

Redland Green School Catchment Area

Submission by Charlotte Leslie, Prospective Conservative MP for Bristol North West to Bristol City Council School Admissions Dept.

Submitted to:

School Admissions
Bristol City Council
PO Box 57
Bristol
BS99 7EB

Submitted by:

Charlotte Leslie
Prospective Conservative MP, Bristol North West
5 Westfield Park
Redland
Bristol BS6 6LT

Date of submission: 29th February 2008

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object formally to your proposals to designate a considerable proportion of the current Redland Green school catchment area as "second priority" for admissions 2008/9 onwards. This will effectively prevent children leaving Elmlea Junior School and children from parts of Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym from securing a place at Redland Green.

Since the proposal came to light I have been contacted by many parents in these areas who are deeply concerned about the plans and opposed to this proposal and I fully support them. Responding to their concerns I have compiled the following report, and organised a petition objecting to the proposals, (which I enclose) which demonstrates considerable opposition. The report sets out the context and reasons for opposition to proposed changes to the admissions boundaries, and also puts forward a suggested solution.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to both withdrawing your proposals to designate community around Elmlea school as "second priority" and furthermore replace your proposals with ones which would increase the likelihood of children in Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym securing a place at Redland Green by revising the catchment areas along the lines suggested in the following submission.

Yours sincerely,



Charlotte Leslie
Prospective Conservative MP, Bristol North West

Contents:

1. The Context
2. The issue
3. Parental Submissions
4. Ways Forward
 - Appendix 1: Additional tables
 - Appendix 2: List of signatures supportive of accompanying petition

With thanks to all those who submitted comments, suggestions and took the time to sign the accompanying petition.

1. The Context : Challenges for Bristol’s education

Redland Green was built with the stated objective of serving children in North West Bristol. In particular it was argued that it was central to the City Council’s objectives of reducing the drain of pupils (and funding) from Bristol to the independent sector and schools in other authorities.

The acute importance of this will be familiar to the Council considering that:

- Bristol City Council suffers from a loss of over a fifth of all its pupils from its schools to other local authority schools. And approximately the same number to independent schools (21%)
- That’s the largest loss of pupils in the country, outside London boroughs.
- The problem has worsened by 4% since 2002.
- Bristol is the only authority in the immediate area to have a net loss of pupils from its schools. (See *fig.1 below.*)

Fig. 1: Numbers of children leaving local authority schools¹

Authority	Total pupils residing in the Local Authority	No. and % of pupils residing in a Local Authority attending schools maintained by other Local Authorities	Net difference between imports and exports (as % of total school population)
Bristol	18,213	3,900 (21%) down by 3% since 2002	-3,239 (-21.5%) (-4.2% since 2002)
South Glos	15,746	1,664 (11%) up by 0.8 since 2002	135 (0.8%) -0.9 change since 2002
North Somerset	10,939	495 (4%) down by 0.4% since 2002	590 (5.1%) 0.9% change since 2002
South West	285,489	18,500 (6%)	866 (0.3%) -
England	2,940,237	237,946 (8%)	-

In seeking to achieve the aim of reducing the drain of pupils from schools in Bristol North West, there was considerable controversy about the selection of the site. There was particular concern at the decision to locate a school designed to serve North West Bristol in West Bristol rather than North West Bristol.

It has now transpired, as many argued at the time, that Redland Green has not provided the capacity required by local parents, (especially as the school was built with the full knowledge that there would be no capacity for the school to expand) and in particular has been unable to meet the needs of families living north of the Downs. The City Council is proposing to address this by designating families from north of the Downs as “second priority”.

¹ <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000744/index.shtml> :

Table does not include Bristol LA resident children going to Bristol independent schools. Figures unavailable at time of writing.

It is the purpose of my response to argue that this is not just detrimental to those families affected in Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym but also detrimental to the City Council's often stated objective of increasing the retention of pupils within its schools.

The objective for the City Council should be to try and fulfil the school preferences of families and thereby increase the number of Bristol children being educated in Bristol schools.

Currently, Bristol has one of the highest rates of parents not getting into their first preference school. (see fig.2)

Fig. 2 – First Preference achieved for secondary Schools²:

Authority	Number of offers issued	Number and % who obtained a preferred school		Number and % who obtained first preference		No. not getting first preference
Bristol	3,641	3,451	95.00%	3,173	87.00%	468
South Gloucestershire	2958	2928	98.90%	2828	95.60%	130
North Somerset	2030	2015	99.26%	1987	97.88%	43

Yet tellingly, Bristol has a high number and proportion of surplus places in the local area – 13% and has risen from a total number of 6,584 to 7202 between 2004 and 2006.

In terms of vacant places, Bristol is right at the top of the national league table. Bristol has the next highest percentage of vacant places after Halton, Hammersmith & Fulham, Rochdale, Stockton and Nottingham, making us 6th highest in the country. It is unlikely to be coincidence that Bristol is at the top of vacant places, but near the bottom of the performance tables.

