

DETERMINATION

Case reference: ADA2152 and ADA2177

Objectors: Berridge Junior School, Nottingham (ADA2152) and Nottingham City Council (ADA2177).

Admission Authority: The Governing Body of The Nottingham Bluecoat School and Technology College

Date of decision: 9th September 2011

Determination

In accordance with section 88 H (4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objections to the admission arrangements determined by the Governors of The Nottingham Bluecoat School and Technology College.

I determine that the oversubscription criteria for entry in September 2012 should be as set out in appendix 1 attached.

The referral

1. Objections have been referred to the Adjudicator by Nottingham City Council ("the Council") and Berridge Junior School ("BJS"), Nottingham, about the admission arrangements for The Nottingham Bluecoat School and Technology College ("the School"), a voluntary aided Church of England secondary school, for September 2012. Both objections are based on the view that the School has taken insufficient account of the guidance in paragraph 2.53 of the School Admission Code ("the Code") that an admission authority for a faith school should consider the extent to which their admission arrangements "*impact on the communities in which they are physically based and those faith communities which they serve*".

Jurisdiction

2. These arrangements were determined under section 88C of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (the Act) by the governing body, which is the admissions authority for the School. The objections from the School and the Council were received by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator on 31st May 2011 and 17th June 2011 respectively. I am satisfied these objections have been properly referred to me in accordance with section 88H of the Act and that they fall within my jurisdiction.

Procedure

3. In coming to my conclusions, I have had full regard to all relevant legislation and guidance.

4. The documents I have considered in reaching my decision include:

- BJS's objection of 31st May 2011 and related documents and data;
- the Council's objection of 17th June 2011 and related documents and data;
- a letter from the Council dated 25th August 2011;
- an email from the School's chair of governors, setting out the School's response to the objection, dated 21st June 2011 and related documents and data;
- a letter from the director of education of the Southwell Diocese ("the Diocese") dated 15th June 2011;
- the School's agreed admission arrangements for 2011 and 2012;
- the most recent Ofsted inspection reports on the School and BJS;
- a letter from the Council dated 7th July 2011;
- a letter from the chair of governors dated 19th July 2011;
- an email from the chair of governors dated 22nd August 2011.

I also held a meeting at the School on 22nd August 2010 which was attended by representatives of the School, the Council, BJS and the Diocese. I have considered evidence put to me at the meeting and subsequent to it.

5 In addition to investigating the matters raised by the objectors I have also reviewed the admissions arrangements as a whole and considered whether I should use my power under section 88J(2)(b) of the Act. I am using my powers under the Act to make the change to the arrangements described in paragraphs 41 and 42 below.

The Objection

6 Both objections are based on the view that the School has not taken account of the guidance in paragraph 2.53 of the School Admission Code ("the Code") that an admission authority for a faith school should consider the impact of their admission arrangements "*on the communities in which they are physically based and those faith communities which they serve*".

7 Both objectors state they do not believe there has been a breach of any mandatory requirements of the Code with their objections being based on a shared belief that there has been a breach of the guidance provided by the Code, in this case at paragraph 2.53.

8 Paragraph 3 of the Code states that "*the Code includes guidelines which the relevant bodies should follow.*" The issue in relation to these objections is, therefore, whether the School followed the advice of the Code at paragraph 2.53. The School believes it did whilst the objectors believe it did not. The Diocese's position is set out in a letter dated 15th June 2011) which states it "*supports the aim of the school to be able to offer places to the pupils who live closest to the school and clearly a substantial amount of recent data has been drawn together by the school and analysed to arrive at the criteria which appear in the new policy.*" On other matters, the Diocese is less supportive of the School's position (see paragraph 29 below).

Background

9 The School is a large, oversubscribed, mixed gender, voluntary aided Church of England secondary school in Nottingham which serves pupils from age 11 -19. It has specialist technology college status and an admission number of 300. At its last inspection in March 2011, Ofsted judged the School to be good. Just under half of pupils are from white British backgrounds. The remainder are from a range of minority ethnic groups, over a quarter speak English as a second language, a larger than average proportion of pupils are known to be eligible for free school meals, and the proportion of pupils with identified special educational needs and/or disabilities is above average. The School occupies two sites, Apsley Lane (“AL”) and Wollaton Park (“WP”), some one and a half miles apart. Year 7 pupils are admitted to both sites.

