



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD
ON TUESDAY 1 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE COUNCIL
CHAMBER, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

PRESENT:- Lord Mayor (Councillor Carl Rice) in the Chair.

Councillors

Muhammad Afzal	Neil Eustace	Keith Linnecor
Uzma Ahmed	Mohammed Fazal	Mary Locke
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Mick Finnegan	Ewan Mackey
Deirdre Alden	Des Flood	Majid Mahmood
Robert Alden	Jayne Francis	Karen McCarthy
Nawaz Ali	Matthew Gregson	James McKay
Tahir Ali	Peter Griffiths	Gareth Moore
Sue Anderson	Paulette Hamilton	Yvonne Mosquito
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Andrew Hardie	Brett O'Reilly
Mohammed Azim	Kath Hartley	John O'Shea
Susan Barnett	Ray Hassall	David Pears
David Barrie	Barry Henley	Eva Phillips
Bob Beauchamp	Penny Holbrook	Robert Pocock
Matt Bennett	Des Hughes	Victoria Quinn
Kate Booth	Jon Hunt	Hendrina Quinnen
Steve Booton	Mahmood Hussain	Chauhdry Rashid
Sir Albert Bore	Shabrana Hussain	Habib Rehman
Barry Bowles	Timothy Huxtable	Fergus Robinson
Marje Bridle	Mohammed Idrees	Gary Sambrook
Mick Brown	Zafar Iqbal	Valerie Seabright
Alex Buchanan	Ziaul Islam	Rob Sealey
Sam Burden	Kerry Jenkins	Shafique Shah
Andy Cartwright	Meirion Jenkins	Mike Sharpe
Tristan Chatfield	Simon Jevon	Sybil Spence
Zaker Choudhry	Julie Johnson	Claire Spencer
Debbie Clancy	Brigid Jones	Stewart Stacey
John Clancy	Carol Jones	Ron Storer
Lynda Clinton	Nagina Kauser	Sharon Thompson
Lyn Collin	Tony Kennedy	Paul Tilsley
Maureen Cornish	Ansar Ali Khan	Lisa Trickett
John Cotton	Changeese Khan	Margaret Waddington

City Council – 1 November 2016

Ian Cruise	Mariam Khan	Ian Ward
Basharat Dad	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Mike Ward
Phil Davis	Chaman Lal	Fiona Williams
Diane Donaldson	Mike Leddy	Ken Wood
Peter Douglas Osborn	Bruce Lines	Alex Yip
Barbara Dring	John Lines	Waseem Zaffar

NOTICE OF RECORDING

18735 The 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.

The whole of the meeting would be filmed except where they were confidential or exempt items.

MINUTES

Councillors Maureen Cornish, Andrew Hardie and David Pears note that their names did not appear in the list of those present.

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

18736 **RESOLVED:-**

That, subject to the above amendments, the Minutes of the Meeting of the City Council held on 13 September 2016, having been printed and a copy sent to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Ark Tindal Primary School

18736 The Lord Mayor welcomed staff and pupils of Ark Tindal Primary School who were in the public gallery to watch some of today's proceedings. The Lord Mayor asked Members to join him in welcoming them to the meeting.

B. Deaths

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Lady Mayoress Patricia Hollingworth who served as Lady Mayoress in 1982-1983 alongside her husband the late Honorary Alderman and Freeman of the City Peter Hollingworth.

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

18737 **RESOLVED:-**

That this Council places on record its sorrow at the death of former Lady Mayoress Patricia Hollingworth and its appreciation of her devoted service to the residents of Birmingham; it extends its deepest sympathy to members of Patricia's family in their sad bereavement.

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Councillor and Honorary Alderman Reginald Archibald Corns, who served as a Councillor for Duddeston Ward from 1968 to 1971 and Northfield Ward from 2000 to 2015

After a number of tributes had been paid by Members, it was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and:-

18738 **RESOLVED:-**

That this Council places on record its sorrow at the death of former Councillor and Honorary Alderman Reginald Archibald Corns and its appreciation of his devoted service to the residents of Birmingham; it extends its deepest sympathy to members of Reginald's family in their sad bereavement.

PETITIONS

Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented at the Meeting

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No 1)

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

18739 **RESOLVED:-**

That the petitions be received and referred to the relevant Chief Officers.

Petitions Update

The following Petitions Update was submitted:-

(See document No 2)

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and -

18740 **RESOLVED:-**

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

EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDERS

It was moved by Councillor Sharon Thompson:-

“That, pursuant to CBM Committee discussions, Standing Orders be waived as follows:

- Allocate 5 Minutes for item 6 (Proposed Changes to the Constitution)

It was agreed at CBM Committee to allow the item Proposed Changes to the Constitution to be scheduled on the agenda of City Council before ‘Question Time’ and allocate 5 Minutes for that item.”