But if the Council can fulfil the school preferences of families and increase the number of Bristol children educated in Bristol schools, this will bring considerable advantages - most directly funding, and thereby a vital uplift in the performance of the LEA., which currently lags behind acceptable standards.

Sadly, despite some improvement, Bristol's secondary schools rate at or in the bottom quartile of all local authorities on most measures of educational attainment and behaviour, and fall far behind the national average both on KS3 results, (very disappointing results for this year released only recently) as well as on GCSE results. (See fig.3) and notably, in Bristol North West, Henbury and Avonmouth wards have actually fallen behind since 1997.

Fig. 3 - How Bristol and North West Bristol compares – Educational Attainment ³

Area	5A*-C (%)	5A*-C Difference from 1997	5A*-G (%)	5A*-G Difference from 1997	No Passes	No Passes Difference since 1997
England	62.0	16.9	91.7	3.8	1.1	6.6
South West	59.5	12.4	90.9	1.8	1.9	3.3
Bristol L.A	46.9	14.8	85.0	5.3	3.6	7.3
Avonmouth	28.3	-1.9	80	-12.7	5.6	-4.6
Henbury	34.4	-2.8	84.7	-4.4	6.1	-0.4
Henleaze						
Horfield	41.2	1.4	85.9	2	3.4	8.4
Kingsweston	64.8	21.3	85.2	3.2	6.6	5.9
Lockleaze	42.3	12.9	93.3	8.7	1	4.9
Southmead			62.5	10.7	0	12
Stoke Bishop						
Westbury-on-Trym						

These statistics show the reality of the challenges we face as a city, and the need to implement policies which will improve Bristol's unjustifiably low educational performance.

² Conservative Party Research, FOI request

³ http://www.dfes.gov.uk/inyourarea/statics/las_lea_801_4.shtml

2. The Issue : A choice of secondary school for North West Bristol

"By redefining the area west of Westbury Road as 'second priority' for Redland Green School, the Council is effectively condemning children in that area as second class citizens who are not entitled to the same standard of education as the 'first priority'."

(Parent)

Bristol North West Parents moving out of Bristol Schools:

Despite being promised a new secondary school in Bristol North West, many parents with children at Elmlea school, some of which are signatories to this submission, are disappointed to find that they do not have access to the school which they were promised.

"The 2003 consultation document for the school that became Redland Green School stated that 'The school will serve a group of primary schools where large numbers of pupils currently leave the maintained sector on transfer to secondary school'. Elmlea Junior School was intended be part of the group of primary schools served by Redland Green School. This objective will have obviously failed for children living within the Elmlea area if the proposed changes to areas of first priority go ahead."

(Parent, Elmlea Junior School)

When Cotham was a Grammar School, the catchment area included Stoke Bishop and Westbury on Trym, so did Henbury's as a Secondary Modern. After the abolition of the 11 plus, analysis shows that Cotham's catchment area was gradually moved away from Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym until those areas were only served by Henbury and Portway. This is when parents began looking elsewhere in greater numbers. Now the problem is acute. 3 years ago, 90 leavers from Elmlea went to 27 different secondary schools, which illustrates the extent of the problem.

In Year 7 applications for 2007, 32 children from Elmlea Junior School applied for a place at Redland Green. Only 3 were successful. That's 90% of applications from Elmlea School refused. This has resulted in families looking outside City Council schools for their child's education despite a clear desire to send them to a City Council school at Redland Green. *(see appendix 1 for tables.)*

In comparison, applicants from other schools had a much higher chance of securing a place.

- Of 47 applications from Bishop Road Primary 40 secured a place – an 85% success rate.
- Of the 13 applications from St Bonaventure's Primary 10 secured a place – a 77% success rate.

"It's a simple aim really – we want the children in our local primary schools to move on to secondary education together; we want brothers and sisters attending the same school. We don't want our communities continually fractured by the move from primary to secondary education. The question is, has Bristol City Council got the same desire too? And can it be bold enough to implement this solution?"

(Parent)

Disproportionate provision in Cotham/Redland/Bishopston area:

What is concerning however is that prior to the opening of Redland Green a similar percentage of children from Bishop Road Primary were going into existing City Council schools e.g. Cotham or Monks Park. Prior to Redland coming on stream, around 87% of Bishop Road Primary pupils already used Bristol Council-run secondary schools. They now go to Redland with the consequent knock-on effect of surplus places at schools such as Monks Park.

The Cotham/Redland/Bishopston area was already served by Cotham School, Monks Park and Fairfield. Current admissions arrangements have been providing children in this area with a good chance of securing a place at Redland Green whilst they already were in a position to secure a place at one of the other schools and were moreover previously doing so.

The opening of Redland Green is not therefore maximising the scale of pupil retention in City Council schools because it is drawing a very substantial proportion of its intake from a primary school where parents were already previously happy to send their child to a City Council secondary school.