10 In 2009 the School decided to review its admission arrangements in light of feedback from the Adjudicator that the existing arrangements, which had not been reviewed for some time, were too complex. This review led to some initial changes in 2010 with more comprehensive changes being agreed for 2012.

11 In undertaking the review the School states it sought to:

- maintain a high level of pupil involvement with *“work and worship within a Christian community”*;
- provide the opportunity *“to introduce other young people in the locality to the Christian Faith”*;
- *“maintain access for the important multi-faith element of our local community”*;
- *“recognise our technology status”*, and,
- *“consider the faith communities we serve as well as the local communities in which the two campuses of the school are physically based.”*

12 Another stated factor in the governors’ considerations was the development of the second site at WP, a site previously occupied by the Margaret Glen-Bott secondary school which had been discontinued. The first year 7 pupils were admitted to this site in September 2004.

13 The School also states that the review was informed by an analysis of the post codes of the pupils admitted to the School which found that *“a large proportion come from within the proposed two mile radius”*. Consideration was also given to the School’s work with all its feeder primary schools, noting that *“the School does work with BJS but we also work equally closely with 11 other local schools.”*

14 In its evidence, BJS refer to a historical relationship between themselves and the School which dates back to the late 1970s. The objectors contend that, at that time, the Council provided capital resources to allow the School to expand with the assumption that the School would make 45 places available for pupils who attended BJS, a school situated in an inner-urban area. Evidence from BJS suggests that the School's governing body endorsed this arrangement at a meeting on 15th September 1977. The arrangement was later modified to apply to children who had lived in the BJS catchment area for over 12 months rather than to pupils who attended BJS. All parties agree that the link with the BJS catchment area is well established and highly valued, especially by parents who live in this area.

15 In its evidence, the Council refers to a decision taken by the Council's Executive Board on 22nd July 2003 in response to a report from the director of education entitled "*Closure of Margaret Glen-Bott School, Reallocation of the Catchment Area and the Expansion of Bluecoat School.*" The minutes of this meeting record that a decision was taken to close Margaret Glen-Bott and expand the School's year 7 admission number from 180 to 300 conditional upon four factors, one of which was "*The continuation of the allocation of 45 places to children who live in the catchment area of Berridge Junior School.*" The same minutes noted that "*a further report would be submitted to this Board for approval of a legal agreement*" which would formalise the transfer of the site and the associated conditions. The Council has been unable to supply a copy of such an agreement.

16 In any event, as the School has voluntary aided status the Council did not have the authority to make changes to the School's admission arrangements. On 8th August 2003, the School published a Statutory Notice indicating its intention to implement the changes agreed by the Council. This Notice included an explanatory note which stated that the School intended that the additional places would be made available to children living in the Margaret Glen-Bott catchment area "*in addition to the 45 places that are currently made available to the children living in the catchment area of Berridge Junior School.*" The Council takes the view that the Statutory Notice is sufficient legal proof that the School accepted the conditions and that it is reasonable to conclude that they should still apply

17 The Council contends that its decision to allow the School to expand by developing the Margaret Glen-Bott site was conditional on the allocation of the additional places which included the pre-existing 45 places for children living in the BJS catchment area and that this "*was a critical element of the decision.*"

18 The School's determined arrangements for 2012 break the link to the BJS catchment area. As part of the new arrangements the School has also removed any reference in its over-subscription criterion to any named feeder primary school and changed the point from which radial distance to pupil's homes are measured from the AL site to the WP site. BJS and the Council believe that, in making these changes, the School has not paid sufficient attention to paragraph 2.53 of the Code. The objectors specifically refer to:

- the severance of the historical relationship between the School and the BJS community which has existed for over 30 years;
- the possibility that inner city residents may lose places to “*non-city*” residents;
- disruption to the balance of secondary school admissions across the City which may “*destabilise other city secondary providers*”;
- strong objections from parents of pupils at 7 previously named feeder primary schools and from families who live in the associated catchment areas.

19 The objections have the support of the local Admissions Forum. The Council states that “*it understands that representations were also made during the consultation period by the headteachers of six other primary schools.*” Evidence from BJS refers to “*the local community has collected a 1000 signature petition*” against the new arrangements.

