

**Report of Capacity Planning and Sufficiency**

**Report to School Organisation Advisory Board**

**Date: 20 May 2014**

**Subject: Outcome of statutory notices for the expansion of primary provision in Farsley and Horsforth for 2015**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Are specific electoral Wards affected?<br>If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Calverley and Farsley, Horsforth                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No            |
| Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No            |
| Is the decision eligible for Call-In?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No            |
| Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?<br>If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:<br>Appendix number: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

**Executive Summary**

1. Leeds City Council has a statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of school places. In response to rising birth rates, it has implemented a number of proposals for expansion of primary provision in order to meet this duty, and continues to bring forward further proposals. Such changes require a statutory process, which involves first a public consultation, and then a statutory notice period, both of which allow for representations to be made from stakeholders.
2. At its meeting on 14 February 2014, the Executive Board considered a report on the outcome of a consultation on proposals to expand Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School and convert them both into primary schools. The Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice which was published on 26 March 2014 and expired on 7 May 2014. Twelve representations were received, ten objections and two letters of support, one each in relation to Springbank and Westroyd from their respective Governing Bodies.
3. At its meeting on 5 March 2015, the Executive Board considered a report on the outcome of a consultation on proposals to expand Broadgate Primary School, Horsforth and gave permission to publish a statutory notice. The notice was published on 9 April 2014 and expired on 7 May 2014. Three representations were received, all objecting to the proposal.

4. Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 a final decision must be made within two months of expiry of these notices (therefore by 7 July 2014), or be referred to the School's Adjudicator for a decision. Any significant change to the proposals at this stage would require the proposals to be rejected, and fresh consultation to begin, precluding the delivery of places for 2015.

## **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 This report describes the representations made to the Local Authority regarding the statutory notices for three proposals, and asks SOAB to consider these responses and make a recommendation to Executive Board on a final decision on these proposals.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 The proposals were brought forward as part of a programme of expansions of primary provision to ensure the authority meets its legal duty to secure sufficient school places. The proposals are:

- To expand Farsley Westroyd Infant School from a capacity of 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raising the upper age limit from 7 to 11, therefore creating a primary school with an admission number of 30, with effect from September 2015.
- To expand Farsley Springbank Junior School from a capacity from 240 to 420 and lowering the age limit from 7 to 4, therefore creating a primary school with an admission number of 60, with effect from September 2015
- To expand Broadgate Primary School from a capacity of 210 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 60 with effect from September 2015

- 2.2 The public consultation for Farsley Westroyd and Farsley Springbank was held from 16 September 2013 to 25 October 2013 and responses to this consultation were considered at the Council's Executive Board on 14 February 2014. Permission to proceed to statutory notice was given.

- 2.3 The public consultation for Broadgate Primary School was held from 25 November 2013 to 17 January 2014 and responses to this consultation were considered at the Council's Executive Board on 5 March 2014. Permission to proceed to statutory notice was given.

## **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 With regard to Farsley Westroyd and Farsley Springbank, twelve representations were received, 10 objections and two in support. The concerns raised were not new, they had been raised during the consultation phase.

- 3.2 Three representations were received in relation to the expansion of Broadgate Primary School, all objecting to the proposal. The concerns raised were not new, they had been raised during the consultation phase.

- 3.3 A summary of the issues raised in objection are contained in the following paragraphs. Copies of the representations are enclosed with this report, and can also be found at [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk). Previous Executive Board reports also enclosed in this report.

3.4 **Proposal One: Expansion of Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School and conversion to primary schools**

3.5 Both Governing Bodies are in favour of the proposals and have stated this in response to the statutory notice.

3.6 **Concern:** There are already issues with traffic, parking and congestion, these expansions will only make it worse. There are already many families that travel from outside of Farsley to get a place in these popular schools which adds to the traffic problems.

**Response:** The new provision would require new buildings, which in turn require planning permission. Highways and road safety issues would need to be addressed as part of this process, and would need to consider the full impact of the complete project from the outset. Children's Services have commenced engagement with officers within the relevant parts of the Highways department with the aim of ensuring that the impact on the surrounding road and footpath infrastructure is minimised in so far as this is possible. Options being considered at this stage are altered opening times; staggered pick up and drop off times; walking buses, and options for parents to park further away from the school and walk. Child safety is a key priority and the local authority would try to ensure that staff vehicles are parked off the road. It is our policy to encourage children to walk to school. If current play space is required for parking, then it would be re-provided elsewhere.

