevance given the lack of powers of LAFs.

Membership

The meeting considered a table on core membership of Admission Forums as set out in regulations, and compared this with the current membership of representative groups.

The new Code extends the membership beyond the core membership to all Primary and Secondary Schools. Each representative of a school should be a head teacher, or a governor (other than one appointed to the school by the local authority who is also a member of the authority). However, the Code does not expect every school to attend.

It was suggested that schools should be asked for their views on membership and attendance. The best way forward might be to, perhaps, provide all schools with a link to agendas and minutes with a general invite to attend, but with a reminder that they are already represented through the core school group membership.

The core membership of Admission Forums is set out in regulations and is:-

Members Nominated By	Number
Local Authority – any representative of the Authority	1-5
Schools:	
Community and Voluntary Controlled	1-3
Foundation	1-3
Voluntary Aided	1-3
Church of England Diocesan Board	1-3
Roman Catholic Diocese	1-3
Parent Governor	1-3
Representatives of the Local Community	Up to
3	
Academies (Not applicable to Rotherham)	
City Technology Colleges/Technology College (Not applicable to Rotherham)	

The meeting confirmed the following membership in accordance with the new Admissions Code.

CORE MEMBERSHIP

ROTHERHAM LEA (3)

Councillor Jane Austen
Councillor Colin Barron
Councillor Iain St. John

CHURCH OF ENGLAND (3)

Mr. B. N. Sampson
Carol Sellars
Mrs. G. Atkin

DIOCESE OF HALLAM, RC (3)

Father Anthony Hayne
Clare Thorp
Mrs. H. McLaughlin

**SCHOOLS -
COMMUNITY AND CONTROLLED (3)**

Mrs. I. G. Hartley
(Two vacancies)

**SCHOOL –
VOLUNTARY AIDED (3)**

Mr. G. Lancashire
(Two vacancies)

COMMUNITY REPS (3)

Mrs. P. Powell
Mr. F. Hedge
Mr. P. Robins

PARENT GOVERNOR REP (1)

Mr. M. Hall

Others invited to attend – Early Years Development Officer and Mr. M. A. Khan

Agreed:- (1) That with regard to the expectation placed on the Forum under the new Admissions Code, and the need to fulfil the duties of the LAF, an Annual Report be compiled and published in respect of Rotherham LAF. A copy of the Annual Report should be sent to all schools.

(2) That the extract on Membership of Admission Forums be sent to all schools and their views sought on the best way forward.

(3) That as from the date of the next meeting all schools be provided with a link to the meeting's agenda and reports.

(4) That representatives be sought to fill vacancies on the Schools Group for both Community and Controlled schools, and also Voluntary Aided schools.

23. IN-YEAR FAIR ACCESS PROTOCOL

In response to the revised guidance contained within the DfES' School Admissions Code of Practice, Martin Harrop submitted an extract from the new Code and Rotherham's current 'Hard to Place' protocol and reported on the In-year Fair Access Protocol.

The In-Year Fair Access Protocols (formerly referred to as 'hard to place pupil protocols') exist to ensure that access to education is secured quickly for children who have no school place, and to ensure that all schools in an area admit their fair share of children with challenging behaviour.

The new protocol needs to be in place by September, 2007.

Rotherham's current 'hard to place' protocol was outlined. It gives places quickly to secondary children who fall into specific categories and has worked well over the past two years.

The new In Year Fair Access protocol should now extend to all primary schools and should also make provision for all those who come in to the area outside the normal admission round.

One member raised an issue with regard to children coming into schools who do not speak English and the rising numbers in relation to children from Eastern Europe. This was particularly relevant to the impact on school resources, for example, in Central Rotherham.

In terms of support for these children, reports were fed into Cabinet Member meetings on progress being made and arrangements in place by the LEA, and the Welcome Centre worked with LA staff and parents to enable smooth transition of children.

The meeting was informed of the monitoring system of these children by the LEA's Advisory Service, and the role of The Welcome Centre.

Clare Thorpe reported that the Diocese of Hallam was also supporting children of asylum families in the best way possible. A suggestion was made that the Welcome Centre may be helpful to the Diocese in this work, particularly with regard to the circulation of admission leaflets for Catholic Schools which had been translated in Polish. Polish families expect to pay for entry to Catholic Schools and the information explained that this was not the case in the UK.