Colstons and Cathedral School Academies: Further cause for a boundary re-think:

The scale of provision in West Bristol will further be increased with the development of Colstons Girls and the Bristol Cathedral School as Academies. The combined intake of Colstons and Cathedral is equivalent to another Redland school. This development alone should warrant a rethink on catchment area boundaries in the north of the city.

In addition, the geography adds to the disproportionate loading of secondary school provision in the Bishopston area: Colstons is half a mile away from Cotham, Bristol Cathedral School is three quarters of a mile. The catchment area criteria put forward by Colstons and Cathedral schools under their proposed academy status are not set in stone and could be reviewed as part of an overall plan for the future.

But despite all this, in North West Bristol (the area with the greatest loss of pupils from Bristol schools) the City Council is, under its current plans, actually proposing to restrict even further the ability of parents to secure a place at a Bristol school at which they wish to educate their child. This is illogical.

3. Ways Forward:

If the City Council is serious about trying to stem the drain of pupils from North West Bristol and schools like Elmlea then it must not just maintain the current admission arrangements but revise them to give children in this area a greater chance of a place at Redland Green School, not a lesser chance. The City Council could also use this as an opportunity to provide families living in the Bishopston area with a greater choice of Bristol schools.

This could be achieved by designating a new area for admissions policy. This could comprise from the current Redland Green catchment area the section south of Kellaway Avenue and north of Cranbrook Road. Families living in this part of Bishopston could be offered a choice of Monks Park, Fairfield or Cotham. The problem of loss of pupils from Bristol schools is not as acute in this area as it is north of the Downs and this proposal would ensure that local families could choose from a range of Bristol schools, which they were previously doing before the opening of Redland Green.

This section comprises around a third of the much tighter catchment area the Council proposes for Redland Green (i.e. excluding the area north of the Downs). By redefining this boundary, the pressure on places at Redland Green would be reduced (in line with what the Council reports it is seeking to do) and would enable parents living in the parts of Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym currently in Redland Green's catchment area not just to remain in the catchment area, but to remain there with a much more realistic chance of securing a place. It would also increase the chances of families in Henleaze and the rest of Westbury-on-Trym of securing a place at Redland Green.

If the City Council is serious about increasing pupil retention in its schools this approach is far more likely to achieve this objective because it would facilitate families in Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym securing a place at the school they wish to choose. It would also assist the Council in addressing its surplus places problem, particularly at schools like Monks Park.

With Colstons and Cathedral Schools entering the maintained sector, there is every reason for the Council to review the admissions arrangements of all schools in the Redland/ Bishopston / Cotham area. This review should be independent and transparent, and the findings should be made public.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to both withdrawing your proposals to designate community around Elmlea school as "second priority" and furthermore replace your proposals with ones which would increase the likelihood of children in Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym securing a place at Redland Green by revising the catchment areas along lines suggested here.

Charlotte Leslie

Charlotte Leslie
Prospective Conservative MP
Bristol North West

Appendix 1: Parental submissions – To be taken as part of this formal submission

These are submissions received in response to the petition issued, and should be considered by the Council as formal submissions alongside suggestions elsewhere in this report.

Bristol City Council must be put under pressure to keep Elmlea Junior School in the above APR. I suggest that the number of places for Year 7 intake at Redland Green be allocated in proportion to the number of children in Year 6 of each of four primary schools it was originally promised to serve. I understand Elmlea Junior School represents about 30% of the children from these schools and therefore should be allocated 30% of admissions. I also feel that there should be a transparency to this allocation so that parents have confidence that the process is being carried out fairly.

Parent of child in Year 3 of Elmlea Junior School

We are writing this email to contribute our views to the consultation process regarding Bristol Council's proposed changes in areas of first priority for Henbury, Portway and Redland Green Schools. We are sending this email directly to the Council and also to the Governing Body of Elmlea Junior School and request a response from each of you. We are directly affected by these proposals as we have one child at Elmlea Junior School and another child at Elmlea Infants School.

In summary, we strongly object to the proposed redrawing of the areas of first priority for these schools. We believe that the Elmlea area should remain within the area of first priority for Redland Green School, or that an additional new secondary school should be built to serve this and nearby areas. We also have serious concerns about how the Council is undertaking this consultation exercise.

The 2003 consultation document for the school that became Redland Green School stated that 'The school will serve a group of primary schools where large numbers of pupils currently leave the maintained sector on transfer to secondary school'. Elmlea Junior School was intended be part of the group of primary schools served by Redland Green School. This objective will have obviously failed for children living within the Elmlea area if the proposed changes to areas of first priority go ahead.

