



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD  
ON TUESDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2018 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE COUNCIL  
CHAMBER, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:-** Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor John Lines) in the Chair.

**Councillors**

Muhammad Afzal	Mohammed Fazal	Mary Locke
Akhlaq Ahmed	Peter Fowler	Ewan Mackey
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Jayne Francis	Majid Mahmood
Alex Aitken	Eddie Freeman	Zhor Malik
Deirdre Alden	Peter Griffiths	Karen McCarthy
Robert Alden	Fred Grindrod	Saddak Miah
Tahir Ali	Paulette Hamilton	Gareth Moore
Olly Armstrong	Roger Harmer	Simon Morrall
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Kath Hartley	Brett O'Reilly
Mohammed Azim	Adam Higgs	John O'Shea
David Barrie	Charlotte Hodiola	David Pears
Baber Baz	Jon Hunt	Robert Pocock
Bob Beauchamp	Mahmood Hussain	Julien Pritchard
Matt Bennett	Shabrina Hussain	Hendrina Quinnen
Kate Booth	Timothy Huxtable	Chauhdry Rashid
Nicky Brennan	Mohammed Idrees	Carl Rice
Marje Bridle	Ziaul Islam	Lou Robson
Mick Brown	Morriam Jan	Gary Sambrook
Tristan Chatfield	Kerry Jenkins	Lucy Seymour-Smith
Zaker Choudhry	Meirion Jenkins	Shafique Shah
Debbie Clancy	Julie Johnson	Mike Sharpe
John Clancy	Brigid Jones	Ron Storer
Liz Clements	Josh Jones	Martin Straker Welds
Maureen Cornish	Nagina Kauser	Sharon Thompson
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Paul Tilsley
Phil Davis	Chaman Lal	Lisa Trickett
Adrian Delaney	Mike Leddy	Mike Ward
Diane Donaldson	Bruce Lines	Ken Wood
Barbara Dring	John Lines	Alex Yip
Neil Eustace	Keith Linnecor	Waseem Zaffar

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RECORDING**

- 19115 The Deputy Lord Mayor advised that the meeting would be webcast for live and subsequent broadcasting via the Council's internet site and that members of the Press/Public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

The Deputy Lord Mayor reminded Members that they did not enjoy Parliamentary Privilege in relation to debates in the Chamber and Members should be careful in what they say during all debates that afternoon

---

**DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

- 19116 The Deputy Lord Mayor reminded members that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests arising from any business to be discussed at this meeting.

Several Members sought to declare that they were in a union but the City Solicitor indicated that members had made such a declaration previously and did not need to do so at this meeting unless they had not done so at a previous meeting.

---

**MINUTES**

It was moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and –

- 19117 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2018 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

---

**LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 19118 The Deputy Lord Mayor indicated that he had no announcements.
- 

**PETITIONS**

**Petition Relating to External Organisations Presented at the Meeting**

The following petition was presented:-

(See document No. 1)

In accordance with the proposal by the Member presenting the petition, it was moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19119 **RESOLVED:-**

That the petitions be received and referred to the relevant external organisation.

---

**Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented at the Meeting**

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 2)

In accordance with the proposals by the Members presenting the petitions, it was moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19120 **RESOLVED:-**

That the petitions be received and referred to the relevant Chief Officer(s) to examine and report as appropriate.

---

**Petitions Update**

The following Petitions Update had been made available electronically:-

(See document No. 3)

It was moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19121 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Petitions Update be noted and those petitions for which a satisfactory response has been received, be discharged.

---

**QUESTION TIME**

19122 The Council proceeded to consider Oral Questions in accordance with Standing Order 10.3.

Whilst Councillor Fred Grindrod was asking a question on Brexit he advised the Chamber that he had been appointed on to the Birmingham City Council's Brexit Commission as a representative of the Economy and Skills Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Details of the questions asked are available for public inspection via the Webcast.

---

**APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNCIL**

19123 There were no appointments to be made

---

**EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDERS**

It was moved by Councillor Martin Straker Welds, seconded and

19124

**RESOLVED:-**

That, pursuant to discussions by Council Business Management Committee, Standing Orders be waived as follows:

- Allocate 35 Minutes for item 9 (Forward Together to Build a Fair and Inclusive City for Everyone: A Community Cohesion Strategy for Birmingham)
- Allocate 40 Minutes for item 10 (Women & Democracy)

---

**FORWARD TOGETHER TO BUILD A FAIR AND INCLUSIVE CITY FOR EVERYONE: A COMMUNITY COHESION STRATEGY FOR BIRMINGHAM**

The following report of the Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion, Community Safety and Equality was submitted:-

(See document No. 4)

Councillor Tristan Chatfield moved the motion which was seconded by Councillor Ewan Mackey.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Tristan Chatfield replied to the debate

The Motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19125

**RESOLVED:-**

That the City Council:

- Adopt the Community Cohesion Strategy for Birmingham as set out at Appendix 1.
  - Note city partners have been invited to adopt the Strategy as the city's approach to community cohesion.
-

**WOMEN & DEMOCRACY**

The following report of the Deputy Leader and the Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion, Community Safety and Equality was submitted:-

(See document No. 5)

The Deputy Leader Councillor Brigid Jones moved the motion during which she indicated that the first point of the Liberal Democrat amendment was acceptable but the second point was for another debate. The Motion was seconded.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Jon Hunt and Morriam Jan gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 6)

Councillor Jon Hunt moved the amendment, during which he confirmed that he was removing the second point, which was seconded by Councillor Morriam Jan.

A debate ensued.

The Deputy Leader Councillor Brigid Jones replied to the debate

The amended amendment having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The Motion as amended having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19126

**RESOLVED:-**

- A. That the attached Statement of Intent is agreed;
- B. That Cabinet Members and named officers are asked to implement the action plan included within the report in order to tackle the many barriers to women's representation in Local Government;
- C. Add the following to action plan:-

Noting the small proportion of women representing the new single member wards, to lobby the Boundary Commission for a further review of city wards to tackle this issue.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

19127

**RESOLVED:-**

That the Council be adjourned until 1705 hours on this day.

The Council then adjourned at 1635 hours.

At 1705 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

---

**MOTIONS FOR DEBATE FROM INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS**

The Council proceeded to consider the Motions of which notice had been given in accordance with Standing Order 4(i).

**A. Councillor Kerry Jenkins and Nicky Brennan have given notice of the following motion.**

(See document No. 7)

Councillor Kerry Jenkins moved the Motion, which was seconded by Councillor Nicky Brennan.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Debbie Clancy and Deirdre Alden gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 8)

Councillor Debbie Clancy moved the amendment

In response to the Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Kerry Jenkins confirmed that she could not accept the removal the first 7 bullet points as suggested in the first part of the amendment but could accept the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point suggested in the second part of the amendment.

The amendment seconded by Councillor Deirdre Alden who confirmed that, in view of Councillor Kerry Jenkins comments, there was no agreement and the amendment remained as it was.

A debate ensued during which Councillor Gary Sambrook indicated that Members should address the Chamber through the Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor chairing the meeting and not shout and point across the Chamber.

Councillor Kerry Jenkins replied to the debate.

The amendment having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The Motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19128

**RESOLVED:-**

This Council notes that:

- 42% of children in Birmingham are living in poverty;
- The Trussell Trust reports a 40.6% increase in demand at its Birmingham food banks from September 2017 to September 2018;
- A survey undertaken by Plan International UK last year found that 1 in 10 teenage girls had been unable to afford sanitary products;
- 56% of teenage girls said they would rather be bullied at school than talk to their parents about periods;
- This is particularly problematic for girls from low-income families who see their parents struggling to make ends meet and feel reluctant to ask them to add sanitary products to the weekly shop;
- In many cases, as a result, they may lose a significant number of days of schooling or be unable to take part in all school activities;
- In his recent damning report on the impacts of austerity in the United Kingdom, United Nations Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Professor Philip Alston concluded that 'Women are particularly affected by poverty.' One of the consequences of this has been an increase in period poverty and regrettably, even women in low-income employment are sometimes unable to afford good quality sanitary products when struggling to meet household bills and feed their families;
- In a country as well-off as Britain 'Period Poverty' is a scandal that should be ended.