20 The School has an admission number of 300, with year 7 pupils being admitted to both sites. Should the School be over-subscribed in 2012, which is almost certain to be the case, the over-subscription criteria, after children in public care (criterion a), indicate that places will be offered as follows:

- up to 140 places to applicants “*who are involved in the work and worship of a Church of England or another Christian Church*” (criterion b);
- up to 25 places to applicants “*who are involved in the work and worship of the other world faiths*” (criterion c);
- “*up to 30 places to applicants on the basis of their aptitude in technology subjects*” (criterion d);
- “*thereafter, places will be allocated to other applicants who live within a 2 mile radius of the main entrance to the Wollaton Park Campus*” (criterion e).
- “*remaining places will then be allocated to other pupils who live outside a 2 mile radius of the main entrance to the WP campus at the closing date for applications*” (criterion f).

Priority within each criterion will be determined first by whether the child has a sibling attending the School then distance from the child’s home to the WP site.

21 These criteria are significantly different to those which applied in 2011. The main changes are as follows:

- an increase in the number of Church of England places from 125 to 140;
- the removal of any reference to nine feeder primary schools (7 community schools and two Church of England schools) and residence in the catchment areas of the 7 community primary schools;
- the removal of a specific reference to 45 places being available for children who live in the catchment area of BJS.

All references to attendance at named primary schools or residence in named catchment areas have been replaced by the criterion distance from home to the WP site.

22 In October 1999, the Adjudicator considered a decision by the School to remove reference to BJS from its admissions arrangements. The determination stated that the School “*may not exclude the priority previously given to pupils from BJS*”. The objectors make several references to this determination. Whilst some broad principles remain from that time, the legislative basis for school admission arrangements has changed significantly and the current Code did not apply at that time. This case can only be considered within the current legal and factual framework.

Consideration

23 The objectors contend that the negative impact of the determined arrangements on the communities historically served by the School has not been adequately considered. They are particularly concerned about the fact that the new arrangements end links to the communities served by named feeder schools, that the particular link with BJS is ended, and that the measurement of home to school distance is now from the WP site rather than the AL site.

24 The reasons why the School undertook a review of its admission arrangements are set out in paragraphs 11-13 above. To inform this review, the School undertook a thorough analysis of previous admission rounds. It found that some 90% and 70% of entrants lived within three miles and two miles respectively of the AL site and identified 11 primary schools with whom they worked closely. The School also reports “*anecdotal evidence that some parents of children attending local primary schools did not even apply*” as their child’s school was not named on the list of feeder schools.

25 The School believes that the new arrangements have “*simplified our procedures*” and provide a “*system where all parents feel they have the same opportunities to apply for a place at the School.*” The evidence suggests that the School did undertake an analysis of the potential impact of the new arrangements on the local community and concluded “*we are supporting our local communities,*” and “*the revised arrangements will have very little impact*”

on BJS". On the basis of this analysis it also concluded that its new arrangements will not unfairly disadvantage any social group or discourage any group of parents from seeking a place for their child at the School. Indeed, the School believes that, if it had followed the advice of the Council to allocate 100 places to the communities served by BJS and a nearby primary school, Edna G Olds, it would have significantly reduced access to places at the School for parents who attend other nearby primary schools and that residents of these areas would have been unfairly disadvantaged.

26 I believe that, whilst the School has given some consideration to the impact of its admission arrangements on nearby communities in general, it did not initially give sufficient consideration to two key points made by the objectors during the statutory consultation period about the impact on the particular communities it has historically served. These are:

- (i) The status of the historic relationship between the School's admission arrangements and the residents of the BJS catchment area; and
- (ii) The impact of changing the point of measurement for determining distance from home to school from the AP to the WP site.

I shall consider each of these in turn.

The Status of the Historic Link with the BJS Catchment Area

27 The first key point is the issue of what the objectors refer to as "*an existing agreement*" between the School and the Council concerning changes to the School's admission arrangements made at the time of the closure of Margaret Glen Bott secondary school. The Council has provided a copy of a Statutory Notice published by the School on 8th August 2004 which states the School's intention to increase its admission number from 180 to 300. An explanatory note states "*55 of the additional places will be made available specifically for children living in the current Margaret Glen-Bott School catchment area, in addition to the 45 places that are currently made available to children living in the catchment area of BJS.*"

28 No party was able to provide a copy of any formal agreement although all agreed that the relationship between the School and families in the BJS catchment area was long standing and highly valued, especially by parents. Whilst I must conclude that no legally binding agreement between the Council and the School exists, the publication of the Statutory Notice in 2004 indicates that, at that time, the School accepted the conditions agreed by the Council's Executive Board. I conclude that the School gave insufficient consideration to the implications of its own Statutory Notice of 8th August 2004 and to the historic link between the School and the BJS catchment area. Indeed, I understand that it did not know of the Statutory Notice's existence and therefore did not consider it at all. Legally, it is difficult to see how a Statutory Notice published in 2004 could of itself still bind the School, which is its own admission authority and which determines its admission arrangements on an annual basis, albeit the fact of the historic link between the School and the BJS catchment area remains a relevant consideration. .

