

Appendix E

Consultation Responses.

Response 1

Following a FGB meeting last night, I have been asked to email you on behalf of the governing body of Batheaston Primary School.

The governors unanimously voted to support the proposed changes to the admission criteria as set out in your consultation as dated 6 December 2012 (Primary Admissions Criteria).

As the headteacher, I would also personally support the proposed changes so that we can be secure in the knowledge that siblings can be together at Batheaston Primary.

Thank you and best wishes,

Sarah Weber
Headteacher
Batheaston Primary School

Response 2

Dear Banes Admissions department,

I am writing to support your proposal to change the admissions policy for Batheaston Primary School and those other schools that were included in the rural primary schools admission criteria applied in 2005. I understand the plan is to adapt these criteria for children starting school in 2014, so that sibling places carry equal weight to local places. We would be delighted if this change took place.

We are a family living in Larkhall. My son gained a place at Batheaston Primary in 2011 (after an admissions shuffle; he had previously been given a place at St Saviours Infants which was revoked). We applied in the usual way, putting Batheaston higher up our choices because we liked it and its ethos, although we were well aware that the chances of getting in were slim. We were also happy with the local option.

By the time we were offered the place in the summer, I was pregnant with my daughter, who will be due to start school in 2014. Under the current rural primary schools admission criteria, and given Batheaston's usual over-

subscription, my daughter stands very little chance of getting in. We do not wish to move house, and I would be faced with a school run to two schools (my husband would not be able to help as he works long hours in Bristol) meaning one child would always be left waiting, or taking my son out of a school he is now settled in simply to have them in the same school. Obviously we are reluctant to do this.

While I quite see that local schools should be for local families, I also think that once a child has been admitted to a school that family should be considered part of the school community, no matter where they live, and that all the children in the family should be able to attend that school. I think the proposed change would be of huge benefit to many families, both logistically and educationally, and I hope you will approve it.

Response 3

FAO: Admissions Department,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed admissions criteria for community and VC schools.

We strongly support the proposal for the three categories under 'Category B' which would essentially allow places for siblings living close to the school.

Our situation:

Our son is in Class 2 at Batheaston CEVC Primary School and our other son is due to start school in the 2015/16 academic year. We live 0.604 miles from the school and when I last checked with a member of staff in your department, we were category D. This would have meant that in the last years intake (2012/13) we would not have got our son a place in the reception class at school (I think you only allocated up to Category C). It is our closest school, we walk there and back every day, officially Bathampton is closest as the crow flies but that is a busy toll bridge road drive away. It is important to us that both sons can attend the same school and it is important to them. I won't even go into the logistics of getting them to different schools in different directions + environmental impact etc. but there is a huge benefit to siblings being educated at the same school.

We are lucky to have our son at such an amazing school. We hope that if these proposals go through, our other son will have the same opportunity.

Response 4

Dear Sirs

I am writing in response to the consultation on the changes to primary admissions criteria. I have a daughter at Batheaston Primary School, and a son aged 2, whom I would like to have the option of sending to Batheaston.

We recently moved house, as we had outgrown our old one. We had huge difficulty, in the current housing market, in finding a suitable property to buy within the current catchment area of Batheaston School (i.e. according to the current admissions criteria, closer to Batheaston School than to any other, which in effect means within 0.5 mile radius of Batheaston School). This added significantly to the already substantial stress of selling and buying houses. It meant that houses in a number of locations within the natural community of Batheaston, such as Morris Lane and London Road West, came with uncertainty over whether they would be considered within the Batheaston catchment area by the council, and whether or not the academic year of my son would be oversubscribed. There were so few houses of the right type on the market at the time we were proceedable, that we broadened our search to include Bathford and Larkhall, neighbouring communities which would have fallen squarely within the catchment of another school under the existing criteria, but which with the proposed amendment, would still be close enough to allow my son to attend Batheaston with his sister, and where we have built up an existing relationship with staff.

I therefore support the proposed amendments as being a sensible increase in flexibility, that will make it more possible for parents to move house, whilst feeling confident that they will not be putting at risk their younger children's future place at their older siblings' school.

Response 5

We are the grandparents of two children and have responsibility for their day care twice a week. We are most concerned that our Grandson may not be able to attend the above school in 2014/15 with his sister.

The thought that our Grandson may have to attend a different school has caused considerable anxiety for both his parents, and for us. For example, only one of us is able to accompany the children to and from school. Therefore if at different schools other arrangements would need to be made. The repercussions of these changes would necessitate our daughter having to change her hours of work, assuming she can (or leave work which would impact on the family's finances). This uncertainty has lead the parents to actively seek to sell their house and move closer to their preferred school thus insuring our Grandson's acceptance. Again this has all sort of repercussions the least being able to sell and then find a suitably, affordable alternative.

Being of a different generation we view this kind of uncertainty as being crazy and unnecessary. To us it seems logical to assume that siblings would automatically attend the same school for all sorts of obvious reasons.

We are certainly looking forward to an early result so that this worry can at least be put to one side.