It was-

18741

RESOLVED:-

That, pursuant to CBM Committee discussions, Standing Orders be waived as follows:

- Allocate 5 Minutes for item 6 (Proposed Changes to the Constitution)

It was agreed at CBM Committee to allow the item Proposed Changes to the Constitution to be scheduled on the agenda of City Council before ‘Question Time’ and allocate 5 Minutes for that item.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

The following report of the Council Business Management Committee was submitted:-

(See document No 3)

Councillor John Clancy moved the motion which was seconded.

A debate ensued during which Councillor Timothy Huxtable indicated that the West Midlands Transport Authority (referred to in Article 11) was now the Transport for West Midlands with 7 Members.

Councillor John Clancy 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 -

18742 **RESOLVED:-**

That approval be given to the necessary changes to the City Council's Constitution as indicated by the tracked changes in the appendix to the report and that the Acting City Solicitor be authorised to implement the changes with immediate effect.

QUESTION TIME

18743 The Council proceeded to consider Oral Questions in accordance with Standing Order 9 (B).

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

APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNCIL

18744 There were no appointments to be made.

FUTURE COUNCIL WORKFORCE CONTRACT

The following report of the Council Business Management Committee was submitted:-

(See document No 4)

Councillor Ian Ward moved the motion which was seconded.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Ian Ward 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 -

18745 **RESOLVED:-**

That the City Council approves the proposed changes to terms and conditions as outlined in appendix D of this report and delegates responsibility for the implementation to the Chief Executive.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

18746

RESOLVED:-

That the Council be adjourned until 1700 hours on this day.

The Council then adjourned at 1630 hours.

At 1702 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT

It was moved by Councillor Sharon Thompson and seconded –

“That the time limit for ‘Motions for Debate from Individual Members’ be extended by 20 minutes.”

The Motion was put to the vote and, by a show of hands, was declared to be carried.

It was accordingly –

18747

RESOLVED:-

That the time limit for ‘Motions for Debate from Individual Members’ be extended by 20 minutes.

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(A).

Councillors Jon Hunt and Sue Anderson have given notice of the following Motion:-

(See document No 5)

Councillor Jon Hunt moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Sue Anderson.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Ewan Mackey and Meirion Jenkins gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No 6)

Councillor Ewan Mackey moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Meirion Jenkins.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Ian Ward and Waseem Zaffar gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No 7)

Councillor Ian Ward moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Waseem Zaffar.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Jon Hunt replied to the debate.

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

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

It was therefore -

18748

RESOLVED:-

Council welcomes the opportunity to host the Commonwealth Games in Birmingham, providing that bidding does not distract the Council from the urgency of immediate issues, including very severe financial pressures.

Council affirms that our city is a city of sport and that recognition of our contribution to national and international sport is long overdue.

Council believes a successful bid will need to demonstrate widespread popular support and therefore proposes that a bidding committee use crowd-funding to contribute towards the full costs of making a bid, ensuring there is minimal risk to public funds. Crowd-funding will allow creative, modern ways of fund-raising, such as selling options on tickets in the event of a successful bid.

Recognising the current pressures on city Council expenditure, Council calls for a feasibility study to set out:

- proposals for investment for facilities in the city and wider region, arising from a successful bid;
- clear proposals for underwriting such investment;
- and a clear analysis of the potential economic benefit of the games, which can, not only unlock jobs and development, but also support the health and wellbeing of the city's population;

City Council – 1 November 2016

- In the spirit of openness and transparency, the Council makes public the full costings of any bid for the Commonwealth Games when they have carried out the preliminary investigations.

Furthermore, subject to the outcome of the feasibility study, the council supports a bid that is aligned to the opening of high speed rail connections to the city in 2026 and recognises the catalyst the Commonwealth Games would be for the early delivery of much needed housing and transport infrastructure.

B. Councillors Robert Alden and Gary Sambrook have given notice of the following Motion:-

(See document No 8)

Councillor Robert Alden moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Gary Sambrook.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Lisa Trickett and Stewart Stacey gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No 9)

Councillor Robert Alden moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Gary Sambrook.

A debate ensued.

THE QUESTION BE NOW PUT

It was moved by Councillor Sharon Thompson and seconded –

“That the question be put.”

The Motion was put to the vote and, by a show of hands, was declared to be carried.

It was accordingly –

18749 **RESOLVED:-**

That the question be now put.

Councillor Robert Alden replied to the debate.

