

From: Councillor Barry Henley
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2018 8:57 PM
To: 'LESCommitteeServicesAll@birmingham.gov.uk'
Cc: Councillor Victoria Quinn; Councillor Mike Leddy
Subject: Call in: Birmingham Council Housing Investment Programme 2018/19 to 2020/21.
Reference: 004665/2018

For the Attention of David Smith

Dear Mr Smith

CMIS records that: On 27 March 2018, Cabinet:- (i) Noted the update against 2017/18 programme delivery; (ii) Approved the Full Business Case report Appendix 1 for the scope of works to be included in the Council Housing Improvement Programme 2018/19 to 2019/20 including fire suppression systems at an estimated capital cost of £129.890 million, together with adaptations at an estimated cost of £6.905 million over the same period; (iii) Authorised the Service Director, Housing and Head of Capital Investment to allocate the Housing Investment works and place orders with the recently procured service providers in accordance with the scope of those contracts; (iv) Noted the allocation of £105.913 million for clearance and new build activity included within the Public Sector Housing Capital budget of £242.708 million, with specific scheme details to be the subject of further reports as appropriate sites are identified; (v) Authorised the City Solicitor to negotiate, execute, seal and complete all necessary documents to give effect to the above recommendations. THE DEADLINE FOR CALL IN IS 1600 HOURS ON WEDNESDAY 4 APRIL 2018.

My colleague and I consider this to be a very unwise decision. Below is the completed pro forma requesting that the decision be called in, and we will provide a signed copy before the deadline. Our objection to the decision can be summarised by the following:

- The decision is contrary to the budget agreed for Housing because extra expenditure for fire suppression has been added in and this is not required.
- The Executive has overlooked the scientific evidence that our tower blocks are already safe and protected against fire in accordance with the Building Regulations and therefore adding sprinklers will not make them safer. The £31million cost should be spent on needed items. If life safety is the motive then it should be spent on road accident prevention.
- We have no sprinklers in our tower blocks. In future they will be required in blocks over 30m high. But there is no requirement to retrofit them. This is novel and there is no sensible reason to equip buildings which have been safe for fifty years when they will all be demolished in the next few years.
- The decision implies that £31 million will be spent unnecessarily which is a significant financial amount.
- The decision is particularly significant for Brandwood Ward as we have 15 tower blocks. This money, if available should be spent on refurbishment not on fire suppression.

Date: 3 April 2018

Please arrange for a meeting of the

Housing

O&S Committee

to be called to discuss the following executive decision:

Title: **Birmingham Council Housing Investment Programme 2018/19 to 2020/21**

Taken By: Cabinet

On: 27 March 2018

Reason for request:

- | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Is the Executive decision within existing policy? | 1. the decision appears to be contrary to the Budget or one of the 'policy framework' plans or strategies; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 2. the decision appears to be inconsistent with any other form of policy approved by the full Council, the Executive or the Regulatory Committees; | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 3. the decision appears to be inconsistent with recommendations previously made by an Overview and Scrutiny body (and accepted by the full Council or the Executive); | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Is the Executive decision well-founded? | 4. the Executive appears to have failed to consult relevant stakeholders or other interested persons before arriving at its decision; | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 5. the Executive appears to have overlooked some relevant consideration in arriving at its decision; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 6. the decision has already generated particular controversy amongst those likely to be affected by it or, in the opinion of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, it is likely so to do; | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 7. the decision appears to be particularly "novel" and therefore likely to set an important precedent; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Has the Executive decision been properly taken? | 8. there is a substantial lack of clarity, material inaccuracy or insufficient information provided in the report to allow the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to hold the Executive to account and/or add value to the work of the Council. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 9. the decision appears to give rise to significant legal, financial or propriety issues; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 10. the notification of the decision does not appear to have been in accordance with council procedures; | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) Does the Executive decision particularly affect a Ward? | 11. the decision appears to give rise to significant issues in relation to a particular Ward. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Councillor

(Signed)

Barry Henley

(Print Name)

Councillor

(Signed)

Mike Leddy

(Print Name)

Regards

Barry

Cllr Dr Barry Henley

Labour member for Brandwood Ward

Chair of Service Birmingham

Chair of Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education

Chair of the Conservation and Heritage Panel

Member of Planning Committee