The current area of first priority for Redland Green School covers 4 primary schools that between them have over 300 pupils per school year. Redland Green School was built on a site that could only take 189 pupils per year with no possibility for expansion. It was clear at the time and has now been amply demonstrated that there was never going to be sufficient capacity at this site. It is sadly laughable for the Council to now claim that the over-subscription at Redland Green School has been caused by more people than expected moving into the area. Even if no parents had moved into the area, Redland Green School would still be very over-subscribed. Frankly, this sounds more like a pathetic excuse to attempt to cover up the Council's bad decision over the location of the school.

By redefining the area west of Westbury Road as 'second priority' for Redland Green School, the Council is effectively condemning children in that area as second class citizens who are not entitled to the same standard of education as the 'first priority'. It is a fact that the GCSE results achieved by both Henbury and Portway Schools are well below those expected of Redland Green. We believe that there are two solutions to the problem of over-subscription at Redland Green School:

1) Redland Green School was built within the previous area of first priority for Cotham School. Children in this area were already well served by a good school. Part of Cotham's area of first priority was then transferred to Redland Green's area of first priority. This transfer should be reversed to allow the area to the west of Westbury Road to remain within Redland Green's area of first priority. If this were to create an over-subscription problem at Cotham School, this could be resolved by using some of the available land at that school to increase its capacity. This would mean Redland Green School would be outside its own area of first priority, but this simply highlights once again that this school was built in the wrong place. Such a situation would not be much worse than the ridiculous proposed area of first priority for Henbury School which places that school right in one corner of its proposed triangular-shaped area. The proposed area of first priority for Portway School is marginally better but still places that school right on the edge of its area. Neither of these proposed areas appear to meet the top criteria for areas of first priority ie "that they should serve the local area".

2) It is clear that there is insufficient capacity in the state secondary schools for the Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury On Trym areas of Bristol. This problem will get worse once the current extension to Elmlea Junior School is completed. Given that we are stuck with Redland Green School where it has been built, but this has not solved the issue of children leaving the maintained sector in these areas, it seems that the best solution is to BUILD ANOTHER SECONDARY SCHOOL. We suggest that the Council proceed urgently with the previously rejected proposal to build a new secondary school at the Stoke Lodge site.

During the 2003 consultation process for the new school the Council was repeatedly told that Redland Green was the wrong place for the school as it could not create sufficient additional capacity. Parents felt then that the consultation process was a sham as the Council seemed set on the Redland Green site and the views of parents and the wider public were not going to be allowed to get in the way of this decision. We are gravely concerned that this new consultation process is just another sham, especially as the Council appears to have given no publicity to these proposals. We would like the Council and the Governors of Elmlea Junior School to answer the following points about this consultation:

-what has the Council done to publicise these proposals and consultation process? Quietly posting such a major change on a website with no other announcements hardly sounds like open and meaningful consultation;

-it appears that this consultation process began following a meeting of the Bristol Admissions Forum on 29th November 2007. Is this correct? When did the Council inform affected schools of these proposals? Why were parents with children at Elmlea Junior School kept in the dark until alerted by a school newsletter on 29th January 2008 – a delay of two months?

- Is it the case that Elmlea Junior School itself was not told of the proposed changes by the Council, but by a parent who happened to stumble across them on the Council website in late Jan 2008?

We look forward to hearing from both the Council and the Governors of Elmlea Junior School.

Mike and Lindsay Andrews

Both Elmlea Infants and Juniors provide an extremely high level of education for local children. Just one example of evidence of this was recently seen when the Elmlea Juniors team came first in a Junior Maths challenge that comprised of teams from state and private schools in Bristol.

With the proposed changes in the Redland Green catchment area there would end up being no viable state education option for Elmlea parents. The upshot of that would inevitably be that more people would move away from the area during infants and junior school years to ensure their children were provided with a decent level of secondary education.

This would most likely lead to Elmlea (Juniors at least) stagnating as it becomes one of the few North Bristol state junior schools that can only realistically offer private secondary education options. This would

also have a detrimental effect on the social mix and diversity enjoyed at the school. Not everyone would wish ideologically or be financially able to provide private education for their children, but we should have the choice. Whilst the ideal (if unrealistic) solution would be that all parents had a viable state as well as private options, it seems to me an arbitrary decision that Elmlea should be the school to be excluded from the catchment area with such a poor standard of alternative offered.

I think the proposed changes in catchment area are a knee-jerk reaction to deal with an oversubscribed school. It seems ludicrous to exclude one of the highest performing schools in the city without providing an alternative satisfactory standard of state education. I don't have a solution up my sleeve I'm afraid but I think the current crisis needs a sustainable solution that raises the standard of education across the city as a whole.

Parent

We are writing to comment on the proposed change of area of first priority for Redland Green School.

The siting of the school originally came down to a choice between the Redland Green site and the Stoke Lodge site. The Redland Green area was already served by Cotham Grammar School. And it was widely acknowledged that the Redland Green site was very cramped. However, illogically, the Redland Green site was chosen in preference to the Stoke Lodge site.