This Council commends the:

- Scottish Government for its commitment to tackle 'Period Poverty' by introducing free sanitary products in all educational establishments;
- Project recently established by the charity Red Box who facilitate the distribution of sanitary products to students in need;
- Period poverty dignity campaigns launched by trade unions which are raising public awareness of period poverty.

This Council resolves to:

- Ask the Health and Well-Being Overview & Scrutiny Committee to work with relevant Cabinet Members, officers and partners to explore how sanitary products can be made available free of charge to female students in Birmingham's schools and colleges and to women employed in or visiting council run buildings;
- Write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer asking the Government to provide the necessary funding to cover the cost of providing free sanitary products to girls and women in council workplaces, schools and colleges and scrap the VAT levied on female sanitary products as soon as is practicable and, in the meantime, to use the VAT collected on these products to fund the provision of free sanitary products for girls and women in need.

**B. Councillor Peter Fowler and Simon Morrall have given notice of the following motion.**

(See document No. 9)

Councillor Peter Fowler moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Simon Morrall.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Mike Sharpe and Diane Donaldson gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 10)

Councillor Mike Sharpe moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Diane Donaldson.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Peter Fowler replied to the debate during which he indicated that discussions had taken place with the mover of the amendment and he wished to amend the motion as follows:-

In the second paragraph change 'West Midlands Mayor' to 'West Midlands Authority'

In the fourth paragraph the first sentence to read 'As such this Council calls for Scrutiny to examine with the Armed Forces Champions and reported back to Full Council to look at:'

The last paragraph in the amendment be added to the end of the motion with the rest of the amendment being withdrawn.

The Deputy Lord Mayor was of the opinion that the amendment had fallen so did not require a vote.

The Motion as amended by the mover having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19129

**RESOLVED:-**

This Council welcomes the publication of the first UK wide veterans strategy by the UK, Welsh and Scottish Governments to support ex armed forces personnel with community and relationships, employment and skills, health and well-being, finance and debt, housing, and contact with the law.

This Council also welcomes the commitment of the West Midlands Combined Authority to closing the employment gap for veterans across the region via a new strand of the Mayor's Mentor Programme and a new



scheme to harness the skills of veterans to become trainers in the construction industry.

This Council notes that, since signing the Armed Forces covenant in February 2012 with cross party support, the Council has embedded support to veterans within a number of key policies. However this Council believes that, with the publication of a new national strategy and in order to mark the end of centenary commemorations of the Armistice it is timely to look again at how the Council supports veterans across the full range of its responsibilities as well as how it works with partners at a local and regional level to ensure the best possible care and support for those who have risked so much for our Country.

As such this Council calls for Scrutiny to examine with the Armed Forces Champions and reported back to Full Council to look at:

- How the Council currently supports veterans, including how successfully it is meeting its commitments under the Armed Forces Covenant and how this can be improved
- To look specifically at the current housing offer and how to ensure that this is addressing the need of veterans in the City
- How the Council currently works with partners to deliver support to veterans at a local and regional level and how this can be improved
- Identify any extra areas of support that the Council can provide either itself or in partnership through looking at best practice elsewhere and by engaging with veterans groups to see where more support may be beneficial
- Identify areas where we can help build better understanding amongst the wider community, especially younger people, by engaging with schools and youth groups such as the Scouts and Cadets
- Identify any areas where the council can constructively feedback to national government for policy changes or additional support to enable the Council to deliver the Government's aims and objectives for veterans at a local level.

In addition the Council also calls on the Executive, at the end of this Review, to write to all armed forces and key armed forces organisations (such as the Royal British Legion) setting out the Birmingham offer, along with details on how to access support to encourage full take up for all eligible individuals.

Council calls on the Government to put funding and resources in place to enable councils and other public bodies to comprehensively support veterans.

---

**C. Councillor Julien Pritchard and Roger Harmer have given notice of the following motion.**

(See document No. 11)

The Lord Mayor advised that as the finishing time for the meeting had been reached the remaining motions and amendments should be moved and seconded formally (without comment) and following which they would be put to the vote without discussion.

Councillor Julien Pritchard formally moved the Motion which was formally seconded by Councillor Roger Harmer.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Brigid Jones and John Cotton gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 12)

Councillor Brigid Jones formally moved the amendment which was formally seconded by Councillor John Cotton.

The amendment having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The Motion as amended having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19130

**RESOLVED:-**

This Council notes that:

- Birmingham City Council has approximately 64,000 Council homes.
- Birmingham City Council has recently built its 3,000<sup>th</sup> new council house since 2009.
- The city is undergoing a large amount of regeneration and building of new housing.
- Plans for regeneration projects such as in Druids Heath are seeing a reduction in the amount of council housing.
- The Mayor of London has introduced a requirement for all new regeneration projects to have a residents' ballot.
- The Birmingham Development Plan seeks to achieve 35% of affordable homes in all new developments of more than 15 dwellings.
- Residents on lower incomes are more likely to be reliant on local support networks and are less able to move to different areas.
- Birmingham City Council does not currently have a right to return or remain policy for residents but the executive have plans to introduce such a policy.
- Birmingham City Council does not currently give affected residents a vote on regeneration plans.
- Housing & Neighbourhoods Overview & Scrutiny Committee has agreed to do an enquiry into a right to return.

The Council recommends that the executive engages with scrutiny to review its policies for regeneration areas to ensure that:

1. Regeneration is planned to meet the City's housing need.
  2. Residents living in a regeneration area have the opportunity to shape and influence plans.
  3. The executive's proposed 'right to return' policy is comprehensive and balanced.
  4. The implications of a residents ballot on regeneration projects is fully explored.
- 

The meeting ended at 1840 hours.

**APPENDIX**

Questions and replies in accordance with Standing Order 10.2.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
MEIRION JENKINS**

**A1      Paradise Grant Thornton**

**Question:**

**On what date were the Council's external auditors, Grant Thornton, informed of the issues with the Paradise redevelopment that you have stated you were made aware of in February 2018?**

**Answer:**

Regular monthly meetings take place throughout the year between the council's auditors and the Corporate Director, Finance and Governance. At these meetings all material changes and issues pertaining to the council are discussed. The auditors, as part of their final audit for 2017/18 accounts, which commenced in June 2018 discussed treatment of the council's position on the Paradise development and included a note (page 12) in their Audit Findings Report issued to Audit Committee on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
GARY SAMBROOK**

**A2     Local Centres**

**Question:**

**For each local centre, how much has been spent by the Council on regeneration in each of the last 6 years?**

**Answer:**

There has been investment in regeneration of the Local Centres in Birmingham in previous years as part of our growth strategy for the city.

However, spend by the Council on this has significantly changed since austerity measures were introduced by the Tory Government. Six years ago, specific Council budgets for regeneration stopped or were winding down due to reduced funding.

Despite this, regeneration has still been taking place in Local Centres through partnership working arrangements, including projects with the Business Improvement Districts and the Local Enterprise Partnership. Rather than using Council budgets, schemes have been brought forward utilising external funding, including the Local Growth Fund and section 106 planning obligations.

With there being over 70 Local Centres in the city, there is not one source of information on the amount spent by the Council or partners on the regeneration of Local Centres in the past six years.

If Councillor Sambrook has questions on a specific Local Centre, then some information may be able to be pulled together.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
GARETH MOORE**

**A3      CMIS Private Papers**

**Question:**

**Why is the private NEC cabinet report from October 2014 not on CMIS, like other private reports that can be accessed with a secure login?**

**Answer:**

The private report and appendices 2-4 are all on CMIS – accessible with a secure login.

The decision record published on CMIS states:

**It was noted that circulation of report appendices 1 and 5 had been restricted by the Cabinet on the advice of the relevant Chief Officer and Director of Legal and Democratic Services to only those Members attending Cabinet and relevant Chief Officers. Those appendices have not been posted on Democracy in Birmingham and paper copies were circulated only to those Members attending Cabinet and relevant Chief Officers.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
PETER FOWLER**

**A4     Leader's Development Fund**

**Question:**

**What is the purpose of the leader's development fund?**

**Answer:**

The Leader's Development Fund is a historical non-staffing budget within the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive's budget, which provides support to external organisations to enhance the civic, cultural and sporting life of the city.

The current City Council financial system was implemented in 2007 and the Leader's Development Fund was included in 2007/8 reporting. Records prior to this are unavailable.