These proposals, i.e. the establishment of two primary schools rather than linked infant and junior schools, would mean that, in the long term, families would not need to travel to both schools to drop children off at school or to collect children at the end of the school day, therefore reducing the amount of traffic between the two schools. It is acknowledged however that during the transition phase, journeys between the two schools would still be required.

These changes would create 30 extra local school places for local children and establish two admission points (one at each school instead of just at the infant site). Local provision maximises the opportunity to walk to school therefore reducing the need for people using their cars to travel to drop their children off at school from outside of the area.

3.7 **Concern:** There would not be enough space at Westroyd for all the children; for outside space, PE, hall space, grassed areas. Older children will not have sufficient space to play and the reception children should not have to cross New Street for lunch.

**Response:** Westroyd Infant school has two sites, the main infant site and the nursery site across New Street. To convert Westroyd Infant School into a 1FE primary school only one additional classroom is required. It has been agreed that there is a clear educational benefit to this being provided as an extension to the existing nursery building to create a Foundation unit. This would also allow the external space on the nursery site to be developed further. The Management

Team at the school would arrange for the Reception children's school meals to be delivered to the Foundation unit, so they would not have to leave site for their lunch.

It is acknowledged that the main site is not large and there would not be external green space on the school site for on-site PE, as is the case now. However, following some remodelling of the main site there would be indoor and outdoor hard play areas suitable for all primary aged children. Access could be arranged for off-site provision in the same way that, for example, swimming lessons are currently provided off-site for primary schools. Risk assessments would be carried out in all cases when taking children off site to access external provision.

The management team at Westroyd are fully supportive of this plan and are confident that they would be able to manage the provision of indoor and outdoor activities well with the space available.

3.8 **Concern:** These proposals will make Westroyd an unpopular choice for parents due to lack of space and facilities, therefore making it vulnerable.

**Response:** The school and its Governing Body are fully supportive of this proposal and are confident that Westroyd will remain a popular choice for parents.

It is recognised that the site is relatively small, however it is of a similar size to other successful 1FE primary schools in Leeds and the overall site and buildings are within the range recommended within national guidance. The school is a key member of the design team and are supportive of a proposed solution that requires only minor extension to the school, with no loss of play space or car parking.

3.9 **Concern:** The consultation process was poorly managed and publicised. Incorrect information was presented, the online response form did not work.

**Response:** There was widespread publicity regarding these proposals; a leaflet drop was carried out in the streets surrounding the schools, posters and leaflets were placed in various shops, on lampposts and in the library, on Town Street/Old Road. An advertisement was placed in The Squeaker's August publication, a publication delivered to all households in the Farsley/Calverley area. Information was posted on the Leeds City Council website. Leaflets and booklets were passed to all Early Years settings in the local area and posters were placed in Jackaboos play gym at Sunnybank Mills. All Farsley schools were sent e-mails, booklets and posters to pass to the pupils to pass on to their parents/carers.

There was an issue with the online response form. However the IT department advised that this was due to a problem involving some versions of Adobe Acrobat resulting in responses not submitting correctly. This technical issue was drawn to the attention of officers at the end of the consultation period, when a respondent raised the issue. All relevant parties were contacted to inform them of this issue and allowed the resubmission of responses for a further week following the original deadline. Steps have been taken to ensure that this issue will not occur again by using the Talking Point facility through the Leeds City Council website. Other methods of response including paper forms and email were not affected.

Social media was used by local residents to share information regarding the proposals and this was not mirrored by a similar social media presence by the Council although officers did post comments on the site created in response to queries raised. Communication methods and lack of social media presence have been considered and measures have been put in place to have a Facebook presence for future consultations.

There were opportunities for stakeholders to respond to the consultation. Two public meetings were held during the consultation period, one at each of the schools, along with drop in sessions to allow parents/residents to ask questions of officers in a more informal setting. Additional meetings were also held during the latter stages of the consultation to present the emerging design options.

- 3.10 **Concern:** Alternative options presented by parents at consultation events were not listened to.

**Response:** The counter proposal of leaving Westroyd as a 2FE infant school and changing Springbank in to a 1FE primary school yet retaining the admission point at Year 3 so that children could still transition at Year 3 from Westroyd would require one further class base at the junior site in addition to the accommodation required for the two form entry primary school model proposed.