Agreed:- (1) That Officers compile a revised protocol to send to schools for consideration and comment, and that this be submitted to the next

meeting of the Local Admissions Forum.

(2) That Bev Booker be invited to attend the next meeting to outline the role of The Welcome Centre.

24. WALES/KIVETON PARK CATCHMENT AREAS

Martin Harrop gave a summary of responses to a consultation exercise, following receipt of a request from the Wales Primary School Governing Body to review local catchment areas.

The Wales Primary School Governing Body had requested a review of local catchment areas and a report was considered at a meeting of the Cabinet Member and Advisers, Children and Young People's Services held on 23rd January, 2007.

The report included the following options:

1. Make no change
2. Combine all of the areas and make one whole 'shared area'
3. Allocate all of the addresses within the 'shared area' to Wales
4. Allocate all of the addresses within the 'shared area' to the two Kiveton schools
5. Divide the 'shared area' and draw two conjoined catchment areas
6. Draw two new conjoined catchment areas.

Consultation has now taken place and the following can be reported:

Local stakeholders (parents/governors – individual responses)

The overall response rate was 36%.

Of the 82 responses, 39 (47.5%) opted for no change.

There was, therefore, a small majority (43 respondents i.e 52.5%) who opted for change, but this was divided between the various options put forward in the report.

If there was to be a change, the largest number (24 respondents i.e. 29% of the total) preferred Option 3, whilst 12 (14.5%) preferred Option 2. There was only minor support for the other listed options.

Governing Bodies

Both the Kiveton Park Infant and the Kiveton Park Meadows Junior Schools Governing Bodies felt unable to support the report's preferred Option 3 and both recommended Option 1(no change).

Comments

Generally, there was support for the concept of parental preference and the ability to 'choose' a school.

Some of the consultees offered the opinion that 'if it ain't broke – don't fix it', making reference to the fact that, currently, all preferences are

satisfied. (All preferences are currently satisfied simply because both schools are undersubscribed and any change to the catchment area would have no effect in that situation).

Some respondents were concerned that any removal of the shared area would be detrimental to parents living in that area and, in particular, that those moving into new housing in the Kiveton Park catchment would have a higher priority for admission to those schools than those currently living in the shared area, even though they would be living further away from the schools.

There was also no real confirmation of the original assertion that the shared area was confusing for parents.

It is, perhaps, the latter two points when considered alongside the original report, that had been taken into account when making a decision on this matter.

The original report had suggested that Option 3 would be the most appropriate option, because it would:

- a) Be a minor rather than a major change
- b) End any confusion arising from the use of a 'shared area' and
- c) Mainly reflect the current trend of parents preferences in the area.

Reference was made to the proposal and the fact that it had not been discussed by the LAF prior to a decision being made by the Cabinet Member and Advisors, Children and Young People's Services. This was acknowledged and an assurance given by officers present that any future proposals would be submitted to this forum for consideration and discussion prior to consideration by the Cabinet Member, Children and Young People's Services.

The Local Authority had resolved to agree Option 1 (No change) with the situation to be monitored and a further report to be prepared for Members in 2009/10.

Agreed:- That the report be received.

25. UPDATE ON THE CURRENT ADMISSIONS CYCLES

Marina Jordan gave a verbal update on the current situation with regard to primary and secondary school admissions cycles for September, 2007.

Secondary Schools – Year 7 Admissions in September, 2007

The National offer date was 1st March, 2007. On that day there were 7 oversubscribed schools. This was fewer than in recent years.

There were 509 on-line applications which equates to 16% of the cohort.

95.4% had been offered a place at the first preferred school and 98.8% of children were allocated 1st/2nd or 3rd preferred school.

Therefore there was only a small number of children who did not get one of the preferred schools, which followed that the number of appeals had reduced compared to previous years.

Tom Minett gave an update on the current number of admission appeals and appeal panel meetings being processed within Committee Services. Despite a large number of appeals for Wickersley Comprehensive, all other appeals (Wath Comprehensive/Clifton Comprehensive/St. Bernard's Catholic High School, Wingfield Comprehensive and Oakwood Comprehensive) had reduced. Demand was not uniform across every school.