Since my time as Leader I have utilised this budget to support or match fund events and initiatives for the benefit of the city. Details of the current 2018/19 spend are included in Written Question A5.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
EDDIE FREEMAN**

**A5     Leader's Development Fund spend**

**Question:**

**What has the leader's development fund been spent on in each year since 2012, including value of each item and per ward?**

**Answer:**

Spend for 2018/19 is highlighted below.

2018/19 Leader's Development Budget - Actual and Committed Spend - Month 8.

Everyman Remembered	£15,000
Armistice Day	£16,600
West Midlands Lieutenancy	£10,000
Harry Gem Tennis Pioneer	£ 1,000
Council House Dressing	£ 2,070
Weoley Castle Armed Forces Event	£ 350
Accommodation Hire - EMT	£ 400
Transportation Costs	£ 4,401
Building Strong Cities Event	£ 9,364
Birmingham Jazz Festival	£10,000
Foster Carers Event	£ 7,500
Other miscellaneous	£ 3,335
Apprenticeship Levy	£ 401
Tackling Problem Gambling Event	£ 2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£82,421</b>

To extrapolate the data from the finance system into a format to answer this question from 2012 has not been possible in the time allocated from receiving the written question until Council. This information will be distributed once collated in full.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
ADRIAN DELANEY**

**A6     Leader's Development Fund spend in 19/20**

**Question:**

**What is the Leader's Development Fund planned to be spent on in 19/20, including value of each item?**

**Answer:**

There are no confirmed commitments to date.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
DAVID BARRIE**

**A7      Community Infrastructure Levy**

**Question:**

**How much of the CIL is planned to be spent on the Commonwealth Games 2022 in future years (including proposed but unconfirmed spend)?**

**Answer:**

A strategy is being developed to determine the priorities for allocating CIL receipts. This will include consideration of appropriate infrastructure to support both the Commonwealth Games and post Commonwealth Games legacy as well as other infrastructure projects in the city.

Officers have proposed a total of £5million of CIL receipts to be spent in Perry Barr which is consistent with the Birmingham Development Plan and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, but this is still subject to appropriate Cabinet approvals.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
DAVID PEARS**

**A8      NEC ongoing costs**

**Question:**

**How much have been spent in each year since the sale of the NEC on any residual debt, pension strain or any other costs associated with the NEC Group, including forecast spend for the remainder of the current MTFP?**

**Answer:**

The net expenditure is as follows:

2015/16 actual	£32.4m
2016/17 actual	£47.9m
2017/18 actual	£7.5m
2018/19 estimate	£31.9m
2019/20 estimate	£31.2m
2020/21 estimate	£31.0m
2021/22 estimate	£30.6m
2022/23 estimate	£29.6m

**Notes**

1. Following the sale of the NEC Group, the City Council continues to meet the cost of all the outstanding debt raised to fund the NEC Group capital assets. However, following the sale, the City Council has retained the freehold of all NEC Group sites and given short leases at The ICC Birmingham and Arena Birmingham. The legacy costs have remained since the sale proceeds were not used to pay off historic NEC debts.
2. The figures exclude the financing charges related to the historic NEC Group capital expenditure prior to the introduction of the prudential borrowing regime in 2004, since the City Council cannot separately identify the cost of individual capital schemes.
3. In 2015/16 and 2016/17 the City Council created an accounting provision for a potential contribution to NEC Pension schemes. This sum was released in 2017/18 when an asset backed funding arrangement was introduced. The figures above include the impact of these transactions together with the ongoing cost of the asset backed funding arrangement.
4. The figures above include income now included directly within the City Council's group accounts following the sale of NEC Group.
5. The ongoing commitment is in line with, but slightly less than figures reported to Cabinet at the time of the NEC sale.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**A9      Project Overspends**

**Question:**

The capital programme, currently requires an overspend of >10% or £200k (whichever is greater) to have a revised business case back to the original approver. Which projects have met this threshold in the last 4 years, including when the revised business case was approved and by whom?

**Answer:**

**Capital Schemes - Project Overspends Analysis (2014/15 to 2017/18)**

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Revised Business Case Approved by</b>	<b>Revised Business Case Approval Date</b>
Chester Road	Report of the Strategic Director of Economy Under Delegated Authority	13-Jan-17
Swimming Pool Facilities	being investigated	
Community Sport	being investigated	
Community Development & Play	being investigated	
New Wholesale Market	Capital & Treasury Management Monitoring Quarter 2 (July to September 2016) report to Cabinet	15-Nov-16
New Wholesale Market	Capital & Treasury Management Monitoring Quarter 1 (April to June 2017) report to Cabinet	13-Sep-17
Big City Plan Initiative	Director of Planning & Regeneration report to Cabinet	20-Apr-15
Sparkhill Pool	Acting Strategic Director of Place report to Cabinet	17-Nov-15

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
MAUREEN CORNISH**

**A10     Channel 4 £52k spend**

**Question:**

**What is the breakdown of how the £52k the council put into the Channel 4 bid was spent?**

**Answer:**

The funding towards the Channel 4 Bid was provided in two stages. For the first round of the bid process, costs were split equally between Birmingham City Council, GBSLEP, Coventry City Council, Coventry and Warwickshire LEP, and WM Growth Company with each providing a £12.5K contribution.

The bid process was coordinated by the West Midlands Growth Company, with KPMG appointed to project manage and provide necessary specialist input to the bidding process, alongside BOP which provided specialist media and broadcasting industry input, contacts and guidance. This stage also included the production of dedicated marketing, social media campaigns and document production.

Following the shortlisting to just 3 city locations, a significant amount of work was then required to develop Birmingham's detailed proposition for the final stage of the HQ bid. The additional cost totalling £120k was shared equally between Birmingham City Council, GBSLEP and the West Midlands Combined Authority, and the West Midlands Growth Company continued to coordinate.

The second stage costs included the development of new skills, talent development and educational accelerator propositions for local colleges, schools and universities that would support the growth of the creative industries sector that would have been in partnership with Channel 4. In addition, project management, programme development, bid drafting, legal and property advice (including a draft Heads of Terms) were also included.

Throughout the bid process, there was a significant amount of time and work provided in good-will by many leading organisations and individuals in support of the development of the detailed proposals behind the bid. Private sector resources also contributed in terms of developing proposals for the physical location of the Channel 4 offices and studio, both in terms of initial and permanent property propositions.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
ADAM HIGGS**

**A11     Channel 4 £52k Officer time**

**Question:**

**What is the total number of hours spent by Council Officers on the Channel 4 bid, including the associated salary costs?**

**Answer:**

A range of Council officers, across several salary grades spent varying amounts of time on the Channel 4 bid to ensure that Birmingham and the City Council were fully engaged and represented in the different stages of the bid process. No precise records of hours spent were formally recorded and in the time allocated from receiving the written question until Council it has not been possible to collate this information. It will be distributed once collated.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
SUZANNE WEBB**

**A12     Paradise Development repayment**

**Question:**

**For the requested additional £50m for the paradise redevelopment what are the forecast repayment terms from future business rates income (i.e. how much per year and for how many years)?**

**Answer:**

Under the Paradise development model, the City Council would borrow the additional requested sum under prudential borrowing to be repaid by the Enterprise Zone Investment Plan (EZIP) end date of 2045/46. The current assumption in the model is a weighted average interest rate based on PWLB borrowing rates over a term of up to 24 years.

Additional business rate income (NNDR) being generated by the new developments from 2022/23 would increase incrementally in line with occupancy estimates and indexation each year and will cover all financing charges over the same period resulting in a net zero impact on the City Council's General Fund.

Any shortfall in additional business rate income is underwritten by a Developer's guarantee.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
JULIEN PRITCHARD**

**A13    Climate Change**

**Question:**

**“How far along we are to meeting our climate change target of 60% cuts in CO<sub>2</sub> by 2027? What percentage cuts in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have already been achieved?”**

**Answer:**

The Council’s target of 60% reduction in carbon emissions by 2027 represents a reduction from 6.874mn tonnes from the baseline set in 1990 to 2.7496mn tonnes by 2027.

The Carbon reduction figures are measured every 2 years , whereby the current data for Birmingham’s total emissions for 2016 were 4,467,000 tonnes. The percentage cut in CO<sub>2</sub> is therefore 33.7% against the 1990 baseline.