Changing the Measurement Point from the AL site to the WP Site

29 A second significant issue is the change to the measurement point from which home to school distance is calculated. Given that the two sites are some 1.5 miles apart; this will have a significant impact on the allocation of places under the new arrangements. The School is required to specify this point and did so, the entrance to the WP site, a significant change from pre-existing practice which measured distance from the AL site. This change is not supported by BJS and the Council who both believe that this change will restrict access to the School from relatively deprived inner urban communities and that, to prevent this from occurring, distance should be measured from a child's home to the nearest of the two sites. During the statutory consultation period, the Diocese advised the School to take this approach. Paragraph 2.49 of the Code requires Church of England schools to consult their local Diocesan Board and states "*they should follow the Board's advice.*" The School agrees that, in this case, it considered the Diocese's advice but chose not to follow it.

30 The School has stated the following reasons for making this change.

(i) The School wishes to serve all communities and primary schools close to both of the School's sites. Because the WP site is relatively new, and the previous practice of measuring home to school distance from the AL site, the School has concluded it is not giving equal access to the School to families living to the south and east of the WP site compared to those living relatively close to the AL site. This is particularly the case in relation to the parent communities associated with Edna G Olds and Dunkirk primary schools. The School reports that both of these schools asked it to reconsider its admission arrangements to better meet the needs of families who live between 0.5 and 1.5 miles south and east of the WP site but who have, historically, been unable to access a place at the School.

(ii) The School wishes to provide access to places at the School for pupils attending all 11 local primary schools with whom it has a working relationship. Whilst it acknowledges its links with BJS it believes these are no more significant than those with the other 10 primary schools and that the specified link with BJS unfairly limits access to families living in the catchment areas of the other 10 schools.

(iii) The School does not believe this change will adversely disadvantage any social group.

31 The objectors have questioned this decision, especially in light of the fact that year 7 pupils are based on both sites. Their view on this matter is supported by the Diocese. All three parties believe that this change has redefined the basis for identifying the communities the School serves and suggest that distance should be measured from the child's home to the nearest of the two sites. Their reasons for taking this view are set out below.

(i) Moving the measurement point from the AL to the WP site will disadvantage families living in relatively deprived inner urban areas, most of whom live closer to the AL site than the WP site. One such community is that which lives within the BJS catchment area. The communities that are likely to benefit live in areas of relative socio-economic advantage.

(ii) Demographic data show a trend of increasing demand for secondary school places in the area in the medium term caused by increased migration into the local area and an increasing birth rate. This increased demand will make it progressively harder for families in the relatively deprived areas to access places at the School.

(iii) As, according to the School's own figures, some 90% of recent intakes come from within 3 miles of the AL site and 70% from within 2 miles, the change to the measuring point to the WP site is perverse and can only serve to disadvantage many families who live closer to the AL than the WP site. This is giving priority to a potential future demand for places from communities relatively close to the WP site over proven demand from communities close to the AL site.

32 At the meeting on 22nd August, the Council, Diocese and BJS agreed that their concerns could be assuaged if the School measured distances from the nearest of the two sites to a child's home rather than just to the WP site. The same parties also point out that year 7 pupils are based at both sites. They take the view that measuring distance to the nearest site balances the needs of the communities currently served by the School and the legitimate expectations of those living close to the WP site.

33 The School states it considered using two measurement points but chose not to adopt this approach. Its stated reasons for not doing so were:

(i) the additional costs of ascertaining the distance to the nearest site (estimated at £1k per year); and,

(ii) such an approach might raise an expectation amongst parents that their child would be educated at the nearest site when this might not be possible and *“lead to more challenges and appeals if a child were not allocated to the campus to which they had applied and costly to maintain with no obvious gain”*.

34 I do not believe these are good reasons for not adopting the use of two measuring points. Technology makes it relatively easy and inexpensive to measure distance from home to nearest site. The allocation of year 7 pupils to particular sites is an internal management decision and is not a matter which forms part of the admissions arrangements or which could be subject to a formal admissions appeal. It would be for the School to make its arrangements for managing the allocation of pupils to sites clear but this is a separate matter from the admission arrangements themselves.