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

Here upon a poll being demanded the voting, with names listed in seat number order, was as follows:-

(See document No 10)

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 -

18750 **RESOLVED:-**

This Council notes the Government Consultation on Clean Air Zones and Asks the Executive of the Council to take into account the following points when formulating the Council's submission:

- (i) 900 premature deaths a year in Birmingham are attributable to poor air quality.
- (ii) The energy industry's contribution to the concentration of poor air in Birmingham is 5.7% compared to transports' up to 63.9%.
- (iii) The government is not mandating the charging of cars, motorcycles and mopeds in a Clean Air Zone.
- (iv) However, if Birmingham does not meet its targets set by Government, the Government could fine the Council by some £60m.
- (v) Such a fine could only be met by ever more swingeing cuts in Council services, felt most severely by the poor and disadvantaged. This turns the Tory Pollution Tax into a Tory Poll Tax.
- (vi) Any decision around what sort of Clean Air Zone is required should be taken on the basis of evidence generated as a result of a Clean Air Zone feasibility study that demonstrates it will have the desired outcomes for the city in terms of health benefits whilst supporting inclusive economic growth and access to opportunity. This should include transitional support to SME's and specifically taxi and private hire businesses.

The response should emphasise that national action is required on a number of areas including but not limited to: discouraging/reducing the use of diesel vehicles, encouraging the take up of ultra-low emission vehicles and investment in infrastructure to support a shift to forms of transport other than the private car, particularly for short trips.

C. Councillors John Clancy and Ian Ward have given notice of the following Motion:-

(See document No 11)

Councillor John Clancy moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Ian Ward.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Ken Wood and Gary Sambrook gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No 12)

Councillor John Clancy replied to the debate.

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

It was therefore -

18751

RESOLVED:-

This Council is committed to the principle of Inclusive Growth and we welcome the interim findings of the RSA's Inclusive Growth Commission.

We believe that unless growth includes everyone, it is ultimately self-defeating, costing the state and wasting talent.

We further believe that to achieve growth for all we must integrate social and economic policy, devolve powers that are social as well as economic and prioritise prevention and early intervention.

We therefore call upon the government to:

- Put inclusive growth at the heart of the forthcoming Autumn Statement and Industrial Strategy
- Take forward measures to invest in both physical and human infrastructure and connect more people to economic opportunities, such as devolved skills and employment budgets.
- Introduce a new measure, a 'quality GVA', to track growth. This would enable us to measure not just hard economic numbers, but also changes in levels of deprivation, the impact of investment upon our deprived populations and how far economic prosperity is spreading.

City Council – 1 November 2016

A great challenge also exists locally to ensure we rebalance growth across the entire City. Therefore, we call on the Council to:

- Ensure the Council budget for 2017/18 considers inclusive growth that brings benefit to all parts of the City.

To publish a timeline before 1st December 2016 for how and when an economic growth strategy covering all 40 wards (to be 67 from 2018) will be produced.

The meeting ended at 1824 hours.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT ALDEN

A1 Constitution

Question:

It was decided that there needed to be a quick analysis of the Constitution. Why did the Leader decide that this needed to be carried out quicker rather than wait for internal capacity?

Answer:

The Statutory Role of the City Solicitor is to be responsible for the Council's Constitution, which includes maintaining, reviewing and monitoring the Constitution to ensure that it is lawful and that its aims and principles are given full effect.

Legal Services instructs external legal partner firms only in specific circumstances; the in-house legal service operates stringent demand management monitoring and when on occasion it is unable to meet work within necessary timeframes, the Service instructs a partner firm to carry out the work.

A review exercise by the Acting City Solicitor was firstly to ensure that the Council's Constitution was lawful, and this exercise warranted an expeditious timeframe.

A further review will now be undertaken in-house to update language, presentation and recognised best practice.

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

A2 Future Council

Question:

How much has the Council spent on the Future Council programme broken down by individual items including amount spent, date of commission and description of project since 1st January 2014?

Answer:

Future Council Programme Expenditure 2014/15 to 2016/17

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
	£	£	£
Future Council Programme	94,646	1,375,536	329,232
Operating Model (Financial Plan & Service Delivery)		1,423,264	13,226
Partnerships		87,284	
Forward The Birmingham Way	26,825	775,325	
Political Governance		68,757	
Support Services		340,564	
Community Leadership		300,000	
Policy Contingency		289,588	
Directorate		514,354	
Grand Total	121,471	5,174,672	342,458

Should Councillor Beauchamp require additional detail, I would be happy to arrange for the relevant officers to meet with him and discuss his precise needs.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN
MACKEY**

A3 Sutton Coldfield Library

Question:

How much lost income does Birmingham Property Services anticipate they will suffer from the closure of Sutton Coldfield Library?

Answer:

The vacation of Sutton Library from the Red Rose Centre will result in a reduction in rental income of £31,750 per annum.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR SUE ANDERSON**

A4 Pension Fund - Management Fees

Question:

Quoted in the Birmingham Post, the Leader criticises the management fees paid by the West Midlands Pension Fund. Could he amplify, perhaps explaining the impact of these fees on returns for pensioners?