Of the remaining 4,467,000 tonnes, 33.4% of emissions are from industry and commercial, 33.9% from domestic and 32.7% from transport.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**B      In-house lawyers**

**Question:**

**How many in-house lawyers are currently employed by the council?**

**Answer:**

There are 74.9 full time equivalent (FTE) Lawyers.

This is made up of 67.2 FTE practising Solicitors and 7.7 FTE Legal Executives.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING FROM  
COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

**C      Impact - reduction of £1 million - Children's Trust**

**Question:**

**Could the cabinet member set out the impact on children's services on the proposed reduction of £1 million in the contract with the Children's Trust in next year's budget proposals?**

**Answer:**

The Children's Trust has developed plans that enable it to deliver this contract change saving without impacting adversely on children, young people and families.

The Trust has identified a number of areas where increased efficiency in the way services are provided will lead to real savings. The Trust was established, in part, to be able to move quickly to change the design and delivery of its services to citizens and its internal support services.

More active management of care placements and costs, increasingly efficient 'back office' support and continuing to reduce the cost of staffing by recruiting more social workers, leading to less reliance on more expensive agency social workers, will all contribute to achieving the saving without any change to the service offer the Trust makes to children, young people and families

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

**D1      Rats**

**Question:**

**How many reports of rats has the council received in each of the last 10 years?**

**Answer:**

Please find the numbers of rat complaints received by the council's Pest Control Team and Environmental Health Team.

No of Rat jobs received by EH	YEAR										
Job type	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Rat Domestic	34037	32614	31343	26754	21072	15647	16476	13176	10733	11027	12644
Rat - Commercial	319	252	246	193	195	200	263	225	163	148	144
Rats or Mice All Contracts	249	310	384	407	426	411	462	369	334	260	413
EH Pest Complaint	696	635	613	428	339	241	303	186	138	177	195
Grand Total	35301	33811	32586	27782	22032	16499	17504	13956	11368	11612	13396

**Key**

Rat Domestic	Rat in residential properties or gardens
Rat Commercial	Any site which is not domestic. May include business property, open land or land with no ownership.
Rats and Mice All contracts	Rat commercial jobs held by the pest control team
EH Pest Complaints	Rat complaints to Environmental Health where Environmental Health Officers have investigated.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,  
WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

**D2     Recycling**

**Question:**

**Both with and without including bottom ash, what was the performance by quarter of recycling in 15/16 and 16/17?**

**Answer:**

Waste Management have only been reporting monthly levels of Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) as part of its recycling performance since April 2018, as it is considered as a legitimate recycle.

As a result the recycling figures for 2015/16 and 2016/17 are below, but do not include monthly IBA percentages, however historically the annual recycling levels for the City would have increased by approximately 11.5% with the inclusion of IBA. This level has remained static over the last three years.

% of Household waste which is reused, recycled and composted.

%	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
15/16	28.27	27.75	26.19	29.54	29.23	30.53	30.36	30.36	29.73	29.35	29.3	28.6
16/17	27.31	27	26.8	28.23	29.29	29.41	29	28.57	29.05	29	27.98	27.98

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**D3     Invoices for waste collections services**

**Question:**

**What is total value of any unpaid and/or disputed invoices for waste collection contractors?**

**Answer:**

We are not aware of any disputed invoices but are aware of one unpaid invoice for Waste Collection Contractors. The value of this outstanding invoice is considered to be commercially sensitive, however it is in the process of being paid and this has been accounted for in the budget.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

**D4      Wastecollection.com**

**Question:**

**What is the total amount of outstanding invoices for the firm ‘wastecollection.com’, including any invoices that are disputed?**

**Answer:**

We are not aware of any disputed invoices but are aware of one unpaid invoice for the firm ‘wastecollection.com’. The value of this outstanding invoice is considered to be commercially sensitive, however it is in the process of being paid and this has been accounted for in the budget.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

**D5     Street Cleansing**

**Question:**

**From January 17 until the end of May 18 – how much was spent per week on street  
cleansing in each ward?**

**Answer:**

This information is not available as the financial information does not record the relevant data  
in the detail requested.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

**D6     HRA spend on waste**

**Question:**

**How much money from the Housing Revenue Account was spent on clearing waste during last summer's industrial dispute?**

**Answer:**

The overall figure for waste removal equated to £817,980. This spend and allocated budget is currently under review.

The HRA is responsible for keeping housing land clear of litter and refuse and this is part of the on-going cleaning arrangements.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR SUZANNE WEBB**

**D7      HRA spend on waste**

**Question:**

**How much money was spent per tower block during last summer's industrial dispute to clear waste over and above the usual waste collection spend, including which budget line this money came from?**

**Answer:**

It is not possible to breakdown the cost of removing waste from the City's Tower Blocks by each individual block however, the overall figure for waste removal equated to £817,980. This spend and allocated budget is currently under review.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**D8     Fly-tipping pilot**

**Question:**

**Can you please publish the findings of the £200k pilot in 2018/19 for the reduction in the level of non-highway fly-posting and fly-tipping across the city, to include how, why and where the money was spent and the outcomes seen?**

**Answer:**

The budget for the placarding and flyposting team was £155,000 and was given to the Waste Enforcement Unit to support three officers to undertake investigations in to the illegal advertising across the City and assistance with fly tipping issues.

The officers were recruited and began operating in April 2018 and have been delivering the service to date.

In respect of fly posting the officers have removed 2410 unauthorised advertisements to secure evidence. 302 businesses were identified and investigated and issued with Community Protection Warnings. As part of these warnings the businesses are ordered to remove any other advertising they may have or the notices will be escalated to community protection notices.

Demands for information regarding trade waste contracts are also requested to ensure compliance with the Environmental Protection Act.

65 Community Protection Notices (CPN) have been issued for further non-compliance. Of which 38 resulted in £100 Fixed Penalty Notices being issued for further breaches of the CPN and a further 12 prosecution reports being submitted to Legal Services for consideration.

Since April we have seen a dramatic decrease in the numbers of illegal advertising, in May 2018 we removed 683 and in November we removed 216 adverts. We are also seeing businesses that have previously failed to comply with requests to remove advertising, now comply. In fact, most businesses we have been in contact are now complaint and no further signs have been found. The majority of the signs we find presently are from new businesses.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MAUREEN CORNISH**

**D9     WRCO interventions**

**Question:**

**Since the last Council meeting, how many interventions have been made by WRCOs with residents to improve recycling (broken down by type of intervention)?**

**Answer:**

Among the other functions of the WRCOs such as round optimisation, container work etc, there are two main data collection forms which are used by the WRCOs relating to recycling, F01 - Recycling Participation and F02 - Resident Engagement.

Between the 6 November (last Council Meeting) and the 28 November 2018:

- **F01:** 418 of the Recycling Participation forms have been completed. Of these 13 have identified specific streets as only presenting between 0-25% of their recycling bins for collection. All 13 have prompted the Waste Prevention Unit to visit these streets and offer advice and education to residents.
- **F02:** 22 Resident Engagement forms have been completed. These forms document advice and information issued to individual residents by the WRCO.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

**D10     Waste Collection Peer Review**

**Question:**

**In response to question D22 at the last full council meeting (6 November) you undertook to take under consideration the suggestion of a peer review into the waste collection service. Having had time to consider that suggestion, will you now be requesting such a review?**

**Answer:**

**Yes, I will look at all options that will contribute to improving the service.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

**D11     Waste Collection Council Debate**

**Question:**

**Will you commit to a full council debate on the bin service in Nov 2019, including a comparison with all other waste collection authorities?**

**Answer:**

If scrutiny wishes to conduct a review I would be more than happy to contribute.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

**D12     Slabs in Cabs**

**Question:**

**Do you think the slabs in cabs were a worthwhile investment?**

**Answer:**

Performance data is key to running a major service such as waste collection. Technological advances should assist with intelligence gathering and evidence to continually improve the service.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,  
WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS**

**D13     Broken bins**

**Question:**

**For every month since the roll out of wheelie bins (including current year to date) how many residents have been charged for the replacement of a lost or broken bin (if data breaks this down, please provide the split between those lost and broken)?**

**Answer:**

	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	Damaged	Missing	Damaged	Missing	Damaged	Missing	Damaged	Missing	Damaged	Missing
<b>Jan</b>			2	59	29	102	38	152	82	197
<b>Feb</b>			8	46	24	98	28	135	50	177
<b>Mar</b>			5	53	25	78	37	162	66	178
<b>Apr</b>			5	46	30	86	29	100	63	174
<b>May</b>			4	36	27	94	45	115	72	161
<b>Jun</b>	3	20	7	75	35	126	44	137	66	159
<b>Jul</b>	1	19	6	59	32	97	55	160	79	189
<b>Aug</b>	3	22	11	77	25	112	51	99	61	158
<b>Sep</b>	1	26	12	74	33	143	43	151	60	220
<b>Oct</b>	2	31	12	61	29	144	54	171	59	217
<b>Nov</b>	1	10	21	80	23	149	61	149	42	181
<b>Dec</b>	4	38	16	108	19	109	37	119		
<b>Total</b>	15	166	109	774	331	1338	522	1650	700	2011

If a resident has had their wheelie bin for less than 10 working days when it is reported as missing, stolen or damaged, it will be replaced free of charge.