35 Given the adverse impact on relatively disadvantaged families of changing the distance measurement point from the AL to the WP site I believe that such a change would not meet the requirement of paragraph 2.4 of the Code as it would work against social equity rather than promote it and that the School gave this matter insufficient consideration.

36 During the meeting on 22nd August 2011, all four parties explored alternative solutions which would enable the School to better cater for all communities close to both sites whilst minimising any disadvantage to others. All parties agreed such an outcome would be desirable. As a result a measuring point, the main entrance to Beechdale Library which is approximately half way between the sites and which is locally well known, was identified and initially agreed to be suitable by all parties. Using this point for measuring distance to school should ensure that, for the immediate future, all families living in the BJS catchment area continue to be able to access places at the School. Such an approach to measuring distance is used elsewhere in similar circumstances.

37 However, on 22nd August the Council stated that its support for this solution was provisional with it asking for time to analyse the potential impact *“against the future landscape, needs of the linked primary schools and overall fair access in a city context.”* In a letter dated 25th August it stated it had reached the conclusion that it could not support the solution described above. The Council gave several reasons for doing so. Reference was made to the fact that outline planning permission has been given for 475 homes to be built on a nearby site and the fact that the Council predicted a 15% rise in reception rolls across the city in the coming years. In their view, these two factors could adversely affect the chances of inner city children obtaining a place at the School in the future. It is by no means certain that the new homes will be built in the short term and the effect of the rising reception roll is a medium term issue. Similarly, the patterns of secondary school provision and parental preference may also change during this period. I believe that it would be unreasonable for these two factors to have a significant influence on my determination.

38 In the same letter the Council states that the introduction of a distance related criterion *“starts to form a de facto catchment area for a school that previously didn’t have one”*. The Code permits the use of distance as an oversubscription criterion because it is clear and objective whilst the previous arrangements had more of the features of a catchment area (defined priority areas and named primary schools) than do the determined arrangements.

39 I believe that the use of Beechdale Library as a measuring point meets the concerns of BJS and its local community, is fair to all families living close to both sites whilst not adversely impacting on relatively deprived communities, and ensures that the School and the Diocese are in agreement. The Council’s concerns are strategic and they are for it to address as and when the need arises. They do not provide a basis for upholding this objection. I also note that the School accepted the Beechdale Library proposed measuring point before this determination was made. This provides further evidence that the School is meeting the requirements of paragraph

2.53 of the Code. Whilst the School may wish to clearly explain why it uses Beechdale Library as a measurement point, all parties agree it is a well known local landmark which will enable parents to accurately measure the distance from it to their home. I have therefore included this measurement point in my determination.

40 Paragraph 1.102 of the Code requires admission authorities to act on any information that suggests that any school policy or practice unfairly disadvantages one group of children compared to another. The School will therefore wish to keep its admission arrangements under regular review as the impact of the new arrangements becomes clear.

Other Issues

41 I have used my powers under the Act to address two other matters. The first is the introduction of the new oversubscription criterion (e) (see paragraph 20 above). The Council believes that the reference to a two mile radius in the distance from home to school criterion in the School's determined arrangements serves no useful purpose as applicants living within two miles are treated in exactly the same way as those who live beyond this distance (criterion f). However, this is not true for applicants who have siblings at the School as, in such cases, siblings living over 2 miles from the School would have a lower priority than applicants who live within two miles but who do not have a sibling. This matter was discussed at the meeting on 22nd August when the School indicated it could see the reasons for dropping any reference to living within two miles (as could the Diocese) but wished to give siblings priority. I have taken this into account in drafting the new arrangements. Given these considerations I have determined that over-subscription criterion (e) should be deleted.

42 The second issue is that I have also noted that the admission arrangements do not meet the requirements of paragraph 2.37 of the Code in relation to clearly explaining how home to school distance will be measured. The School's arrangements for 2011 did this and the School accepts that this omission from the 2012 arrangements was a drafting error which needs to be rectified. I have addressed this oversight in the determined arrangements set out at appendix 1.

Conclusion

43 The School has undertaken a comprehensive review of its admission arrangements against clearly stated and appropriate objectives. Its determined arrangements are certainly less complex than those used in previous years. Although it has thoroughly analysed previous year's admission data and evaluated the potential impact of its new arrangements on the communities it believes it serves, it did not initially give sufficient consideration to two significant matters. The first was the historic link with the BJS catchment area and the second was the likely impact of the proposed new distance measurement point on the promotion of social equity as required by paragraph 2.4 of the Code. Also, in relation to the change of measurement point, I do not believe the School had good enough reason not to follow the

initial advice of the Diocese on this matter. I therefore conclude that the School gave insufficient consideration to the guidance given at paragraph 2.49 of the Code.