Such a proposal would create the extra 30 places, whilst retaining the option of an infant and junior as well as primary school options. It would increase access to Farsley schools for Farsley residents because a new admission point for reception would still be created at Springbank. It would ensure all KS2 children had outdoor playing field provision on site at the school.

However, on balance it is not the preferred option. From an educational perspective it makes the issues of transition from KS1 to KS2 more complex, risking the outcomes for children. It would mean that the benefits of consistency and continuity of care which the original proposal offers are lost, and that the transition risks remain for the majority of pupils. The schools would lose the benefits of becoming primary schools; that is the opportunity to attract and retain staff and offer greater breadth and depth of professional experience. This in turn would impact on the benefits children would have enjoyed by attending a primary school. The concerns about increased traffic would be further exacerbated by the continuing need for parents who have children in both of the schools to make journeys to both each day as well as the additional cohort.

- 3.11 **Concern:** There is a housing development planned at Kirklees Knoll where a new primary school will be built. This will make Westroyd vulnerable.

**Response:** The proposal is brought forward on the basis of the children who are already living in the area. Should the Kirklees Knoll project go forward this will produce further demand, estimated at half a form of entry across every year group. A S106 agreement has been drawn up with the developer that would contribute to a new school being provided on the site, if the development went ahead.

At this point it is not certain that the development will go ahead as planning permission has not yet been granted. There is a need to establish additional educational provision to meet the needs of children already living in the area. Meeting those needs in a timely manner forms an essential part of our drive to become a child friendly city, and meet our obsessions. At this stage, securing the land for a new school is an essential precaution, however there remains a significant funding gap, not least to acquire the land for the school, and all options will be evaluated if the building proposals are approved. The impact on neighbouring schools and their ability to expand would also be taken into consideration before opening further provision in the area.

- 3.12 **Concern:** Is there actually need for 30 places? The data appears to suggest that only 9 additional places are required. How would school places be managed if the birth rate reduces?

**Response:** The birth and cohort data suggests that a further form of entry (30 places) is required in the area. See appendix 1 for a data table showing the number of births in the Farsley Planning area from 2012 to 2016. It shows that the birth rate is rising and there will be no spare capacity in the area from 2015. The demographic pressure is in the Farsley area and additional places would provide a place in a Farsley school for Farsley children. Whilst it is possible to expand both Farsley Farfield Primary School and Valley View Primary School, many children for whom Valley View is their nearest school do actually live in Farsley.

There has been a sustained rise in the birth rate across Leeds and this is mirrored in Farsley. The Local Authority has a statutory duty to provide school places for all children living in Leeds and must ensure therefore that sufficient places are available for those who have been born. If the birth rate declines in the future then officers would work with local schools to determine how a reduction in need would best be managed.

- 3.13 **Concern:** Transition arrangements have been badly thought through and will have a negative impact on the children's education. There is not sufficient space at Westroyd to accommodate all the children should all families opt for their children to stay at Westroyd for the whole of their primary education. Going from a 1FE primary school to a 6FE secondary school will have a negative impact on the children.

**Response:** The transition arrangements would allow for 60 year 3 places at Springbank for three years to enable those who wished to transfer to Springbank as they had intended on entering Westroyd to do so. All children on roll at Westroyd would automatically be entitled to stay on and complete their primary education there. This would allow for maximum parental choice. It is acknowledged that there would not be sufficient accommodation on site and therefore alternative accommodation would have to be found should this be the case. Experience with the conversion of infant to primary school in Horsforth in 2012 was that three quarters of families chose for their children to transition to the junior school rather than stay at the infant school.

As a part of the statutory process transition arrangements that would apply for the schools were described, and this overwrites the admissions policy for its duration.

The proposed transition arrangements allow sibling priorities to be applied to both older and younger siblings. No admissions arrangements can ever provide an absolute guarantee of places, but these would ensure in practical terms that the children attending Westroyd would have priority for the Springbank places, should they wish to transition to Springbank. Full details of the commitments are outlined in appendix 2.

Transition from a 1FE primary school to a 6 FE high school is not uncommon. There are many 1FE primary schools in Leeds, high schools in Leeds are typically 6FE, some are larger. Transition to high school is a key priority for all primary and secondary schools and the schools would work together to ensure transition was well managed. The Learning Improvement Team at Leeds City Council would also provide support, guidance and assistance during this time.