If on the other hand a resident has their wheelie bin for more than 10 working days when it was reported as missing, stolen or damaged, there is a £20 charge to replace it.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BARRIE**

**D14     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 1**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. What were these payments for?**

**Answer:**

The GMB union were not consulted on an MOU that was reached with Unite and Unison in November 2017 in relation to changes to the Waste Management Service.

This failure to consult the GMB union was wrong. As a result, GMB submitted a 'failure to consult' claim at the beginning of this year against the Council which, following legal advice and talks with ACAS, led to a settlement payment to GMB members.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

**D15     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 2**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. Who authorised these payments?**

**Answer:**

The GMB union were not consulted on an MOU that was reached with Unite and Unison in November 2017 in relation to changes to the Waste Management Service.

This failure to consult the GMB union was wrong. As a result, GMB submitted a 'failure to consult' claim at the beginning of this year against the Council which, following legal advice and talks with ACAS, led to a settlement payment to GMB members.

The approval process came within the delegated powers of the relevant Corporate Director, the Corporate Director of Place by way of a Chief Officer report to the Chief Executive and the Chief Finance Officer dated 27<sup>th</sup> February 2018. This was amended on 23 May 2018 with regard to the level of payment.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

**D16     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 3**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. Which Cabinet Members were made aware of these payments?**

**Answer:**

The GMB union were not consulted on an MOU that was reached with Unite and Unison in November 2017 in relation to changes to the Waste Management Service.

The approval process came within the delegated powers of the relevant Corporate Director, the Corporate Director of Place by way of a Chief Officer report to the Chief Executive and the Chief Finance Officer dated 27<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Two reports were signed 22nd and 23rd May with regard to the level of payment.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**D17     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 4**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. What was the approval process for these payments?**

**Answer:**

The GMB union were not consulted on an MOU that was reached with Unite and Unison in November 2017 in relation to changes to the Waste Management Service.

This failure to consult the GMB union was wrong. As a result, GMB submitted a 'failure to consult' claim at the beginning of this year against the Council which, following legal advice and talks with ACAS, led to a settlement payment to GMB members.

The approval process came within the delegated powers of the relevant Corporate Director, the Corporate Director of Place by way of a Chief Officer report to the Chief Executive and the Chief Finance Officer dated 27<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Two reports were signed 22nd and 23rd May with regard to the level of payment.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**D18     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 5**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. What legal advice was sought before making these payments?**

**Answer:**

I have been made aware in the last two weeks that advice was sought from the Council's internal legal services team who sought external legal advice before reaching an agreement with GMB (via ACAS). Unfortunately I have not seen the legal advice both internal and external advice but the city solicitor tells me that the advice was to settle the claim brought by GMB.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR TIM HUXTABLE**

**D19     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 6**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. Were similar payments made to any other staff groups in the council?**

**Answer:**

I understand that only GMB Members received payments for a failure to consult claim.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

**D20     Sweetheart payments to GMB refuse collectors 7**

**Question:**

**Press reports allege that payments of up to £4000 were made to refuse workers in the GMB Union who did not support the bin strike last summer. Were any other payments made to any bin staff, in any union, over and above usual contractual pay?**

**Answer:**

No. Only members of GMB received additional payments but this was as a result of GMB submitting a 'failure to consult' claim against the Council which, following legal advice and talks with ACAS, led to a settlement payment to GMB members.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ**

**D21     Assisted Collections Missed**

**Question:**

**How many assisted collections have been reported as missed, by month, in the course of this year?**

**Answer:**

Below is a table showing the number of assisted collections reported as missed by month between 1 January and 26 November 2018.

<b>Month</b>	<b>Assisted</b>
<b>Jan</b>	849
<b>Feb</b>	538
<b>Mar</b>	727
<b>Apr</b>	756
<b>May</b>	764
<b>Jun</b>	698
<b>Jul</b>	724
<b>Aug</b>	616
<b>Sep</b>	814
<b>Oct</b>	1807
<b>Nov (part)</b>	1248

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL EUSTACE**

**D22    Assisted Collections Missed 2**

**Question:**

**Have the crews been advised they can skip assisted collections when they are struggling to finish their rounds on time?**

**Answer:**

Crews have not been advised to 'skip' assisted collections. We recognise the importance of the additional assistance given to the most vulnerable residents of Birmingham and are committed to ensure that missed collections do not occur.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

**D23     Assisted Collections Missed 3**

**Question:**

**Does the substantial number of complaints about missed assisted collections (including residents reporting not getting collections for a number of months) reflect a deliberate policy to force the elderly and disabled to make their own arrangements for disposal of their rubbish?**

**Answer:**

No, your assertion is incorrect. There is no 'deliberate policy' to force the elderly and disabled to make their own waste disposal arrangements. We recognise the importance of the additional assistance given to the most vulnerable residents of Birmingham and are committed to ensure that missed collections do not occur.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE  
AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

**D24    Late Refuse Collections**

**Question:**

**How many properties have received late collections by ward (by month this year) from crews doing overtime or agency work?**

**Answer:**

Late collections does not mean that overtime is paid, hence this information is not available.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

**D25     Grade 3 Waste Collection Operatives - training in liaising?**

**Question:**

**Given that the grade 3 waste collection operatives now have a brief to engage with the public, what training have they received in liaising with residents in receipt of assisted collections to ensure their rubbish is collected?**

**Answer:**

The Grade 3 Waste Recycling and Collection Officers have all received training on their role using the mobile technology to help them solve issues they have within their workplace. They are trained to help citizens who may need assisted collections, larger or smaller bins or changing addresses from red carded (not suitable for wheelie bins) to green carded (Suitable for wheelie bins). Staff will have also received customer service training previously.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**E1      Culture Commissioning**

**Question:**

**In response to written question E1 at Full Council on 6 November, you provided a table detailing the split of culture spend between Revenue Commissioning and Project Commissions. Can you please break this spend down to show which organisations and projects received what funding in each of those years?**

**Answer:**

Please see the following breakdown as requested. Some of the tables also include an element of match funding.

**2015-16**

**Arts Project Commissions and Associated Programmes: £473,457 + £23,990 match**

Next Generation Projects (Children and young people)	BCMG	£9,700.00
	BE Festival CIC	£10,000.00
	Big Brum TIE	£9,795.00
	Birmingham Hippodrome	£10,000.00
	Blue Orange Theatre	£9,935.00
	Friction Arts	£9,155.00
	LouDeemY Productions	£3,300.00
	Secret City Arts	£7,975.00
	Superact	£7,005.00
	The Cube	£3,550.00
	Women & Theatre	£9,750.00
Culture on our Doorstep Project (Adults and Communities)	Art Works Hall Green	£3,000.00
	Edgbaston Arts Contact Group	£6,960.00
	General Public	£2,856.00
	Jungo Arts	£3,000.00
	Junk	£1,845.00
	Little Bird Community Arts CIC	£9,750.00
	Mercurial Arts	£10,000.00
	Northfield Arts Forum	£9,810.00
	Ort Gallery	£9,081.00
	Purbanat	£10,000.00
	Reel Access Ltd	£9,530.00
	Some Cities	£10,000.00
	Soul City Arts	£10,000.00
Great International City Projects (Festivals)	BE Festival CIC	£7,000.00
	Birmingham Hippodrome	£3,000.00
	Birmingham Jazz & Blues Festival Limited	£9,000.00
	Birmingham LGBT Community Trust	£5,000.00
	Birmingham Repertory Theatre	£50,000.00
	City of Colours	£5,000.00
	Flatpack Festival	£9,000.00
	Flatpack Projects CIO	£ 900.00

