

Responses to the Consultation on proposed Admission Arrangements for the Academic Year 2018/19

Response 1 from a Parent

"Good morning,

Reference the above I would like to register the following concerns.

Our eldest son has been placed at Wharncliffe Side School despite us living at Worrall and well within catchment for Oughtibridge Primary School. Without detailing our individual case this had a devastating impact on our son, and our day to day lives.

To this event we have concentrated on getting our youngest son into the same school and will apply in the same year you propose to increase the local catchment to include the new development. This will push us down the list as catchment will take priority and ultimately could mean our sons are separated, something we have been fighting to avoid since the recent oversubscription farce.

If this is the case then we have to change tact and appeal to have our son accepted in our catchment school which would almost guarantee his sibling to obtain a place.

Mr Bigley is familiar with our case and medically we do not wish to move our eldest son as this would be further damaging to the upheaval already placed on his young shoulders.

The school is already a nightmare around the pick-up and drop off, local residents are always complaining and increasing numbers will further impact on traffic congestion. The school will also have to be developed to accommodate bigger numbers so what impact will this have on existing pupils, and when will development likely happen?

I will email Mr Bigley directly with developments to our individual circumstances however I wish to register my concerns for the reasons stipulated above.

Response 2 from a Parent/Governor

"Dear Sheffield City Council

I received letters from Wharncliffe Side School (WSS) about the proposed changes to catchment areas to incorporate the new housing development on the former Oughtibridge Mill site. I am a parent of children at Wharncliffe Side School, a school governor there, and a resident of Oughtibridge.

I think the proposal to include the site within Wharncliffe Side School's catchment is eminently sensible. Due to population demographics, WSS struggles to fill its places with 'catchment pupils' and that creates uncertainty about future planning and financial viability. It is an Ofsted "good" school and deserves to have a more secure

and sustainable population base to give all children residing in the locality the best possible education.

The additional pupils from the new housing development may even enable the school to increase its pupil admission number and expand to move to full one form entry (30 mainstream pupils per year). That would permit the school to function much more efficiently, again to the educational benefit of all pupils.

I understand the road access point from the new development onto the main road (A6102) will remain where it is. This puts WSS clearly as the nearest school in travel time, rather than say Oughtibridge PS.

Following the family of school principle for entry into Bradfield School it makes logical sense that the secondary school catchment for the new housing development on the mill site is also Bradfield School. I trust someone in the council will follow through the planning implications that this might bring in terms of ensuring sufficiency of places and supporting any capital build require, all in good anticipation and foresight.

My only comment on the oversubscription criteria (which are not proposed to change) is that they follow convention and remain looking broadly sensible.

One final pragmatic thought. The catchment boundary around the Mill development is very convoluted - for instance it pinches down deeply from the north. Unlike many catchment boundaries, this one is not demarcating different residential areas. It is separating out a brownfield site from greenbelt. Currently (and hopefully long into the future) that green belt will have no properties sited on it.

So why not for the sake of neatness add more of those greenbelt areas into the catchment to make the lines neater?

The precedent is already set with the existing catchment of WSS out towards the Strines road, where extensive areas of National Park without any residences are included.

I would suggest taking the Eastern catchment boundary of WSS school to include any of Barnsley MBC south or west of the railway line that is not already included within Royd / Deepcar St John's catchment.

It doesn't add any housing, but it is definitely a lot neater, consistent, and future-proof.

Response 3 from a parent

Clifford CE Infant and Ecclesall Infant and Junior

The parent enquired why there was no reference to the proposals for Clifford Infant CE and Ecclesall? The Local Authority is the Admission Authority for Ecclesall Infant and Junior Schools, it is not the Admission Authority for Clifford CE Infant. The consultation is specifically about proposed admission arrangements, including oversubscription criteria to which there are no proposed changes at Ecclesall. Any

proposed school organisation changes for Clifford CE and Ecclesall will be subject to a separate consultation process which will afford all stakeholders with the opportunity to formally respond.

Response 4 from Lupton Fawcett solicitors

Clifford CE Infant and Ecclesall Infant and Junior

From Lupton Fawcett solicitors on behalf of 5 parents. Alleging “absence of relevant consultation on Admission Arrangements and co-ordinated admission schemes 2018/19”

As above, the consultation on proposed Admission Arrangements and co-ordinated admission schemes do not propose any changes to the arrangements for Ecclesall Infant and Junior Schools. Any school organisation proposals involving the two schools will be subject to a separate statutory consultation process which will afford all stakeholders with the opportunity to formally respond.