Marina explained how the "tie-breaker" system would operate from September 2007 and how this had affected this year's admissions.

Reception/Foundation Stage 2 – September, 2007

There are 14 oversubscribed schools which have a waiting list. Also, there are 4 schools which have just reached the admission number. There were 401 online applications which equates to 13% of the cohort. 97% of first preferences were approved.

For admissions to separate Junior Schools in September 2007, there is only one school which is oversubscribed. 99.6% of first preferences were approved. Four children who attend an Infant School in another Local Authority have been refused for a place and are on a waiting list.

Agreed:- That the verbal reports on the current admissions cycles be received.

26. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

David Hill gave an update on the present situation with regard to the proposed closure of Rawmarsh St. Mary's C of E School and its potential affect on other schools in the area.

The meeting was informed that the notice had been published and no objections had yet been received, although the closing date had not yet been reached.

The meeting raised questions with regard to the decision-making process and what provision was being made for the placement of school children in the event of its closure.

David Hill explained that a final decision would not be made until the end of June, 2007 and outlined the work being carried out with parents and pupils as part of the consultation process, in order to make the possible

transition period as smooth as possible. Existing staff would be redeployed, where possible, and were being consulted throughout the process.

27. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

This was scheduled for Thursday, 5th July, 2007 at 10.00 a.m.

In-Year Fair Access Protocol

In response to the revised guidance contained within the DfES' School Admissions Code, the Rotherham Local Admissions Forum has agreed the following **as the In-Year Fair Access protocol for the Rotherham area**. This protocol applies equally to all **Primary and Secondary** schools within Rotherham **in respect of preferences made outside of the normal admissions round on behalf of pupils who would otherwise have no place available to them**.

Main Principles

The Local Admissions Forum recognises that some parents/**carers** can find difficulty in obtaining a school place for their child(ren) and that this can lead to an unnecessary delay in the admission to a school. This can be for a number of reasons, but **the admissions process can** often also result in undersubscribed schools (which may also be operating under challenging circumstances) being asked to admit a larger proportion of pupils **with challenging behaviour** than those schools which are operating at their admission number.

This protocol is designed to:-

- **ensure that unplaced children, especially the most vulnerable, are offered a place at a suitable school as quickly as possible,**
- provide for a fairer distribution of pupils **with challenging behaviour,**
- work in the best interests of all Rotherham's pupils.

Protocol

1) and 2) below will form the basis of the Protocol. However, no places will be offered under 1) or 2) where 3) 4) or 5) would apply. Where a place cannot be offered at a specific school under the Protocol because 3) or 4) apply, then the place offered would be the next nearest school/appropriate denominational school in Rotherham.

1)

A preference in respect of a child falling within one of the following categories will be agreed, even where the preferred school is already operating at or above its admission number in the year group concerned, where the preferred school is the catchment/nearest/most appropriate denominational school :

- i) public care (**relevant looked after child**),
- ii) permanently excluded from school (but see **5)** and **6)** below),
- iii) attend a PRU and needing to be reintegrated back into mainstream education,
- iv) been out of education for longer than one school term (provided that an appropriate place has not already been allocated),
- v) refugees and asylum seekers not in accommodation centres,
- vi) homeless,
- vii) travellers.

2)

Where an application is received and there is no place available within the admission number at any of the preferred schools named on the form, then a place will be offered as follows:

a) where the parent/carer has made 3 preferences, then a place will be offered at the catchment/nearest/most appropriate denominational school,

b) where the parent/carer has made fewer than 3 preferences, a place will be offered at one of the 3 nearest schools with places available within the admission number.

3)

It is recognised that there are, inevitably, some instances where it is not appropriate to agree a preference made on behalf of a child for a specific school. Preferences will not therefore be agreed as part of the above protocol where the child:-

- i) is a challenging child and the preferred school has a particularly high concentration of pupils **with** challenging behaviour, or **previously excluded children and one or more of the following exceptional exists, namely that the school:-**
 - a) **requires** special measures or has recently come out of them (within the last two years);
 - b) has been identified by OFSTED as having serious weaknesses **or requiring significant improvement and, therefore, given 'notice to improve'**;
 - c) is subject to a formal warning notice;
 - d) is a Fresh Start school or Academy open for less than two years; or
 - e) is a secondary school where less than **30%** of **children** are achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C, or **a primary school where fewer than 65% of pupils achieve level 4 or above at Key Stage 2 in both English and Mathematics for four or more consecutive years, or**
- ii) has, in exceptional circumstances, a previously established connection with the school concerned,

and, in i) or ii) admission to the school would prejudice the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources.