Answer:

The average annual pension paid out nationally under the local Government Pension Scheme by the fund to its pensioners is £2,800 for women, £4,200 for men.

In contrast, investment managers for the West Midlands Local Government Pension Fund were paid £86.3 million expenses in 2014-15 and £74.9 million in 2015-16. It is clearly not the case that those stellar fees have been matched by stellar performance.

Over the past ten years returns on the fund's investments have been a paltry 5.6 per cent. During this time quantitative easing has sent stock markets and asset prices soaring. So I would question how much of the 5.6 per cent increase is due to the expertise of the investment managers.

Further, investment management fees are projected to be: 2016-17 72.8m, 2017-18 76.6m, 2018-19 80.4m, 2019-20 84.4m, 2020-21 88.5m.

At the same time, West Midlands councils have to pay top-up fees of £100 million this year to address the deficit, of which Birmingham's share is now £42 million (this is extra per year on top of what we pay as normal employer's contributions. In 2017-18 Birmingham's top-up fee is £65 million. You could argue that the fees to investment managers are causing the deficit for very unimpressive returns. It is a bail-out for the fund which seems go straight from Birmingham Citizens' and hardworking employees' pockets straight to already highly-paid investment managers.

Birmingham city council cannot afford to pay £65 million towards the deficit, nor should we have to. The council has already had to cut spending by about £500 million since 2010 as a result of the Government's austerity programme and may have to find a further £250 million by 2020. Clearly, more essential services for the citizens of Birmingham would have to be cut were the council forced to pay a further £65 million into the pension fund.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR CAROL JONES**

A5 Pension Fund - benchmark

Question:

Quoted in the Birmingham Post, the Leader suggests that the ten year annual return of the West Midlands Pension Fund of 5.6% per annum has been inadequate. What benchmark has he used as a basis of his criticism?

Answer:

There are many ways of measuring the performance of stock market investments across the world.

The annualised return of the West Midlands Local Government Pension Fund of 5.6 per cent over ten years can be compared with:

- FTSE High Dividend Yield Index 7.4%
- High-Yield Corporate Composite Index 7.11%
- Russell 1000 Growth Index 8.9%
- Russell 2000 Growth Index 8.3%
- NASDAQ US Dividend Achievers Select 7.4%
- S&P Mid Cap 400 Growth Index 10%
- Standard Life Inv UK Smaller Companies 12.2%
- Marlborough UK Micro Cap Growth 17.4%
- Unicorn UK Growth 14%

Over the same period the following unit trusts returned:

- Coronation Industrial Fund 18.7%
- SIM Industrial Fund 18.4%
- Investec Property Equity Fund A 16.3%
- Even investing in the Conservative Growth Composite Index would have returned 5.5%

During the same period UK Government bonds, upon which pension fund liabilities are calculated, returned just 2.6%.

The £161 million paid by to investment advisers over the past two years, had it remained in the West Midlands Local Government Pension Fund, would even in a high street bank savings account earning 1.5% AER have grown by almost £5 million.

Relatively poor returns by the WMLGPF are by no means a new phenomenon. During the years 2007-2013 the fund returned a meagre 0.6% above the effective annual savings rate.

City Council – 1 November 2016

Members of the council must make their own minds up as to whether the following projected fees for the WMLGPF investment advisers represent value for money:
2016-17 72.8m, 2017-18 76.6m, 2018-19 80.4m, 2019-20 84.4m, 2020-21 88.5m.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE**

A6 Entering the “Secret Wealth Garden”

Question:

Could The Leader provide this Council with information regarding the Councils policy to bring investment for housing & infrastructure from Local Government Pension Funds (LGPFs) and the number of conversations he’s had with representatives of LGPFs regarding their 30% housing and infrastructure investment strategy?

Answer:

While I would be delighted if the Local Government Pension Funds had a 30% housing and infrastructure investment strategy, I'm not sure that is yet the case. I've been very clear about my position on this. I think the LGPFs should be investing locally to a better return and made that clear when I met Geik Drever - the Director of Pensions at West Midlands Pension Fund.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT

A7 Snow Hill face-lift

Question:

Can the Leader explain how the proposals for a further face-lift for the Snow Hill area are to be funded?

Answer:

The Snow Hill district, within Birmingham’s City Centre, is identified in the Birmingham City Council’s Big City Plan as an Area of Transformation - a place where big changes are anticipated and where key development opportunities exist. The growth and revitalisation of the Snow Hill district is central to the City’s ongoing economic success and future growth prospects. The area is a major hub for the business, professional and financial services sector.

