

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Admissions Committee

### Meeting held 11 December 2018

**PRESENT:** Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs (Chair), Michelle Cook, Bob Pullin, Kaltum Rivers and Andrew Sangar

.....

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lisa Banes and Talib Hussain.

#### **2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

2.1 RESOLVED: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on items 6 and 7 on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

#### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

#### **4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> November, 2018, were approved as a correct record.

#### **5. ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

5.1 The Committee noted that, since its last meeting, no decisions had been made by the Executive Director, People Services, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, under powers delegated to her with regard to home to school transport or school admissions.

#### **6. HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT APPEALS**

##### 6.1 Verbal Appeal – KE/EC01

6.1.1 In attendance were the appellant and Julie Pryor and Andy Tierney (Customer Services).

6.1.2 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves. He then outlined the procedure which would be followed during the meeting.

- 6.1.3 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report and commented upon a case where the parent had appealed against the administrative decision made by the Executive Director with regard to the refusal to grant a home to school travel bus pass (Case No.KE/01).
- 6.1.4 Andy Tierney explained the Stage 1 review and Stage 2 appeals process regarding the City Council's Home to School Transport Policy. Mr. Tierney informed the Committee of the reasons why the request for a home to school travel pass had been refused at Stage 1.
- 6.1.5 The appellant explained to the Committee that she had very little understanding of the English language and had requested an interpreter from a third party organisation but unfortunately one had not been provided. The Chair asked if she would prefer that the case be deferred until the next meeting when an interpreter would be provided to help her explain the reasons for her request for a home to school travel pass. She agreed to this and was informed that a letter would be sent to her giving a new time and date for the hearing.
- 6.2 Verbal Appeal – KE/LO02
- 6.2.1 In attendance were the appellants and Julie Pryor and Andy Tierney (Customer Services).
- 6.2.2 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves. He then outlined the procedure which would be followed during the meeting.
- 6.2.3 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report and commented upon a case where the parents had appealed against the administrative decision made by the Executive Director with regard to the refusal to grant a home to school travel bus pass (Case No.KE/LO02).
- 6.2.4 Andy Tierney explained the Stage 1 review and Stage 2 appeals process regarding the City Council's Home to School Transport Policy. Mr. Tierney informed the Committee of the reasons why the request for a home to school travel pass had been refused at Stage 1.
- 6.2.5 The appellants explained to the Committee the reasons for the request for a home to school travel pass for their child.
- 6.2.6 In response to questions raised by Members, the appellants stated that their older son had been bullied in the local area and as a result of this, he was given a place at King Edward VII School, away from those who had bullied him. The appellants also stated that their only choice was King Edward VII on transfer to secondary school for their younger son and was granted a place there under the sibling category. Due to the fact that staff at his primary school had taken care of him, he had not been subjected to the same amount of bullying as his older brother. The Committee also noted that the family have been trying to be rehoused away from the area, but have so far been unsuccessful.

6.2.7 At this stage in the proceedings, the appellants left the meeting to enable the Committee to consider the evidence.

6.2.8 RESOLVED: That the appeal be not upheld on the grounds that there are no exceptional circumstances demonstrated, and having regard to the Council's Home to School Transport Policy, the school that the pupil is requesting a pass for is not one of the three qualifying schools.

6.3 Verbal Appeal PA/AC02

6.3.1 In attendance were the appellant and Julie Pryor and Andy Tierney (Customer Services).

6.3.2 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves. He then outlined the procedure which would be followed during the meeting.

6.3.3 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report and commented upon a case where the parents had appealed against the administrative decision made by the Executive Director with regard to the refusal to grant a home to school travel bus pass (Case No.PA/AC02)

6.3.4 Andy Tierney explained the Stage 1 review and Stage 2 appeals process regarding the City Council's Home to School Transport Policy. Mr. Tierney informed the Committee of the reasons why the request for a home to school travel pass had been refused at Stage 1.

6.3.5 The appellant explained to the Committee the reasons for the request for a home to school travel pass for his daughter.

6.3.6 In response to questions from Members, the appellant stated that, due to the anxieties daughter faces on a daily basis, she was receiving support from CAMHS and MAST to help her deal with this. The appellant submitted further evidence to show that his daughter was receiving such support.

6.3.7 At this stage in the proceedings, the appellant left the meeting to enable the Committee to consider all the evidence.

6.3.8 RESOLVED: That the appeal be upheld on the grounds that there are exceptional medical and family circumstances in the case (Case No. PA/AC02).

6.4 Verbal Appeal – TA01

6.4.1 In attendance were the appellants and Julie Pryor and Andy Tierney (Customer Services).

6.4.2 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves. He then outlined the procedure which would be followed during the meeting.