44 The Council, Diocese and BJS all acknowledge the steps the School has taken to reduce the complexity of its admission arrangements and its wish to better serve all communities located close to both sites. The new arrangements are far clearer than those they replace. The objectors did not want improved access to places for some communities to be at the expense of reduced access to some of Nottingham's most deprived communities. The School, Diocese and BJS agree that the use of the main entrance to Beechdale Library as a measurement point will alleviate concerns regarding social equity. I believe it will enable families living in the BJS catchment area to continue to be able to obtain places at the School for the immediate future. The Council has not provided cogent reasons why this solution should not be adopted. Beechdale Library is approximately half way between the two sites and is a well-known landmark in the local community which will enable parents to easily make their own measurement of home to school distance. I endorse this approach.

45 All parties accept that the use of the School's determined oversubscription criterion (e) (see paragraph 20 above) should be removed and that it is necessary to explain clearly how distance from home to school will be measured so that the requirements of paragraph 2.37 of the Code are met.

46 All the above matters are addressed in my determined oversubscription criteria at appendix 1.

47 The impact of the new arrangements is difficult to predict with any certainty. It is the duty of the School to keep them under review, especially so in the first years of implementation, to ensure they continue to meet all the requirements of the Code.

Determination

48 In accordance with section 88 H (4) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I uphold the objections to the admission arrangements determined by the Governors of The Nottingham Bluecoat School and Technology College.

49 I determine that the oversubscription criteria for entry in September 2012 should be as set out in appendix 1 attached.

Dated: 9th September 2011

Signed:

Schools
Adjudicator John Simpson

Appendix 1

Revised Oversubscription Criteria for The Bluecoat Church of England (VA) School and Technology College for Admission in September 2012.

Oversubscription criteria

(See notes on page 4 for definitions):

After the admission of pupils with statements of special educational need where the school is named on the statement, the criteria will be applied in the order in which they are set out below. Where the number of places identified in any criterion are not filled that number of places will be added to the number of places available under criteria (e). If a pupil is not offered a place in the criterion of their choice they will be considered again under criteria (e).

- a) Children in public care;
- b) Up to 140 places will be offered to applicants who are involved in the work and worship of a Church of England Parish or another Christian Church that is a member of Churches Together in England. In the event of oversubscription within this category, the following criteria will apply:
 - i) whether the child or the child's immediate family is at the heart of a Church of England parish or another Christian Church that is a member of Churches Together in England;
 - ii) whether the child or the child's immediate family is attached to a Church of England parish or another Christian Church that is a member of Churches Together in England;
- c) Up to 25 places will be offered to applicants who are involved in, and committed to, the work and worship of one of the other world faiths other than Christianity, such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Shintoism or Sikhism. In the event of oversubscription within this category, the following criteria will apply:
 - i) whether the child or the child's immediate family is at the heart of the Faith Community;
 - ii) whether the child or the child's immediate family is attached to the Faith Community;
- d) Up to 30 places will be offered to applicants on the basis of their aptitude in technology subjects as assessed through a written test. The highest scoring 30 applicants will be offered a place. Confirmation of the test date will be sent to applicants by 31st October 2011;
- e) Remaining places will then be allocated to other pupils who live the shortest distance from their home to the main entrance of Beechdale Library at the closing date for applications. Distance will be measured in a straight line from the main entrance door to the child's home to the main entrance door to Beechdale Library.

In the event of oversubscription **within any criterion** the following criteria will apply in this order:

- i) whether the child has a sibling who will be attending the school at the time of the applicant's admission;
- ii) the nearness of the child's home to the main entrance to Beechdale Library.
- iii) In the event that such a measure is identical to the nearest metre for two or more children and there are insufficient places available for both or all of them, the remaining place/s will be awarded by random allocation using lots drawn by a person independent of the school.

The term sibling includes a child living in the same household under the care of the same parent(s) or guardian(s) and children not normally resident in the same household but sharing a genetic or adoptive parent.

Beechdale Library is located close to the junction of Beechdale Road and Western Boulevard. It is used as the measurement point as it is approximately half way between the Apsley Lane and Wollaton Park sites which both admit year 7 pupils and is a well known community landmark.