4)

Any places offered under this Protocol should not lead to the necessity for any school to breach the Infant Class Size legislation. No place will, therefore, be offered which leads to an Infant class size greater than 30, except where the following apply:

- **in the case of a relevant looked after child (child in public care), or**
- **where there are no other schools that could provide suitable education within a reasonable distance of the child's home address.**

Any children falling within the above would be classed as 'excepted pupils' under the current regulations and a class greater than 30 would be allowed for the remainder of the academic year.

5)

Where a child has been permanently excluded from two or more schools and at least one of the exclusions took place after 1st September 1997, parents can still express a preference for a school place, but the requirement to comply is removed for a period of two years following the **latest** exclusion. However, this does not apply to:

- **children with statements of special educational needs;**
- children who **were** below compulsory school age when excluded;
- **children** who were re-instated following a permanent exclusion;
- and **children** who would have been re-instated following a permanent exclusion had it been practicable to do so.

A permanent exclusion is regarded as taking effect from the first school day the headteacher has told the pupil not to attend school.

In such circumstances the LEA will offer a place at a school it deems to be most appropriate and, therefore, this protocol will not apply.

6) Further information relating to Rotherham's Secondary School Approach to the Re-integration of Permanently Excluded Pupils and Managed Moves for Children at Serious Risk of Exclusion can be found at Annex 1).

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning officers have previously provided a breakdown of potential areas of new housing development in the Wath area. The potential requirement for additional school capacity was then highlighted in a response paper (see attached Appendix). This report offers the opportunity to update the pupil numbers/capacities of schools to show the position in 2006/07 and to look at the position beyond that. An update on the latest position with regard to the potential areas of housing development is also given.

The original paper forecast that there would be 187 surplus places in the local Primary schools in 2006/07. The actual surplus now shows at 160, which is less than the forecast figure but 59 more than the surplus recorded in 2003/04.

Readjusting the original calculation to now include the actual figures leaves a potential total of 287 additional pupils against a current surplus place figure of 160 – a potential deficit of 127 places, which could equate to a requirement for 5 additional classrooms.

The number of surplus places has been growing as the number of pupils has been declining as smaller Reception cohort numbers have been replacing larger Y6 numbers. This situation is applying in general throughout Rotherham and is expected to continue until 2011, which is likely to be the low point for Primary school numbers. The potential number on roll in the Wath planning area is likely to fall to around 1608. This would result in 208 surplus places, which would mean that if all of the potential development areas were completed and there was an additional 287 pupils, then there would be a potential deficit of just 79 places, which would equate to three classrooms.

The main issue in assessing the amount of additional capacity required revolves around the timing of these housing developments. At this stage, it looks as though 79 places would be the minimum deficit, but as pupil numbers begin to increase after 2011 this could lead to a greater deficit of places.

The position in terms of developer contribution through any Section 106 agreement is also complicated and can be very much related to the timing of each development. Clearly, any small development (say less than 100 houses) built before any others would, seen in isolation, have no immediate impact on the ability to offer places in the Wath area. However, the same development built after the other much larger developments could tip the balance at a particular school and lead to the requirement for additional capacity.

The updated position on the 7 areas previously identified is as follows:

	Development	No. of Units	Revised	Catchment	Comments
1	Station Road	38	50	Wath Victoria	Application under consideration
2	Station Road	380	0	Wath Victoria	Most unlikely to be developed
3	Manvers W.	300	339	Wath Central	Planning permission granted
4	Wet Moor L.	114	162	Wath Central	Planning permission granted
5	West Street	107	75	Wath Central	Application under consideration
6	Denman Rd.	114	194	Wath Central	Application yet to be submitted

7	Fitzwilliam F.	300	292	West Melton	Permission granted and started on site
		1353	1112		

There are some areas which are likely to be developed at a higher density than the original figures, but with the large potential area at Station Road (2 above) now being unlikely to be developed for housing, the total number of units is reduced to 1112.