- 6.4.3 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report and commented upon a case where the parents had appealed against the administrative decision made by the Executive Director with regard to the refusal to grant a home to school travel bus pass (Case No.TA01).
- 6.4.4 Andy Tierney explained the Stage 1 review and Stage 2 appeals process regarding the City Council's Home to School Transport Policy. Mr. Tierney informed the Committee of the reasons why the request for a home to school travel pass had been refused at Stage 1.
- 6.4.5 The appellant explained to the Committee the reasons for the request for a home to school travel pass for his son.
- 6.4.6 In response to questions from Members, the appellant stated that due to bullying and the school's failure to address this, it been agreed that a managed move for his child be arranged between his previous school and the school he now attends. He added that his child has close friends at school and has now settled. The appellant stated that he could, if required, produce police incident records, hospital records and details of the managed moved.
- 6.4.7 At this stage in the proceedings, the appellant left the meeting to enable the Committee to consider the evidence.
- 6.4.8 RESOLVED: That the appeal be deferred until the applicant has provided further information regarding the managed move between the previous and current schools to the Executive Director (Case No.TA01).
- 6.5 Verbal Appeals – WE01 and WE02
- 6.5.1 In attendance were the appellants and Julie Pryor and Andy Tierney (Customer Services).
- 6.5.2 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves. He then outlined the procedure which would be followed during the meeting.
- 6.5.3 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted reports and commented upon cases where the parents had appealed against the administrative decision made by the Executive Director with regard to the refusal to grant a home to school travel bus passes (Case No.WE01 and WE02).
- 6.5.4 Julie Pryor explained the Stage 1 review and Stage 2 appeals process regarding the City Council's Home to School Transport Policy. Ms. Pryor informed the Committee of the reasons why the requests for home to school travel passes had been refused at Stage 1.
- 6.5.5 The appellants explained to the Committee the reasons for the requests for home to school travel passes for her children.
- 6.5.6 In response to questions from Members, the appellants stated that they travel

over six miles every day to take the children to school and also the fact that their youngest child now attends the attached Nursery. They also stated that they had tried, but failed to add their children's names onto the waiting lists of schools in their local area.

6.5.7 At this stage in the proceedings, the appellant left the meeting to enable the Committee to consider the evidence.

6.5.8 RESOLVED: That the appeals be upheld on the grounds that there are exceptional educational circumstances in the cases, but requested that you provide proof of address and show that you have gone through the correct procedure in applying for local schools (Case Nos.WE01 and WE02).

#### 6.6 Written Appeals – KE/LO03 and KE/LO04

6.6.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted reports and commented upon two cases where parents had appealed against the administrative decisions made by the Executive Director with regard to the refusal to grant home to school travel bus passes.

6.6.2 The Committee gave consideration to all the supporting information and evidence provided by the pupils' parents and, arising therefrom, it was:-

6.6.3 RESOLVED: That the appeals be not upheld on the grounds that there are no exceptional circumstances demonstrated, and having regard to the Council's Home to School Transport Policy, the school that the pupils are requesting passes for are not one of their three qualifying schools (Case Nos.KE/LO03 and KE/LO04).

(NOTE: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 26 of the Council's Constitution and the provisions of Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the Chair decided that Case Nos. KE/LO03 and KE/LO04 be considered as a matter of urgency in order for the request to be considered at the earliest possible opportunity although it had not been possible to give five clear days' notice that the requests were to be considered).

## 7. **SCHOOL ADMISSION REQUESTS - SECONDARY SCHOOL PLACES**

### 7.1 Requests to prioritise on Waiting Lists

7.1.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted reports and commented upon 47 cases where parents had expressed a wish for their children to be admitted to secondary schools of their choice. The Executive Director stated that places in secondary schools had been identified by the City Council, in accordance with the published admission criteria, and it had been agreed that the Executive Director would provisionally allocate places at those schools where there were places available, up to the standard number/admission limit. The Committee was requested to consider prioritising the pupils on waiting lists, within their respective categories, for admission if and when places become available.

7.1.2 The Committee gave consideration to all the supporting evidence and information provided by the pupils' parents including, in some cases, evidence and advice provided by voluntary or professional bodies and organisations and, arising therefrom, it was:-

7.1.3 RESOLVED: That (a) 15 pupils be not prioritised on the waiting lists, within their respective categories, on the grounds that the Committee considers that there are no exceptional educational, financial, medical or family circumstances demonstrated (Case Nos.1, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 29, 30, 33, 37, 38 and 47);

(b) one pupil be prioritised at the top of the waiting list in the 'catchment and sibling' category on the grounds that there are exceptional medical and/or family circumstances (Case No.24);

(c) 16 pupils be prioritised at the top of the waiting list in the 'catchment' category on the grounds that there are exceptional medical and/or family circumstances (Case Nos. 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 22, 26, 35, 36, 40, 42, 44, 45 and 46);

(d) six pupils be prioritised at the top of the waiting list in the 'feeder' category on the grounds that there are exceptional medical and/or family circumstances (Case Nos. 3, 7, 8, 9, 27 and 28); and

(e) nine pupils be prioritised at the top of the waiting list in the 'other' category on the grounds that there are exceptional medical and/or family circumstances (Case Nos. 17, 20, 23, 31, 32, 34, 39, 41 and 43).

## 7.2 Request to reconsider a change in circumstances

7.2.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report and commented upon a case where parents had made a request for the Committee to consider a change in the family's circumstances, in connection with their request for a place at their preferred secondary school and, arising therefrom, it was:-

7.2.2 RESOLVED: That upon consideration of the case, and with due regard to the additional information now submitted, the Committee considers that there had been a material change in the family's circumstances, and therefore, authority be given for a new application to be processed in this case (Case No.FV1).

## 8. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

8.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2019 at 2.00 p.m., in the Town Hall.