This decision inevitably meant that the pupils from our excellent primary schools in the Henleaze, Elmlea and Westbury Park areas would struggle to gain a place in the Redland Green School. And so it has proved – despite assurances to the contrary that were given at the time. And the current proposal to now create secondary priority areas for Redland Green is further proof.

If the priority area really is to be reduced, then doesn't it make more sense to reduce it in the Redland/Cotham area, which is served by Cotham Grammar too? Why further penalise the schools which suffered most from the siting in Redland Green in the first place?

There is however another option. Why not build another new school on the Stoke Lodge site? This is the only way to really provide a solution. If the Council is genuinely serious about improving the performance of Bristol schools, it needs to provide attractive alternatives that will encourage fewer parents to look to independent schools in Bristol and schools outside Bristol. The current "secondary priority" crisis at Redland Green simply highlights the fact that successful Council-school alternatives just don't exist in sufficient numbers in Bristol at present.

You may argue that the number of North West Bristol children in this situation is not great enough to warrant another school of the size of Redland Green. That's fine - all the research suggests that smaller schools are better places, and having taught in the secondary school system myself, I would fully endorse that opinion.

It's a simple aim really – we want the children in our local primary schools to move on to secondary education together; we want brothers and sisters attending the same school. We don't want our communities continually fractured by the move from primary to secondary education. The question is, has Bristol City Council got the same desire too? And can it be bold enough to implement this solution?

*Andy O'Brien
Elaine Lunts
Parents*

I would like to strongly object to the recommendation proposed to move the the Elmlea Infant and Junior Schools out of the area of first priority for Redland Green School.

The area surrounding Redland Green already has Cotham in the vicinity and Colstons and Cathedral are both shortly to join as Academies also in the same area/proximity. I strongly believe that the children of Elmlea Junior and Infant Schools should have the opportunity to attend Redland Green School and the proposals make this less likely.

I would like to thank you for your efforts to encourage a rethink by the council and suggest the following:

1. Redrawing the area of first priority to include Elmlea, but considers the areas currently in Redland and Cotham that could be better served by Cotham, Colstons, Cathedral, Monks Park and Fairfield or, though not ideal (still strongly preferred to current proposal) ;
2. Random/Lottery draw introduced for the area of current first priority including Elmlea Junior and Infant area (Option 2)

I genuinely believe that the proposed revised admission arrangements for Redland Green are poor and requires reconsideration.

David and Shan Hale
Parents

Proposed changes Area of First Priority Henbury, Portway and Redland Green

I have a son in year three at Elmlea Junior school, our decision to move to this area in 2003 (ironically from Redland) was in part based on the proposals for the new North Bristol school. Having examined the proposed changes for admission arrangements for 2009/10 regarding the changes to the area of first priority for Henbury, Portway and Redland Green schools please see the following comments:

Option 1

No change in admission arrangements for admission to Bristol Community secondary schools

This option is clearly not feasible with the present area of first priority and the size of the school as only a small number of children from Elmlea have a chance of getting a place at the Redland Green school. The school is too small to accept all children in the area of first priority.

The size of the school could be increased by use of other local Bristol City Council facilities (Stoke Lodge – see following).

Option 2

The introduction of some random allocation where there are more children living in the area of first priority than places available (excluding siblings)

This option will only add to the already stressful process of obtaining a preferred secondary place for your child and is not feasible.

Option 3

Changing the areas of first priority for Henbury, Portway and Redland Green Schools and introducing an area of second priority for Redland Green School.

Making all pupils at Elmlea Junior School second priority is not going to help at all. If they cannot get into the school as first priority they surely won't as second.

I wish therefore to comment on the change in the areas of first priority – not only for Henbury, Portway and Redland Green but also for Cotham and Ashton Park. There are other options rather than just the one put forward that would satisfy the promises made in the original consultation in September 2003 for a new North Bristol School.

Stopping pupils leaving Bristol maintained schools at age 11

Looking back on the Secondary education review that was circulated in May 2003 by Bristol City Council regarding the consultation for the new North Bristol School I note the following:

"The need for a new school in the north of the city has long been recognised. In Bristol City Council's extensive consultations over its plans for transforming secondary education, over 71% of the 1664 consultation respondents agreed with the opening of a new school; this proportion rose to 77% of parents who were respondents and 88% of parents with children in primary schools. At present a significant proportion of higher attaining primary school leavers opt out of Bristol maintained schools at 11 and either travel out of the city or go to independent schools. Participation rates in post-16 education are, by national standards, low across the north of the city"

"The proposed DGA for the new North Bristol School has been drawn up to take account of various factors. The school will serve a group of primary schools where large numbers of pupils currently leave the maintained sector on transfer to secondary school."

The new proposed areas of first priority for 2009/10 **do not** address this fundamental problem of pupils leaving Bristol maintained schools at 11 – from talking to other parents with children at Elmlea Junior School – parents will not be sending their children to Henbury or Portway (even as a new academy) schools and will continue to send their children to schools in other council areas or send their children to independent schools. Some parents have also chosen to join the rush for housing closer to the Redland Green School with no guarantees of a place.