There are a range of projects within the area which are being developed aimed at improving pedestrian and public transport access to Snow Hill Station comprising of a package of measures focused on the public realm and public highways. Funding has been allocated from a variety of external funding sources including the Local Growth Fund (LGF); Enterprise Zone (EZ) and Colmore Business Improvement District (CBD).

The most advanced project within the programme is the Snow Hill Square which is currently out for public consultation. The funding for this project comprises of the following Capital allocation:

Stage	Allocation	Funding Source			
		BCC	CBD	LGF	EZ
Development	70,000	35,000	35,000		
Technical Design	450,000		100,000	250,000	100,000
Construction	3,300,000		700,000	2,600,000	
Total	3,820,000	35,000	835,000	2,850,000	100,000

Appropriate authorities to implement schemes will be sought in accordance with the Council’s Gateway and Related Financial Approval Framework.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK

A8 Impower

Question:

How much has the Council spent with Impower broken down by individual items including amount spent, date of commission and description of project since 1st January 2014?

Answer:

All spend since 1 January 2014 is shown on the table below with a description of the project that the spend relates to. The date of commission is not a field held on the system but the date that purchase orders have been raised can be used as a proxy and dates have been included on that basis.
All figures provided exclude VAT.

Breakdown of Impower spend 1st Jan 2014 - 30th Sept 2016		
Directorate	Description	Amount £
Future Council 2015/16	Future Council-Long Term Planning/Strategic Support April - May 2015	103,573
	Future Council-Phase 1/2 & Short term review - October 15 - March 2016	574,927
	Future Council-Commercial Advisory Capacity (Veolia Contract) - Jan - March 2016	50,000
	Future Council-Adults Social Care - Outline business case prep - March 2016	179,650
Future Council 2015/16 Total		908,149
Kerslake Action Plan and Future Council preparation	Corporate preparations for and support for Kerslake Action Plans and the Future Council programme. January 15	140,088
Kerslake Action Plan and Future Council preparation Total		140,088
People (Adults)	This is support to the joint development of the health Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP). This is part of funding for this agreed through the Future Council Programme. April - June 2016	329,450
	Older Adults Integration work, the predecessor of the Better Care Fund and STP. February 2014	360,167
People (Adults) Total		689,617
People (Children's Improvement)	DFE appointed Improvement partners Support for Improvement agenda January 2014 - March 15	1,482,178
	Provide interim SD cover July-Oct 2014	197,593
People (Children's Improvement) Total		1,679,771
People (Schools)	Schools Forum Facilitation Support - January 2016	7,720
People (Schools) Total		7,720
People (All Dir)	Design & Delivery of People DMT Away Day - May 2015	6,877
People (All Dir) Total		6,877
Grand Total		3,432,222

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE

A9 Off Tracks

Question:

In Oral Questions on 13th September 2016, the Leader of the Council mentioned the intention of promoting Birmingham as a “Rail City”.

However, the Leader disappointingly only spoke about HS2 and its significance to Birmingham (disregarding the loss of the HS2 to HS1 link which would seamlessly connect Birmingham to Continental Europe and the Mayor of London’s proposal to terminate the HS2 line at Old Oak Common rather than Euston) and did not mention the restoration of local rail services (i.e. the Camp Hill, Tamworth and Sutton Park lines) and local railway stations along these lines in his answer.

Would the Leader like to take this opportunity to address his omission?

Answer:

The City Council continues to support a HS1-2 Link, and has raised this matter through the Core Cities Group in discussions with Transport Ministers.

The City Council has stated to HS2 Ltd its opposition to locating the HS2 London terminus at Old Oak Common, emphasising that a central London terminus at Euston is required in order to achieve the strategic benefits of HS2 for Birmingham, the West Midlands and elsewhere.

In terms of the existing rail network, it is a particular high priority for the City Council that Bordesley/Camp Hill Chords and associated infrastructure measures will be essential to allow new local rail services on the Camp Hill, Birmingham-Tamworth and potentially Sutton Park, Lines – with new local stations in Birmingham - to operate from 2026 as key enablers of the Midlands Growth Strategy.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE
COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR FIONA WILLIAMS**

B1 City Centre Trees

Question

Information recently provided by officers indicate almost 200 mature City Centre trees have been felled because projects such as the Metro extension, Paradise Circus to name just two of them. There is a policy of replacing these felled trees with two, this is impossible as I have been informed that the underground services mean there is no room to plant the trees.

Given the fact that we are the first Biophilic City in the UK and are committed to looking after its trees who; where; and when; will this tree deficit be dealt with?

Answer:

The number of trees removed in the City Centre in recent years is approximately 150 based on figures obtained from the planning department.

The city centre presents many issues for tree planting due to the competition for space for street furniture and traffic above ground, and the vast array of utilities below ground. Additional pressure from new projects and regeneration presents major challenges for trees in the city centre.