**City Council – 5 December 2018**

	Music for Youth	£4,500.00
	Open Theatre	£3,000.00
	Polish Expats Association	£5,000.00
	Professional Incridibles	£5,000.00
	Punch Records	£9,000.00
	RoguePlay Theatre Ltd	£3,000.00
	Simmer Down CIC	£9,000.00
	Uprize CIC	£7,000.00
	WERK Culture Ltd	£7,500.00
	Writing West Midlands	£9,000.00
	Simmer Down CIC	£900.00
Arts Champions Scheme Projects	Birmingham Opera Company	£2,000.00
	Birmingham Repertory Theatre	£4,000.00
	Birmingham Royal Ballet	£4,000.00
	CBSO	£4,000.00
	DanceXchange	£4,000.00
	Ex Cathedra	£2,000.00
	Ikon Gallery	£4,000.00
	mac Birmingham	£4,000.00
	Performances Birmingham	£4,000.00
	Sampad South Asian Arts	£4,000.00
	The Drum (Newtown Cultural Project Ltd)	£4,000.00
Year of Arts and Young People Projects	Beatfreeks	£20,000.00
	Birmingham Museums Trust	£20,000.00
	Stans Café	£9,650.00
Birmingham Festivals Group development	Flatpack Projects	£10,000.00
Organisational development	No.11 Arts Ltd	£10,000
Heritage Week Project	Birmingham Museums Trust	£10,000.00
Local Arts Forum Co-ordination	Active Arts Castle Vale	£4,000.00
	Argy Bhaji	£4,000.00
	Art Works – Hall Green	£4,000.00
	Edgbaston Arts Contact Group	£4,000.00
	Grosvenor Road Studios	£4,000.00
	Highbury Theatre	£4,000.00
	Inspiring a new generation	£4,000.00
	NAF	£4,000.00
	Reel Access	£4,000.00
	Superact CIC	£4,000.00
Strategic Arts	Arts Board and Leadership Training costs	£1,303.32
	Heritage Week medical cover, promotion and marketing, volunteer t-shirts costs	£1,522.90
	Arts on the Move costs	£2,310.00
	Creative Futures Strategy costs	£5,960.62
	Public Art costs	£5,217.68

**Arts Revenue Commissioning: £5,952,000.00**

Performances Birmingham Ltd	£1,985,000
CBSO	£1,195,000
Birmingham Royal Ballet	£730,000
Birmingham Repertory Theatre	£730,000
Midlands Arts Centre	£540,000
The Drum (Newtown Cultural Project Ltd)	£380,000
Birmingham Opera Company	£140,000
Ikon Gallery	£84,500
DanceXchange	£80,000
Ex Cathedra	£47,500
Sampad	£40,000

**2016-17**

**Arts Project Commissions and Associated Programmes:** £205,000 + £515,000 The Drum (Newtown Cultural Project Ltd) allocation towards Aston and Newtown projects and Black History Month from Birmingham City Council and Arts Council England + £91,662 match

Next Generation Projects (Children and young people)	Blue Orange Theatre	£8,408.00
	Gap Arts Project	£13,563.00
	Northfield Arts Forum	£13,660.00
	On The Edge	£13,860.00
	BE Festival CIC	£5,611.00
	Birmingham Hippodrome	£12,720.00
	LouDeemY Productions	£7,840.00
Culture on our Doorstep Project (Adults and Communities)	DanceXchange	£10,000
	Creative Cohesion West Midlands	£6,000.00
	General Public	£2,120.00
	Women & Theatre	£10,000.00
	LouDeemY Productions	£5,660.00
	Purbanat	£10,000.00
	Sampad South Asian Arts	£8,000.00
	Sonia Sabri	£10,000.00
	Soul City Arts	£7,000.00
	Kalaboration CIC	£7,220.00
Aston and Newtown Projects	Wassifa CIC	£35,529.00
	7E Youth Academy	£33,550.00
	ACE Dance & Music	£71,197.00
	Birmingham Playcare Network	£40,000.00
	Craftspace	£27,886.00
	Handsworth Creative	£35,000.00
	mac Birmingham	£49,040.00
	Aston Performing Arts Academy	£46,065.00
	Birmingham Hippodrome	£125,000.00
	Grosvenor Road Studios	£25,000.00
	Eloquent Praise & Empowerment Dance Co	£4,000.00
		£3,733.00
	Strawberry Afro Theatre CIC	£4,000.00
	Midlands Community Group	
Local Arts Forum Co-ordination	No.11 Arts Ltd (Local arts forum network support/co-ordination)	£5,000.00

**City Council – 5 December 2018**

	Art Works Hall Green	£2,000.00
	Edgbaston Arts Contact Group/Artscoop Central	£2,000.00
	Northfield Arts Forum	£2,000.00
	No.11 Arts Ltd (co-ordination of local arts forums x 7)	£14,000.00
Cultural Co-design project	No.11 Arts Ltd (Cultural Co-design case studies	£10,000.00
	The Edgbaston Arts Contact Group	£9,000.00
	Active Arts Castle Vale	£9,000.00
	Art Works Hall Green	£9,000.00
	Reel Access Ltd	£9,000.00
	Inspiring A New Generation	£9,000.00
	NAF	£9,000.00
	Grosvenor Road Studios Ltd	£9,000.00
	Argy Bhaji	£9,000.00
	Mubu Music Ltd	£9,000.00
	Superact CIC	£9,000.00
	Women and theatre (bham) ltd	£10,000.00
	Project evaluation and other costs	£10,000
Black History Month	Strawberry words ltd	£15,000.00

**Arts Revenue Commissioning: £4,335,000.00**

Performances Birmingham Ltd	£1,700,000
CBSO	£900,000
Birmingham Royal Ballet	£525,000
Birmingham Repertory Theatre	£525,000
Midlands Arts Centre	£400,000
Birmingham Opera Company	£100,000
Ikon Gallery	£60,000
DanceXchange	£60,000
Ex Cathedra	£35,000
Sampad	£30,000

**2017-18**

**Arts Project Commissions and Associated Programmes: £405,000 + £10,355 match**

Next Generation Projects (Children and young people)	Secret City Arts	£14,020.00
	LouDeemY Productions	£6,450.00
	Gap Arts Project	£13,795.00
	Mooville Theatre Company	£10,146.00
	Reel Access Ltd	£12,753.00
	Some Cities CIC	£11,595.50
	Women & Theatre	£11,595.50
Culture on our Doorstep Project (Adults and Communities)	Arts in the Yard	£10,000.00
	Friction Arts	£10,000.00
	On the Edge	£10,000.00
	General Public	£2,800.00
	Women & Theatre	£10,000.00
	Creative Cohesion West Midlands	£8,600.00
	Northfield Arts Forum	£8,600.00
	Artscoop Central	£10,000.00
Cultural Regeneration	Sampad South Asian Arts	£29,950.00

**City Council – 5 December 2018**

Projects (Aston and Newtown geographically extended to)	Simmer Down CIC	£28,814.00
	Friction Arts	£27,275.00
	Ifa Yoruba Contemporary Arts	£20,000.00
	Reel Access Ltd	£28,010.00
	Birmingham City University	£30,000.00
	Craftspace	£18,451.00
	Blackstory Partnership (Black History Month)	£17,500.00
Local Arts Forum Co-ordination	No.11 Arts Ltd (Local arts forum network support/co-ordination)	£5,000.00
	No.11 Arts Ltd (Local Arts Forum co-ordination x 10)	£20,000.00

**Arts Revenue Commissioning: £2,772,000.00**

Performances Birmingham Ltd	£1,450,000
CBSO	£672,000
Birmingham Royal Ballet	£200,000
Birmingham Repertory Theatre	£200,000
Midlands Arts Centre	£120,000
Birmingham Opera Company	£40,000
Ikon Gallery	£25,000
DanceXchange	£25,000
Ex Cathedra	£15,000
Sampad	£25,000