Defined area changes from September 2006

There were several area changes as a result of the Redland Green school including:

Cotham and Ashton Park School

Reduction in the defined area for Ashton Park by removing Hotwells, Clifton Wood and Clifton and increasing the area served by Cotham to include this area.

One option that should be considered is to reinstate the original defined area of Ashton Park and change the Cotham defined area to incorporate some of the existing Redland Green defined area. This would increase the chance of children from Elmlea school getting a place.

Stoke Bishop

Although parents in this area strongly supported building the new school at Stoke Lodge in Stoke Bishop this did not happen. I see that there is a possibility that Bristol City Council is to stop providing adult education at the Stoke Bishop site rendering this site redundant. Is there not a case for using the site for the Post 16 Centre of Redland Green or perhaps Years 7 and 8 (Lower school) thus providing extra space to accommodate all in the existing area of first priority a place at the school?

The other advantage to Redland Green pupils of using the Stoke Bishop site in this way is the extra sports facilities that are part of the existing site.

Summary

In summary I do not agree with any of the existing options put forward as they do not address the fundamental problem of children in North Bristol leaving Bristol maintained schools and propose the following:

Change of area of first priority

Reinstate the original Ashton Park area of first priority (to include Hotwells, Clifton Wood and Clifton) and extend the Cotham area of first priority to take in some of the current Redland Green area of first priority (Suggest the lower part of Redland)

Increase in the capacity of Redland Green School

Keep Elmlea Junior school in the area of first priority for Redland Green and develop the Stoke Lodge site in Stoke Bishop to accommodate the post 16 centre or the lower school (Year 7 and 8) thus increasing capacity at the Redland site.

It would be fantastic for the children and the community if children leaving Elmlea Junior School all stayed together attending the same preferred Bristol maintained school.

Appendix 2: Additional Tables

1.

REDLAND GREEN SCHOOL - YEAR 7 APPLICATIONS, SEPTEMBER 2007⁴

FIRST PREFERENCE APPLICATIONS FROM WITHIN THE AREA OF FIRST PRIORITY BY JUNIOR/PRIMARY SCHOOL

Junior/Primary School	Number of first preference in area applications	Number offered places	Number not offered places on the first round
Ashley Down Junior	3	3	0
Bishop Road Primary	47	40	7
Bristol Grammar	6	1	5
Christchurch Primary	3	2	1
Clifton High	3	2	1
Colston's Primary	9	9	0
Elmlea Junior	32	3	29
Henleaze Junior	52	27	25
Hillcrest Primary	1	1	0
Hotwells Primary	4	3	1
Luckwell Primary	1	0	1
Mary Elton Primary	1	0	1
Outside Avon Primary	3	2	1
Redland Girls	6	5	1
Sefton Park Junior	4	3	1
St Bonaventure's Primary	13	10	3
St John's Primary	5	5	0
SS Peter & Paul Primary	6	3	3
St Ursula's	2	1	1
Stoke Bishop Primary	2	1	1
The Downs School	1	0	1
The Red Maids School	1	0	1
Torwood House School	1	0	1
Westbury Park Primary	50	45	5
Total	256	166	90

REDLAND GREEN SCHOOL - YEAR 7 APPLICATIONS SEPTEMBER 2007

FIRST PREFERENCE APPLICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE AREA OF FIRST PRIORITY BY JUNIOR/PRIMARY SCHOOL

Junior/Primary School	Number of first preference out area applications	Number not offered on first round
Ashley Down Junior	4	4
Avon Primary	1	1
Bannerman Road Primary	1	1
Begbrook Primary	1	0
Bishop Road Primary	6	6
Bristol Grammar	2	2

⁴ Figures from tables from Bristol City Council

Bristol Steiner	2	1
Charborough Road Primary	1	1
Chester Park Junior	1	1
Christchurch Primary	3	2
Clifton High	4	4
Colston's Girls	2	1
Colston's Primary	8	8
Easton Primary	1	1
Education Otherwise	1	1
Elmlea Junior	14	14
Henleaze Junior	15	13
Hillcrest Primary	2	2
Horfield Primary	5	5
Hotwells Primary	2	2
Little Mead Primary	1	1
Redland Girls	3	3
Sefton Park Junior	9	8
Shield Road Primary	1	1
St Anne's Junior	1	1
St Barnabas Primary	2	2
St Bonaventure's	3	3
St George Primary	3	2
St John's Primary	6	6
St Michael-on-the-Mount Primary	1	1
SS Peter & Paul Primary	2	1
St Ursula's	3	3
St Werburgh's Primary	2	2
Stoke Bishop Primary	6	6
Teyfant Primary	1	0
The Red Maids School	1	1
Westbury Park Primary	2	2
Westbury-on-Trym Primary	6	6
Total	129	119