Older trees planted in the city centre were planted when this competition was not so much of a problem, but project officers now struggle to accommodate planting trees due to time, space and budget constraints. Locating services for viable locations and creating soil volumes large enough for a tree to grow is difficult. Relocating services is very expensive.

New projects such as the Centenary Square regeneration will add trees and in addition, officers have been tasked from both the planning department and highways to investigate suitable location for new trees in the city centre and a programme is being developed.

In relation to the City Council major transport projects around the city, there have been a total of 213 trees removed and 435 trees replanted.

Wider regeneration work will result in a net increase of trees by 478, subject to the above mentioned programme being developed.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER

B2 Business Rates

Question:

What is the average time to get new business rates entered onto the collection system including the average rates?

Answer:

For a business rates bill to be issued, there must be an entry in the rating list maintained by the Valuation Office Agency (VOA). This is an organisation reporting to central Government and not to the City Council. The entry on the rating list must have the address of the property, a description of the property and its rateable value (RV). If we are notified of a change of ratepayer for an *existing* property, a bill will be issued within 10 working days of the city council being notified, except where further verification or clarification is required to ensure we have identified the ratepayer correctly. For example, we may have to obtain a copy of the lease or other relevant documentation, or carry out a site visit.

Where we become aware that a *new* property has been created, or an existing property has been split or merged with another, we report this to the VOA who will carry out a valuation. The VOA has 3 months within their national service level agreement to complete the valuation. However in circumstances where the local valuation team cannot undertake the assessment due to the complexity or potential value of the property, this then needs to be referred to the specialist valuation team and this process can take considerably longer. Once we receive formal notification that an assessment has been entered into the rating list, we issue a bill within 5 working days unless further verification or clarification is required.

The amount of business rates payable is calculated by multiplying the RV by the multiplier provided annually by DCLG, then applying any reliefs or exemptions that the ratepayer may be entitled to.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR
GARETH MOORE**

B3 JNC Officers

Question:

How many days a year do JNC officers spend working for consultants, broken down by officer?

Answer:

For the purpose of responding to this question the term “working for” has been defined as relating to a scenario where an officer has provided services for a fee or some form of personal recompense.

There are no recorded instances of this occurring.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR BOB
BEAUCHAMP**

B4 JNC Officers 2

Question:

List all companies, public or private any JNC officers have worked for in the last 12 months?

Answer:

In responding to this question the following assumptions have been made:

- It relates to our current cadre of JNC officers
- It relates to whilst they have also been in the employment of BCC
- The term “worked for” relates to a scenario where an officer has provided services for a fee or some form of personal recompense

There are no recorded instances of this happening over the last 12 months.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR
ROBERT ALDEN**

B5 Costing

Question:

What is the amount spent by the Council's Legal Team on the Constitution?

Answer:

The cost of undertaking the review of the Constitution was £3,000 plus VAT.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE
COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE**

B6 Policy on the Back of a Library Book

Question

Will the Deputy Leader inform the Council of the criteria, formula or methodology used to decide whether a Public Library will fully close, stay open but with reduced hours or retain a full operation? Could he also provide the footfall figures for each Public Library for the period April 2015 – October 2016?

Answer:

The criteria for undertaking the needs assessment and all of the data used in the process (including footfall) were set out in Appendix 3a of the cabinet report. The cabinet report even went beyond this providing in appendix 3c profiles for each individual community library including data on demographic use, transport, employment and educational statistics.

All of this information is publically available on the Be Heard consultation website.

Note: the data used in the model is 2015/16. The footfall data is an annual count and for 2016/17 is not yet available.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY

B7 Community Library Proposals

Question:

At Cabinet, the Deputy Leader said the community library proposals currently under consultation would deliver the budget targets. Item CC27 in the budget and business plan envisages step up savings of £3m in 2018 and a further £5m in 2019. It states "This approach means that libraries, adult education and early year's services in the future will need fewer separate buildings". Can he state how this is to be achieved?

Answer:

The saving proposal (CC27) that has been identified in the City Council and Business Plan 2016 includes the following two components as set out in the table below:

	2017/18 £m	2018/19 £m	2019/20 £m
Open for Learning	2,000	5,000	10,000
Community Libraries	688	688	688
Total	2,688	5,688	10,688
Step Up Saving (as per Question)	-	3,000	5,000

The report on the consultation for the new Community Libraries model will fully deliver the Community Libraries element of the saving (subject to the outcomes of the consultation).