**2018-19**

**Arts Project Commissions and Associated Programmes - £405,000.00**

Next Generation Projects (Children and young people)	Professional Incredibles	£3,000.00
	Secret City Arts	£10,000.00
	Women & Theatre	£10,000.00
	Polish Expats Association	£10,000.00
	LouDeemY Productions	£5,725.00
	Gap Arts Project	£9,910.00
	Mooville Theatre Company	£5,952.30
	Place Prospectors	£3,000.00
	RoguePlay Theatre Ltd	£10,000.00
	<i>Budget Frozen to cover costs incurred by the service relating to the vacant Drum building</i>	<i>£2,412.70</i>
Culture on our Doorstep Project (Adults and Communities)	Creative Health CIC	£8,500.00
	Birmingham Big Art Foundation	£10,000.00
	General Public	£6,000.00
	Women & Theatre	£10,000.00
	LouDeemY Productions	£6,390.00
	Place Prospectors	£3,000.00
	Secret City Arts	£10,000.00
	Uprize CIC	£9,200.00
Black & Minority Ethnic Arts Projects (Aston and Newtown geographically)	Purbanat	£6,910.00
	<i>Budget Frozen to cover costs incurred by the service relating to the vacant Drum building</i>	<i>£182,500.00</i>
	Recognize Black Heritage & Culture CIC	£17,500.00



**City Council – 5 December 2018**

extended to	(Black History Month)	
Local Arts Forum Co-ordination	No.11 Arts Ltd (un-constituted local arts forums x 6)	£12,000.00
	Active Arts Castle Vale	£2,000.00
	Art Works Hall Green	£2,000.00
	NAF	£2,000.00
	Arts in the Yard	£2,000.00
	<i>Budget Frozen to cover costs incurred by the service relating to the vacant Drum building</i>	<i>£45,000.00</i>

**Arts Revenue Commissioning: £2,772,000.00**

Performances Birmingham Ltd	£1,450,000
CBSO	£672,000
Birmingham Royal Ballet	£200,000
Birmingham Repertory Theatre	£200,000
Midlands Arts Centre	£120,000
Birmingham Opera Company	£40,000
Ikon Gallery	£25,000
DanceXchange	£25,000
Ex Cathedra	£15,000
Sampad	£25,000

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

**E2     Young Active Travel Trust**

**Question:**

**Since its creation how much money has been raised by the Young Active Travel Charitable Trust?**

**Answer:**

The Young Active Travel Trust was established with £25,000 sponsorship from Churchill Insurance and £75,000 from the City Council. No further donations have been received.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

**E3     Young Active Travel Trust schools**

**Question:**

**Since its creation which schools have received grants (and of how much) by the Young Active Travel Charitable Trust?**

**Answer:**

I refer the Councillor to the decision of the Trusts and Charities Committee on 18 July 2018 which approved grants to the following schools:

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Amount Granted</b>
Alston School	Walk to School	£1,000
Gracelands Nursery	Healthy Safe Way to School	£1,000
Abbey Catholic School	Scoot & Ride	£1,000
Greenholm School	Keep Clear Parking Campaign	£500
Kings Heath Primary	Scootability	£1,000
Washwood Heath Academy	Cycle to School	£1,000

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS  
AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**E4     Young Active Travel Trust**

**Question:**

**Since its creation how many meetings have been held by cabinet members with potential sponsors\donors?**

**Answer:**

Cabinet Members have no specific responsibility to arrange meetings with potential sponsors/donors. It is open to all Councillors to secure funding for this and any other charity for which the Council is Trustee.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**E5     Arts Grants**

**Question:**

**The 19/20 budget consultation document lists the net spend for Arts Grants as £8.473m, but only just over £3m of this is paid out in grants to arts organisations. It is this c£3m that is being cut by a third to give the proposed saving of £1.080m. What is the remaining £5.2m currently spent on?**

**Answer:**

The remaining £5.2m budget is mainly allocated for the contractual arrangements with the Birmingham Museums Trust.

The exact figures on the Voyager ledger are:

Birmingham Museum Trust £4.672m

Arts grants £3.187m

Major Events £0.333m

Cultural Development Service running costs Staffing etc. £0.281m (includes Film Birmingham Office)

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR TIM HUXTABLE**

**E6     Meetings Young Active Travel Trust**

**Question:**

**On how many occasions has the Young Active Travel Trust met, including dates?**

**Answer:**

The Council is the sole trustee of the Young Active Travel Trust (YATT) and has delegated the day to day management of the YATT to the Council's Trusts and Charities Committee.

A schedule showing all meetings of the Trusts and Charities Committee is publicly available and can be found on the Council's website.

During the current municipal year, it met on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018 and is scheduled to meet again on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES  
FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

**F1      Trade Union Reps**

**Question:**

**How many FTE TU reps are currently funded by council as of the end of November 2018?**

**Answer:**

**As at end of November 2018, 26.1 FTE.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES  
FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

**F2      Trade Union Accommodation**

**Question:**

**How many payments for accommodation are currently made to unions (broken down by union, and total amount per annum)?**

**Answer:**

The 18/19 contribution for accommodation is £12,500 towards premises for Unison only. The GMB/Unite/UCATT are located in Council premises.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES  
FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

**F3      Non-essential spend and trade unions**

**Question:**

**Does the current freeze on non-essential spend include any spend by council employed trade union reps?**

**Answer:**

No. Trade Unions are not provided with any disposable budget by the Council.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES  
FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS**

**F4     Agency Staff**

**Question:**

**Broken down by Directorate, how many council staff are also hired in as agency staff?**

**Answer:**

In accordance with the Data Protection Act, the Council does not have access to agency worker personal information (a unique identifier is required e.g. National Insurance number) to be able to correlate whether the individual is both:-

- a) working as an employee of the Council and
- b) an employee of the agency provider on assignment at the Council.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES  
FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**F5      Savings Delivery Plans**

**Question:**

**Are you personally content, having reviewed copies that all savings delivery plans, for both the current year and next year are now complete and fully achievable?**

**Answer:**

Savings of the scale and nature that we are being forced to make are extremely challenging and they are currently being consulted on with Birmingham's citizens. It's the responsibility of the assigned officer to produce a detailed implementation plan which I will be monitoring.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS  
FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**G1      Bescot Court - Proposals for this site?**

**Question:**

**Bescot Court in Perry Barr ward is now largely vacant due its unsuitability as sheltered housing. I have had a number of discussions with housing officers in recent years about the future of the building and the site, and have proposed, along with the local neighbourhood planners, a redevelopment to secure the future of the adjoining library and to provide high quality apartments for social housing. Could the cabinet member update on what is proposed for this site and the response to proposals emerging from the neighbourhood plan?**

**Answer:**

I accept that Bescot Court's current use is unsustainable as a sheltered housing block of bedsits. We have been looking at a range of options for its future use taking account of the need to retain and maximise social housing provision whilst ensuring that financially we achieve the best solution.

To this end we are looking to work with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider to develop the Housing site for much needed housing use, currently this would involve entering into a lease arrangement. It is possible that this could also then lead to us working with that provider in regard to the library facility.

A decision report is expected in due course.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS  
FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

**G2     Housing Repairs**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years, how many housing repairs were completed within the given timescales, as a proportion of the total number reported?**

**Answer:**

The table below shows the breakdown of information on repairs completed in time over the last 3 years, this has also been split between normal repairs and Gas repairs to provide you with additional detail.

The below numbers of complaints should be taken in context of the overall number of repairs completed. For example for the year 2017/18 our contractors completed 260,000 repairs.

In summary the percentage of overall jobs completed within timescale has increased slightly from 88.6% in 16/17 to 91.7% in 17/18 with it remaining consistent at 91.7% for this year to date.