- 3.14 **Concern:** The majority of respondents who are parents objected to the proposal but it still got to the statutory notice stage. Also, the numbers do not add up with regard to the respondents.

**Response:** All concerns, comments and views received during the consultation were collated and included in a report to the Executive Board in February 2014. The Board considered the paper and approved the recommendations that expanding and Farsley Westroyd Infant School from a capacity of 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raising the upper age limit from 7 to 11 and expanding Farsley Springbank Junior School from a capacity of 240 pupils to 420 pupils and changing the lower age limit from 7 to 4 are still considered to provide the most appropriate solutions for the area and on that basis gave permission to publish a statutory notice.

During the consultation period 75 responses were received, 65% of the respondents agreed with the proposals and 35% of the respondents disagreed. Out of the 38 parents, carers and residents that responded 14 agreed with the proposals and 24 objected.

- 3.15 **Concern:** Will play equipment be removed from Westroyd reception playground.

**Response:** The outdoor play space would be remodelled to accommodate the number of children and be suitable for their age group. This may mean moving play equipment from one area to another.

- 3.16 **Concern:** You stated that as primary schools, staff would have better job opportunities than if they stayed as infant and junior school. If the staff do not have good job opportunities now, then that is a failing of the local authority and the schools themselves.

**Response:** The response provided was in the context that teaching/working in a primary school offers the opportunity to teach across the age ranges whether foundation, Key Stage 1 or Key Stage 2. It provides the opportunity to work across a broader curriculum with children across the age ranges. When staff are applying for promotion posts, for example, looking for senior leadership posts in primary schools, experience of teaching across the primary age range is often a pre-requisite.



3.17 **Concern:** If the proposals are approved, there will be disruption during the building work.

**Response:** Wherever possible work would be carried out in school holidays but some work would have to be carried out during term time. The local authority have extensive experience of managing building projects on school sites and risk assessments would be carried out as standard practice.

3.18 **Concern:** A member of the Capacity Planning Team was a Governor at Westroyd during this consultation. Is this not a conflict of interest?

**Response:** Many council officers are school governors. The member of staff concerned is a parent governor at Westroyd Infant School and he has acted professionally throughout this process. Along with other officers in the team he has supported the preparation of consultation materials but he did not attend any of the public meetings or drop in sessions as would normally be expected of officers nor did he attend the Westroyd governing body meeting during the consultation stage. There was no conflict of interest.

3.19 **Concern:** An e-petition was received by the Local Authority asking for the consultation to be revisited as it had not been conducted fairly, alternative options had not been considered and the proposals were unrealistic

3.20 **Response:** Whilst the petition asks that consultation is revisited, the statutory notice period during which it was received was a period which specifically sought the views of parents, residents and other stakeholders on the options presented. The views expressed during this phase have been addressed in the preceding paragraphs of this report.

3.21 **Proposal Two: Expansion of Broadgate Primary School** from a capacity of 210 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 60 with effect from September 2015.

3.22 The school governing body remain in favour of the proposal, but have some concerns around access and parking issues along Broadgate Lane. This concern had been raised by residents, parents and local ward members during the initial public consultation phase. Since that time, Leeds City Council Highways services team have conducted traffic and parking surveys and are working to identify options to address these concerns.

3.23 **Concern:** Illegal and dangerous parking by parents on Broadgate Lane and surrounding streets will only increase with an expansion.

**Response:** Following work carried out by Leeds City Council Highways services team, which has included parking and traffic surveys on Broadgate Lane and surround area, there are a several proposed measures to mitigate these issues which include:

- Raising existing zebra crossings which would remove parking around these areas, create better and safer crossing points and reduce traffic speeds.
- Implement speed cushions at the top and bottom of Broadgate Lane

- Create 'no waiting at any time' points around Broadgate Lane and King Edward Avenue, to alleviate the issue of parents parking across junctions and residents driveways

3.24 **Concern:** Lack of parental drop off or parking areas, will only get worse if the school doubles in size.

**Response:** This is a key issue that Children's Services and Highways Services have been working to address and will continue to do so. So far a number of options have been considered and are still being worked on, these have included:

Establishing a drop off area/turning circle for parents within the current school boundary. This was deemed too difficult and not cost effective and would require parents to reverse out of this exit very close to the zebra crossing. A number of mature trees would also need to be felled, which would likely cause objections from planning.