The Open for Learning proposal is subject to further review and the outcomes of this review will be reported in the City Council Business Plan and Budget for 2017+ that will be reported to City Council in February/March 2017.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE ASSISTANT LEADER (COUNCILLOR MARJE BRIDLE) FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN

C1 Workload 1

Question:

Given the oral answer given to be me by Councillor Marje Bridle at the September Council meeting, that the Assistant Leaders have carried out some work individually (as well as collaboratively), would you please tell me what meetings and all other work you have done in connection with your role since you were appointed. Please include the collaborative meetings you attended and the work you have carried out individually?

Answer:

Following your equivalent question in September, our work programme went to the Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership on 20 September 2016, and I attach a copy of it after C4 question and answer for your ease of reference.

We have systematically worked on delivering it. We emailed an update on our work to all councillors on 14 October 2016. We all four of us presented out work together, to the Improvement Panel on 17 October 2016, demonstrating how we have responded to their priorities and the Kerslake report.

We are working as a united team of four – this is a unique way of getting on top of the problems facing the City as a result of the unprecedented cut in Central Government support.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE ASSISTANT LEADER (COUNCILLOR TONY KENNEDY) FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN

C2 Workload 2

Question:

Given the oral answer given to be me by Councillor Marje Bridle at the September Council meeting, that the Assistant Leaders have carried out some work individually (as well as collaboratively), would you please tell me what meetings and all other work you have done in connection with your role since you were appointed. Please include the collaborative meetings you attended and the work you have carried out individually?

Answer:

Following your equivalent question in September, our work programme went to the Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership on 20 September 2016, and I attach a copy of it after C4 question and answer for your ease of reference.

We have systematically worked on delivering it. We emailed an update on our work to all councillors on 14 October 2016. We all four of us presented out work together, to the Improvement Panel on 17 October 2016, demonstrating how we have responded to their priorities and the Kerslake report.

We are working as a united team of four – this is a unique way of getting on top of the problems facing the City as a result of the unprecedented cut in Central Government support.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE ASSISTANT LEADER (COUNCILLOR ANSAR ALI KHAN) FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN

C3 Workload 3

Question:

Given the oral answer given to be me by Councillor Marje Bridle at the September Council meeting, that the Assistant Leaders have carried out some work individually (as well as collaboratively), would you please tell me what meetings and all other work you have done in connection with your role since you were appointed. Please include the collaborative meetings you attended and the work you have carried out individually?

Answer:

Following your equivalent question in September, our work programme went to the Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership on 20 September 2016, and I attach a copy of it after C4 question and answer for your ease of reference.

We have systematically worked on delivering it. We emailed an update on our work to all councillors on 14 October 2016. We all four of us presented out work together, to the Improvement Panel on 17 October 2016, demonstrating how we have responded to their priorities and the Kerslake report.

We are working as a united team of four – this is a unique way of getting on top of the problems facing the City as a result of the unprecedented cut in Central Government support.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE ASSISTANT LEADER (COUNCILLOR NARINDER KAUR KOONER) FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN

C4 Workload 4

Question:

Given the oral answer given to be me by Councillor Marje Bridle at the September Council meeting, that the Assistant Leaders have carried out some work individually (as well as collaboratively), would you please tell me what meetings and all other work you have done in connection with your role since you were appointed. Please include the collaborative meetings you attended and the work you have carried out individually?

Answer:

Following your equivalent question in September, our work programme went to the Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership on 20 September 2016, and I attach a copy of it here for your ease of reference.

We have systematically worked on delivering it. We emailed an update on our work to all councillors on 14 October 2016. We all four of us presented out work together, to the Improvement Panel on 17 October 2016, demonstrating how we have responded to their priorities and the Kerslake report.

We are working as a united team of four – this is a unique way of getting on top of the problems facing the City as a result of the unprecedented cut in Central Government support.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

D1 Attendance

Question:

The Birmingham Education Partnership, an organisation set up to deliver school improvement services for BCC and funded almost entirely through that contract recently held its first annual conference. The event was sponsored by a number of organisations, including another beneficiary of Council funding, Service Birmingham. In addition to the conference itself there was a lavish dinner held at the Hilton Hotel the night before, with TV's Ruby Wax and Sameena Ali Khan as celebrity guest hosts. This star studded occasion was also attended by the cabinet member and senior council officers. The cost of the event, including dinner, was advertised at £250 per person for BEP Members and £350 per person for non-members. Can the cabinet member advise:

How many Council officers and elected members attended?

Answer:

One elected member (Cllr Jones) and nine Council officers.

Free conference places were provided for Cllr Jones and four Council officers. The remaining five places were charged at £230 each and were paid for from the respective service budget (two officers from Schools HR, the Headteacher of Birmingham Virtual School and two Education Services Assistant Directors). No BCC officer was charged for the dinner.