This would equate to an additional 33 pupils per year group = 231 pupils in the Primary sector. With a potential surplus place figure of 208 in 2011, based on the current situation, there is, therefore, a potential deficit of just 23 places. This could, however, increase thereafter as pupil numbers begin to rise again.

The conclusion to be drawn is that, although there is no imminent problem in terms of school place provision, each of the developments listed above could contribute, at some point in the future, towards a requirement for additional school capacity in the Wath area.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT – WATH Appendix

There are 7 development/development interest sites identified. These all fall within Wath's catchment area for secondary education.

For primary education, the position is as follows:

Development	No. of houses	Catchment School
1) Station Road	38	Wath Victoria
2) Station Road	380	Wath Victoria
3) Manvers Way	300	Wath Park/Central
4) Wet Moor Lane	114	Wath Park/Central
5) West Street	107	Wath Park/Central
6) Denman Road	114	Wath Park/Central
7) Wet Moor Lane/ Manvers Way	300	West Melton
TOTAL	1353	of which: 418 Wath Victoria 635 Wath Park/Central 300 West Melton

1353 houses @ 3 pupils per year group/ 100 houses would produce approximately 41 pupils per year group.

For primary education, the catchment area split would produce:

Wath Victoria	= 13 pupils per year group
Wath Park/Central	= 19 pupils per year group
West Melton	= 9 pupils per year group

For school place planning, however, it also needs to be noted that there are a number of church schools in the area which do not have a specific drawn catchment area.

The position for the Wath planning area based on 2003/04 pupil numbers was as follows:

School	Capacity	No. on Roll	Surplus places
Brampton Cortonwood Inf	115	83	32
Brampton Ellis CE Inf	120	117	3
Brampton Ellis CE Jnr	269	244	25
Wath Park Inf	180	170	10
Wath Central Jnr	240	266	-26
Wath Victoria	240	226	14
West Melton	164	118	46
Wath CE	210	205	5
Our Lady + St. Jos. Cath.	175	175	0
Wentworth CE	104	112	-8
TOTALS	1817	1716	101

So, at 2003/04, there were 101 surplus places in the area. These developments have, in total, the potential to produce 41×7 (F2 – Y6) = 287 additional pupils which would indicate a shortfall of 186 places. This would probably equate to around 7/8 classrooms spread over a number of schools. Clearly, the above looks at the position as it would be if the new build were in place as at 2003/04 figures. Changes in birth rates, new housing already in place or in the pipeline and the timing of any of the new developments would produce a different scenario. For instance, the current estimated numbers for the above schools in 2006/07 show a total number on roll of 1632 pupils with a surplus of 187. An additional 287 pupils would then produce a shortfall of just 100 places, which could lead to a requirement for only 4 additional classrooms.

The other point to bear in mind is the possibility that all additional pupils produced might prefer to attend their catchment area school. The LEA's policy would guarantee a place at the catchment school to all such applicants applying on time and, if this happened based on the 2006/07 estimates, it would produce a requirement for 7 additional classrooms.

So the conclusion is that the developments could produce a requirement for between 4 and 8 additional classrooms overall in the primary sector.

For the secondary sector the position is somewhat different. As previously stated, all of the development areas fall within Wath's catchment area. The school usually fills up in each year group, but many of its pupils are resident outside the catchment area and, in fact, outside the borough. At Y7 entry, any pupils resident in the catchment who apply for a place on time would gain entry to the school and there would probably be sufficient capacity for this not to create a need for additional classroom space. This would, however, be at the expense of many of those who would have normally expected to have gained entry from outside the catchment area. (It could be argued that the LEA ought to expand a popular school, if an increasing number of preferences were being refused).

The other main problem would revolve around those moving into any new housing mid-year when places have already been allocated. If pupils in that position did gain a place at the school, probably through the appeals process, then the school would become overcrowded and again there would probably be a need for additional capacity at the school.

The next nearest secondary school is Pope Pius (a catholic school), which is also currently full.

The above would bring us back to the possible requirement for Section 106 agreements and the need to try to ensure that something was in place for the first of these possible developments, where new school capacity was required within a stipulated period of time. Otherwise the burden would fall on the developers of the later sites only.