2. First Preference: Data provided to the DfES during March 2007 (see notes)

Authorities	Number of Offers Issued	Number and % who obtained a Preferred School		Number and % who obtained 1 st Preference		Number without any Offer	Vacant school places
Barking & Dagenham	2360	2210	94.00%	1689	71.50%	0	215
Barnet	3383	2991	88.40%	2058	60.80%	0	0
Barnsley	2774	2739	98.70%	2614	94.20%	36	327
Bath	1616	1555	96.00%	1498	93.00%	0	223
Bedfordshire	4650	4567	98.21%	4299	92.45%	0	259
Bexley	2772	2687	97.00%	1728	62.34%	85	0
Birmingham	14,694	13795	87.34%	10005	63.35%	0	0
Blackburn	1933	1745	90.00%	1558	81.00%	0	28
Blackpool	1562	1507	96.50%	1442	95.20%	0	216
Bolton	3520	3444	97.84%	3281	93.21%	0	70

Bournemouth	1468	1411	96.11%	1042	70.98%	0	204
Bracknell Forest	1229	1145	93.00%			0	39
Bradford							
Brent	2767	2580	92.00%	1963	69.80%	45	42
Brighton	2238	2088	93.30%	1871	83.60%	0	92
Bristol	3,641	3,451	95.00%	3,173	87.00%	0	650
Bromley	3350	3164	95.00%	2199	66.00%	0	0
Buckinghamshire	5855	5511	92.40%	3345	56.08%	0	83
Bury	2083	2046	98.20%	1893	90.90%	37	0
Calderdale	2414	2347	97.20%	1945	80.60%	0	85
Cambridgeshire	1298	1298	89.80%	974	67.40%	146	0
Camden	1298	1298	89.80%	974	67.40%	146 (10%)	0
Cheshire	7616	7236	95.00%	6893	90.50%	202	731
City of London							
Cornwall	5520	5449	99.00%	5366	97.20%	0	774
Coventry	3278	3082	94.25%	2976	88.73%	196	478
Croydon							
Cumbria	5595	5548	99.20%	5563	95.90%	0	0
Darlington	1206	1043	86.60%	802	66.50%	0	24
Derby City	2592	2553	98.50%	2259	87.01%	39	305
Derbyshire	8463	8295	98.00%	8036	95.00%	0	706
Devon	8,128	7990	98.30%	7612	93.65%	0	0
Doncaster	3417	3374	98.75%	3251	95.14%	43	559
Dorset							
Dudley	3903	3365	86.20%	3099	79.00%	0	47
Durham	5568	5516	99.00%	5424	97.40%	0	940
Ealing	3218	3002	93.28%	2270	70.50%	0	26
East Riding	3620	3586	99.00%	3518	97.00%	20	420
East Sussex	5221	4857	93.00%	4578	87.70%	0	487
Enfield	3711	3500	94.00%	2388	64.30%	211	237
Essex	15575	15195	97.56%	13054	83.81%	0	1463
Gloucestershire	7238	6796	93.90%	5892	81.40%	0	0
Greenwich	2601	2452	94.27%			0	254
Hackney							
Halton	1328	1334	99.60%	1288	97%	6	343
Hammersmith and Fulham	1138	1138	88.50%	728	62.00%	136	225
Hampshire	14575	14285	98.00%	13820	95.00%	0	1190
Haringey							
Harrow	1775	1754	98.75%	1569	88.00%	0	115
Hartlepool	1119	1119	100.00%	1101	98.00%	0	132
Havering	2736	2599	95.00%	2161	79.00%	137	227
Hereford	1972	1921	97.42%	1768	89.66%	0	191
Hertfordshire							

Hillingdon	3054	2913	95.40%	2233	73.10%	0	357
Hounslow							
Isle of Wight High Schools	1521	1480	97.00%	1453	95.50%	0	135
Islington	1512	1512	96.00%	1083	73.00%	74	225
Kensington and Chelsea	700	609	83.00%	427	61.00%	111	0
Kent	15,774	15170	96.10%	11682	74.00%	97	1321
Kingston Upon Hull							
Kingston Upon Thames	1,446	1352	92.00%	875	60.00%	22	51
Kirklees	4773	4773	100.00%	4150	86.90%	0	517
Knowsley	2210	2086	94.40%	1852	88.78%	0	0
Lambeth							
Lancashire	13342		98.00%		92.00%	0	0
Leeds	8132	7657	94.20%	6704	82.40%	0	0
Leicester City Council	3371	3210	95.20%	2888	85.70%	177	323
Leicestershire	13104	13102	99.98	12895	98.4	2	0
Lewisham	2878	2705	94.00%	1648	58.40%	0	27
Lincolnshire							
Liverpool	5933	5429	92.00%	4629	78.02%	0	0
Luton	2423	2280	94.00%	2009	83.00%	0	145
Manchester							
Medway							
Merton	1631	1522	93.30%			0	125
Middlesborough	1767	1644	95.97%	1367	79.80%	0	281
Milton Keynes	2880	2735	95.00%	2678	93.00%	0	0
N Somerset	2220	2206	99.36%	2182	98.20%	0	0
Newcastle	3,132	3038	97.00%	2855	91.20%	99	0
Newham							
Norfolk	11018	10698	95.60%	10143	90.60%	16	1479
North Lincolnshire	1919	1904	99.22%	1852	96.51%	0	0
North East Lincolnshire							
North Somerset	2030	2015	99.26%	1987	97.88%	0	199
North Tyneside							
North Yorkshire							
Northamptonshire							
Northumberland Middle to High	3813	3813	100.00%	3748	98.00%	0	0
Nottingham City	2790	2720	97.49%	2493	89.35%	50	904
Nottinghamshire							
Oldham	3116	3018	96.80%	2835	91.00%	98	232
Oxfordshire	6242	6130	98.20%	5675	90.92%	0	664
Peterborough							
Plymouth	2703	2658	98.34%	2549	94.30%	0	376
Poole	1117	1097	92.00%	1053	88.00%	23	196
Portsmouth	1764	1739	98.69%	1665	94.49%	0	293