Utilise land near to St Mary's church to create additional parking. An initial survey of this land has been conducted and there is potential for up to 28 car parking spaces. The development of this land including the creation of an entrance needs to be fully costed, however there are concerns that this would not necessarily solve the problem of parking for Broadgate parents and may not be cost effective.

Utilise the Brownlee Arms pub car park near to the top of Broadgate Lane as a park and stride option. The school themselves including the children have campaigned to use this area at least for morning drop off. The manager of the pub has indicated that morning would be difficult due to deliveries, but the Highways and Transport team are continuing to investigate this with the owners of the pub.

Utilise Morrisons supermarket car park as a park and stride option. This has been agreed by all parties and a pilot park and stride is currently being developed and will be reviewed over a number of weeks to determine take-up and success.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

4.1.1 The consultations in relation to all the proposals detailed above have been managed in accordance with all relevant legislation and local practice. The proposals were advertised widely. Where concerns were raised regarding lack of publicity, we have made changes to our processes to address this for future proposals.

4.1.2 The statutory notices described were published in the newspaper (YEP), notices placed on the school gate as well as being advertised in the community. Information was also placed on the Leeds City Council website and Facebook for Farsley and Horsforth.

4.1.3 Ward members in all wards city wide were formally consulted during the public consultation stage, both individually, and through area committees, where

appropriate, to ensure awareness of all proposals city wide and improved understanding of the impact of proposals in neighbouring areas.

## **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

4.2.1 The EDCI impact assessments have been completed and are available on request from the Capacity Planning and Sufficiency Team.

## **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

4.3.1 These proposals have been brought forward to meet the Council's statutory duty to secure sufficient school places. By providing places close to where children live, these proposals improve accessibility of local and desirable schools, thereby reducing the risk of non-attendance and reducing the length of the journey to school.

4.3.2 A key objective within the Best Council Plan 2013-2017 is to build a child friendly city. The delivery of pupil places through Basic Need is one of the most baseline entitlements of a Child Friendly City. A good quality school place contributes to the achievement of targets within the Children and Young People's Plan such as our obsession to 'improve behaviour, attendance and achievement'. In addition, "Narrowing the Gap" and "Going up a League" agenda and is fundamental to the Leeds Education Challenge.

4.3.3 A further objective of the Best Council Plan 2013-2017 is to ensure high quality public services. We want to promote choice and diversity for parents and families and deliver additional school places in the areas where families need them. Meeting this expectation while demonstrating the five values underpinning all we do is key to the basic need programme

## **4.4 Resources and value for money**

4.4.4 The estimated cost of delivery of the expansion of the Farsley schools is £3.2million which will be funded from the education capital programme. The funding provides additional accommodation on each school site for the increased number of pupils.

4.4.5 The estimated cost of delivery of the expansion of Broadgate Primary School is £3.7 million which will be funded from the education capital programme. The funding provides additional accommodation on the school site for the increased number of pupils. It also includes a substantial contingency to allow for off-site highway works in response to concerns raised by local residents and elected councillors.

## **4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.5.1 Leeds City Council's Executive Board is the decision maker for proposals relating to school organisation. It has set up the School Organisation Advisory Board (SOAB) to consider proposals if representations are received during a statutory notice period, then make recommendations to the Executive Board.

- 4.5.2 Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 a decision must be made within two months of expiry of the notices (therefore by 7 July 2014), or the matter will be referred to the school's adjudicator for a decision. The decision maker can in each case:
- Reject the proposal
  - Accept the proposal
  - Accept the proposal with a minor modification e.g. change of implementation date
  - Approve the proposals subject to them meeting a certain condition e.g. grant of planning permission
- 4.5.3 The decision maker must give reasons for the decision irrespective of whether the proposals are rejected or approved indicating the main factors/criteria for the decision. SOAB should therefore provide appropriate comment with their recommendations. If the decision maker does not make a decision on the proposals within 2 months of the end of the statutory notice, the Authority must within one week refer the proposals to the Schools Adjudicator for a decision.
- 4.5.4 Any significant modification to a proposal would require fresh consultation, and prevent places being realised for 2015.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 These proposals are required to ensure the authority meets its legal requirements to ensure sufficiency of primary provision for September 2015. There is evidence of local need for these places, and they offer choice and diversity to parents. Any significant change to the proposals at this stage would mean alternative solutions would not be secured in time for September 2015, and any delay would affect the deliverability of the physical accommodation in time.