<b>18-19</b>	<b>Year to date</b>
<b>KPI002 - Work completed within timescale</b>	<b>91.7%</b>
<b>Contractor total works orders completed</b>	<b>138156</b>
<b><i>Work completed within timescale - Repairs</i></b>	<b>90.2%</b>
Total work orders completed - Repairs	<b>97633</b>
<b><i>Work completed within timescale - Gas</i></b>	<b>95.7%</b>
Total work orders completed - Gas	<b>23833</b>

<b>17-18</b>	<b>Year to date</b>
<b>KPI002 - Work completed within timescale</b>	<b>91.7%</b>
<b>Contractor total works orders completed</b>	<b>266075</b>
<b><i>Work completed within timescale - Repairs</i></b>	<b>91.0%</b>
Total work orders completed - Repairs	<b>187820</b>
<b><i>Work completed within timescale - Gas</i></b>	<b>96.2%</b>
Total work orders completed - Gas	<b>56874</b>

<b>16-17</b>	<b>Year to date</b>
<b>KPI002 - Work completed within timescale</b>	<b>88.6%</b>
<b>City total works orders completed</b>	<b>217306</b>
<b><i>Work completed within timescale - Repairs</i></b>	<b>86.8%</b>
Total work orders completed - Repairs	<b>158092</b>
<b><i>Work completed within timescale - Gas</i></b>	<b>93.7%</b>
Total work orders completed - Gas	<b>53578</b>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS  
FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

**G3     Housing Repairs Complaints**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years, how many complaints have been received relating to housing repairs not having been completed satisfactorily or not completed at all after the job have been closed down on the system as 'complete'?**

**Answer:**

Whilst the repairs service holds data concerning the number of complaints received for the specified period, the data held does not confirm whether the complaint was made / received whilst the job was open or closed.

Also unfortunately the complaint recording data, although captures a number of sub categories, does not cover the specific category requested. However we can confirm the following in regard to the overall number of repair complaints received over these 3 years:

The below numbers of complaints should be taken in context of the overall number of repairs completed. For example for the year 2017/18 our contractors completed over 260,000 repairs. Complaints for that year represent just over 1% of overall repairs.

For the financial year 2016/2017, a total of 3,593 complaints were received in respect of the provision of housing repair services by Birmingham City Council and its repairs partners.

For the financial year 2017/2018, a total of 2,752 complaints were received in respect of the provision of housing repair services by Birmingham City Council and its repairs partners.

For the financial year 2018/2019 (April 2018 to 28 November 2018), a total of 1,898 complaints have been received in respect of the provision of housing repair services by Birmingham City Council and its repairs partners.

In addition Contractors collect general satisfaction data and I can advise the following for the previous 3 years:

2016/17 – 99.8%

2017/18 – 99.8%

2018/19 to date – 99.9%

We are currently reviewing how this information is collected with our contractors

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT  
FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

**H1 Scott Arms Junction - Relieve Congestion - 2022 Games**

**Question:**

**Given that the Scott Arms junction on the A34 is a major bottleneck in the route into the city, what work is being undertaken to find ways to relieve congestion at this junction for the 2022 Commonwealth Games and the proposed introduction of new bus services on this route?**

**Answer:**

The Council and Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) are working with partners to produce a comprehensive Transport Plan for the Commonwealth Games (CWG) 2022. The initial version of this plan will be subject to public consultation in 2019. Birmingham 2022 will be public transport games, with spectators and workforce having enhanced public transport to access venues, and the majority of venues having no private car parking available other than disabled parking. There will also be a significant travel demand campaign to encourage both games and 'business as usual' trip makers to use sustainable modes, and those that need to drive to use appropriate routes.

The A34 corridor is key to the Transport Plan as it gives access to the Alexander Stadium, Athletes Village and Villa Park. The Scott Arms junction is on the route to the Stadium from the Strategic Road Network at M6 J7, therefore the games Transport Plan will be for spectators and workforce to use alternative modes to make this journey. Measures planned include longer distance trips being intercepted at strategic park and rides sites, with additional bus services provided, a potential new Sprint Rapid Transit service in operation, a rebuilt Perry Barr station, new cycle facilities along the corridor, and controlled parking zones around venues.

The Sprint route is proposed to pass through Scott Arms and designs were subject to recent public consultation. The consultation designs propose increased bus priority at the junction. TfWM are currently working with Birmingham, Sandwell and Walsall to review consultation responses and agree any revisions required prior to moving forward to detailed design.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**H2      Perry Barr Flyover - disruption**

**Question:**

**The recent Perry Barr ward forum was told that demolition of the flyover at Perry Barr – if it proceeds – will cause two years of disruption. What assessments are being undertaken of the cost of that disruption to the economy of the city, the health and welfare of the Perry Barr area and household budgets of those using the route?**

**Answer:**

No decision on the future of the flyover has yet been made, an Options Appraisal report is expected to be presented to Cabinet early in the New Year.

The highway changes being considered at Perry Barr, specifically the A34/A453 junction and the A34/A4040 junction are significant (whether the flyover is retained or removed). The construction works programme is expected to be around 2 years in duration; the programme will be developed once a contractor has been appointed and every effort will be made to deliver the highway changes in the shortest time possible.

The Council has a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage the highway network, with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable, the expeditious movement of traffic on the road network and the more efficient use of the road network having regard to its other obligations, policies and objectives. To deliver physical changes to the highway it is necessary to put in place temporary traffic management arrangements that may involve lane closures or lane narrowing and/or road closures. Where possible these restrictions are limited to the off peak periods. Not only are these restrictions necessary for the efficient delivery of the works, they are also required to ensure the safety of construction workers and highway users.

There is no specific cost benefit analysis carried out to measure the disruption impact. An air quality assessment of the impact of the construction together with the final scheme will be undertaken.

The Council working with the appointed Contractor and Transport for West Midlands will produce a comprehensive construction management plan and also implement travel demand management to help mitigate any adverse impacts during the construction period.

The proposed Perry Barr regeneration scheme is an extremely important and long-awaited opportunity for the city, which will deliver much-needed homes and better public transport for the citizens of Birmingham.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

**H3      Cost benefit analysis of disruption caused by works**

**Question:**

**Given that works to major roads in the city are often continuous, with one project following another, what is the council procedure for undertaking cost-benefit analysis of the disruption caused by such works?**

**Answer:**

The Council has a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage the highway network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable, the expeditious movement of traffic on the road network and the more efficient use of the road network having regard to its' other obligations, policies and objectives.

To deliver physical changes to the highway it is necessary to put in place temporary traffic management arrangements that may involve lane closures or lane narrowing and/or road closures. Where possible these restrictions are limited to the off peak periods. Not only are these restrictions necessary for the efficient delivery of the works they are required to ensure the safety of construction workers and highway users.

Every effort is made to minimise the disruption of roadworks to the travelling public. The Council's Traffic Management Protocol sets out the steps that all works promoters must follow to ensure disruption is kept to a minimum. The temporary traffic management proposals of the promoter must be approved by the Council before works start.

Works are programmed taking into consideration all other planned works. The level of investment in infrastructure is unprecedented and it is a major challenge to manage the delivery of highway projects to the required programmes without some inconvenience to the travelling public. Through various communication channels the public are given advance notice of proposed works and may be advised to use other forms of transport where possible.

The cost benefit analysis of the disruption caused by highway works forms part of the overall Business Case submission for major projects that are funded by the Department for Transport. For small to medium projects there is no specific cost benefit analysis carried out to measure the disruption impact, however as previously explained there is a robust process to ensure disruption is kept to a minimum. Clearly there is a balance between the temporary disruption and the longer term benefits that the project aims to achieve including the creation of jobs, maximising investment, building new homes and delivering new transport infrastructure.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

**H4      Road Fatalities**

**Question:**

**For each fatality on Birmingham roads in the last 3 years, what was the recorded estimated speed of the vehicle involved along with the speed limit for that road?**

**Answer:**

Using STATS 19 (a database collection of all road traffic collisions that resulted in personal injury and were reported to the police within thirty days of the incident), the council regularly reviews and monitors collision data as part of efforts to make Birmingham's roads as safe as possible, especially for vulnerable road users.

This database does not provide the recorded estimated speed of vehicles involved in collisions.

The police are the lead agency for collision investigation and have the primary duty to investigate and establish the circumstances that have led to road deaths and life changing injuries. The roads policing lead investigator is responsible for carrying out a scene examination. Material which can be gathered after the scene has been cleared includes vehicle damage intrusion measurements, which may assist in vehicle speed estimations. After reviewing the last three years of collision data for the calendar years 2015 to 2017, it has been identified that there were eighty fatal collisions on Birmingham's roads, resulting in a total of 87 fatalities.

The speed limits on the roads where these collisions occurred were as follows:

Speed limit	Number of collisions
20 mph	1
30 mph	60
40 mph	15
50 mph	1
70 mph	3