Reading							
Redbridge							
Redcar and Cleveland	1660	1607	97.00%	1555	94.00%	0	254
Richmond	1393	1236	89.00%	924	66.00%	86	0
Rochdale	2732	2715	99.37%	2570	94.07%	0	511
Rotherham	3486	3444	98.80%	3326	95.40%	0	268
Rutland	294	292	99.30%	278	94.50%		26
Salford	2353	2276	97.00%	2096	87.00%	53	0
Sandwell	4,153	4025	96.61%	3181	76.59%	0	0
Sefton	3,229	3021	95.90%	2851	90.91%	0	427
Sheffield							
Shropshire	3123	3081	98.60%	2877	92.00%	0	0
Slough							
Solihull	2,621	2591	99.00%	2101	80.00%	0	0
Somerset	4362	4079	93.51%	4079	93.51%	198	496
South Gloucestershire	2958	2928	98.90%	2828	95.60%	*	298
South Tyneside							
Southampton							
Southend	1974	1911	96.80%	1239	64.83%	63	111
Southwark	2537	910	86.80%	1267	51.00%	0	82
Staffordshire	10905	10580	97.02%	10192	97.20%	325	0
St Helens	2011	2000	99.45%	1938	96.37%	0	156
Stockport	3129	3014	96.30%	2684	85.70%	0	12
Stockton	1276	1276	100.00%	1276	100.00%	18	346
Stoke on Trent	2720	2661	98.00%	2504	93.20%	59	0
Suffolk							
Sunderland	2488	2373	95.00%	2252	91.00%	0	0
Surrey	11185	10481	94.00%	9358	84.00%	0	249
Sutton	2105	2019	94.00%	1382	65.00%	33	0
Swindon	2466	2390	97.00%	2334	95.00%	0	199
Tameside	3120	2997	96.05%	2740	87.82%	0	95
Telford and Wrekin	2011	1967	97.81%	1812	90.10%	0	308
Thurrock	1868	1838	98.00%	1662	89.00%	0	78
Torbay	1618	1511	93.00%	1333	82.40%	0	138
Tower Hamlets							
Trafford	2522	2377	94.20%	1372	93.00%	0	0
Wakefield	3736	3717	99.50%	3648	97.60%	0	411
Walsall							
Waltham Forest							
Wandsworth			92.60%		52.00%	0	0
Warrington	2318	2274	98.00%	2230	96.00%	0	154
Warwickshire							
West Berkshire	1556	1542	99.00%	1430	92.00%	8	138
Westminster	1001	1001	92.00%	748	69.00%	83	101
Wigan							

West Sussex	6492	6301	97.00%	5947	92.00%	7	302
Wiltshire	4750	4665	98.20%	4398	92.60%	85	679
Wirral							
Wokingham	1740	1727	99.25%	1436	83.15%	0	211
Wolverhampton	2791	2637	94.48%	2169	77.71%	0	403
Worcestershire	8,055	7841	97.35%	7663	95.13%	0	613
York							
Total	435071	405088	93.11%	356257	81.88%	3126	27323

Notes

1. This data was produced as a result of an ad-hoc request, asking local authorities for information on preferences met on national offer date (1 March) i.e. the date on which all offers for entry to secondary school in September 2007 should be sent.
2. As the Department does not specify how this data must be measured and reported, as it is not routinely collected, there are differences in how individual local authorities may have measured preferences met e.g. most would have measured the proportion of parents living in their area who were offered a place at their first preference of school (regardless of the location of that school); while others measure the proportion of those offered a place at a school in that area for whom it was a first preference (regardless of where the parent resides).
3. This data is not comparable with data collected in subsequent years due to differences in definition of terms and type of data collected.