## **6 Recommendations**

- 6.1 Children's Services believe that the issues raised throughout the consultation process do not present insurmountable barriers and that these can be addressed. Children's Services asks that SOAB considers the issues raised and recommends to Executive Board that these proposals be approved.

## **7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

- 7.1 Executive Board report 17 July 2013 – Permission to consult on primary expansions for Farsley
- 7.2 Executive Board report 14 February 2014 – Outcome of consultation on proposals for expansion of primary provision in Farsley
- 7.3 Executive Board report 6 November 2013 – Permission to consult on primary expansions for Horsforth

---

<sup>1</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

7.4 Executive Board report 5 March 2014 – Outcome of consultation on proposals for expansion of primary provision in Horsforth

7.5 Consultation booklet for each proposal:

**Farsley Planning Area**

| School                | Adm Lt | Year Start School |      |      |      |      | 2012 Data |       | 2013 Data |       |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
|                       |        | 2012              | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 1st pref  | Alloc | 1st pref  | Alloc |
| Farsley Farfield PS   | 60     | 36                | 29   | 33   | 43   | 35   | 56        | 60    | 55        | 60    |
| Farsley Westroyd IS   | 60     | 63                | 79   | 78   | 89   | 98   | 70        | 61    | 76        | 60    |
| Farsley Springbank JS | 0      | -                 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -         | -     | -         | -     |
| Valley View           | 60     | 60                | 77   | 75   | 86   | 82   | 30        | 44    | 40        | 75    |
| Totals                | 180    | 159               | 185  | 186  | 218  | 215  | 156       | 165   | 171       | 195   |

7.6 Full proposals in relation to the above schools

7.7 Copies of representations received.

Appendix 1

Appendix 2  
Transition

TRANSITION TABLES

**Westroyd Infant School, transition to primary school table**

| Start Date  | Reception | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3                        | Year 4                        | Year 5                        | Year 6                 |
|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Sept 2013   | 60        | 60     | 60     | No entry to these year groups |                               |                               |                        |
| Sept 2014   | 60        | 60     | 60     | No entry to these year groups |                               |                               |                        |
| Sept 2015*  | 30        | 60     | 60     | 0-60                          | No entry to these year groups |                               |                        |
| Sept 2016   | 30        | 30     | 60     | 0-60                          | 0-60                          | No entry to these year groups |                        |
| Sept 2017** | 30        | 30     | 30     | 0-60                          | 0-60                          | 0-60                          | No entry to year group |
| Sept 2018   | 30        | 30     | 30     | 30                            | 0-60                          | 0-60                          | 0-60                   |
| Sept 2019   | 30        | 30     | 30     | 30                            | 30                            | 0-60                          | 0-60                   |
| Sept 2020   | 30        | 30     | 30     | 30                            | 30                            | 30                            | 0-60                   |
| Sept 2021   | 30        | 30     | 30     | 30                            | 30                            | 30                            | 30                     |

**Springbank Junior School, transition to primary school table**

| Start Date  | Reception                     | Year 1                        | Year 2                 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Sept 2013   | No entry to these year groups |                               |                        | 60     | 60     | 60     | 60     |
| Sept 2014   | No entry to these year groups |                               |                        | 60     | 60     | 60     | 60     |
| Sept 2015*  | 60                            | No entry to these year groups |                        | 0-60   | 60     | 60     | 60     |
| Sept 2016   | 60                            | 60                            | No entry to year group | 0-60   | 0-60   | 60     | 60     |
| Sept 2017** | 60                            | 60                            | 60                     | 0-60   | 0-60   | 0-60   | 60     |
| Sept 2018   | 60                            | 60                            | 60                     | 60     | 0-60   | 0-60   | 0-60   |
| Sept 2019   | 60                            | 60                            | 60                     | 60     | 60     | 0-60   | 0-60   |
| Sept 2020   | 60                            | 60                            | 60                     | 60     | 60     | 60     | 0-60   |
| Sept 2021   | 60                            | 60                            | 60                     | 60     | 60     | 60     | 60     |

The grey boxes indicate the year groups that will not have any children admitted in those particular years.

\* 2015 - Primary schools established, admitting 30 children into reception at Westroyd and 60 children into reception at Springbank.

\*\* 2017 - The last year that children moving into year 3 at the Infant school, have the option to transfer to the junior school.