Three BCC officers made presentations to the conference and one ran a stall promoting BCC educational publications.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

D2 Attendance 2

Question:

The Birmingham Education Partnership, an organisation set up to deliver school improvement services for BCC and funded almost entirely through that contract recently held its first annual conference. The event was sponsored by a number of organisations, including another beneficiary of Council funding, Service Birmingham. In addition to the conference itself there was a lavish dinner held at the Hilton Hotel the night before, with TV's Ruby Wax and Sameena Ali Khan as celebrity guest hosts. This star studded occasion was also attended by the cabinet member and senior council officers. The cost of the event, including dinner, was advertised at £250 per person for BEP Members and £350 per person for non-members. Can the Cabinet Member advise:

What were her choices from the menu and wine list?

Answer:

I'm a vegetarian. Wine list? This was a teachers' conference, not a Tory fundraiser.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

D3 Cost

Question:

The Birmingham Education Partnership, an organisation set up to deliver school improvement services for BCC and funded almost entirely through that contract recently held its first annual conference. The event was sponsored by a number of organisations, including another beneficiary of Council funding, Service Birmingham. In addition to the conference itself there was a lavish dinner held at the Hilton Hotel the night before, with TV's Ruby Wax and Sameena Ali Khan as celebrity guest hosts. This star studded occasion was also attended by the cabinet member and senior council officers. The cost of the event, including dinner, was advertised at £250 per person for BEP Members and £350 per person for non-members. Can the Cabinet Member advise:

What the cost of the tickets including who met the cost?

Answer:

Free conference places were provided for Cllr Jones and four Council officers. The remaining five places were charged at £230 each and were paid for from the respective service budget (two officers from Schools HR, the Headteacher of Birmingham Virtual School and two Education Services Assistant Directors). No BCC officer was charged for the dinner.

The conference overall was self-funding with considerable sponsorship from private firms in the education sector. The BCC contract funds were not used for the conference. Evaluations from delegates were overwhelmingly positive.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

D4 Missing from Education

Question:

In the July Council meeting, following criticism from an Ofsted monitoring visit in relation to the Council removing children missing from education from their books, Councillor Jones stated the following:

“All local authorities remove children from their books after extensive checks within the limits of their powers and in line with the national framework and this happened with these children the same as it would in any local authority. We’re not the border police, we’re not the local police, we’re not Interpol, there is a limit to what a council can do. Our policies and procedures to deal with CME are well established and are being further strengthened in the light of recent feedback but the real weakness is in the national policy which does limit council powers. We need a joined up debate across the country”

“I’m not the national government and my hands are tied by the regulations they put in place. “

“There were 250 children who we’d reached the end of reasonable efforts, we removed them from the list exactly the same as every other council does, in line with national procedures.”

Is the Cabinet Member quite sure this is accurate?

Answer:

Since July 2016 there has been significant work undertaken to raise the profile and strengthen the actions taken to identify children who are missing from education. The O&S Committee on the 12th October 2016 received a detailed report which provided an update on these actions.

The DfE issued new guidance on Children Missing Education in September 2016. Since then a new BCC policy has been developed. This was issued to schools at the start of the new academic year.

Prior to September 2016, a review of procedures to identify the whereabouts of the children missing education was completed. The procedures were found to be appropriate and fit for purpose. This was positively commented on by HMI during the Sept CSC inspection.

The practice which has changed since September 2016, has included:- a more robust data set- we now have a better understanding of the number of children missing from education

- greater clarity within the schools about the actions they must take within the first 5 days of the child becoming missing

City Council – 1 November 2016

- stopping the practice of removing Children from the register if they couldn't be found after a period of time. All children are maintained on the register and continuous checks are made to identify their whereabouts

- now placing alerts on BCC's Audit Data Warehouse - Children are no longer removed from the Council's records, but retained on the Impulse data base as 'cases pending further enquiries' and Birmingham Audit have agreed to upload the information into the Data Warehouse to alert all system users, including the Police.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR DES FLOOD**

D5 Children in Need

Question:

How much money does Birmingham City Council spend on every child who is in need in comparison to previous years since 2012?

Answer:

The total direct section 17 spend for Children In Need is as follows:

12/13 £2.7m

13/14 £3.6m

14/15 £3.1m

15/16 £3.7m

16/17 (forecast) £4.0m

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW**

D6 Supported Children

Question:

How many children in our City are supported by Looked after Child Plan, Child Protection Plan and Children in Need Plan?

Answer:

Looked after Children Plan	1820
Child Protection Plan	820
Child In Need Plan	2152

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

D7 Assessments

Question:

**How many children are awaiting assessment against the Looked after Child Plan,
Child Protection Plan and Children in Need Plan?**

Answer:

An open assessment is where a child is currently undergoing an assessment in accordance with the Children's Act 1989: S17 (Child In Need) or S47 (Child Protection). The number of children with open assessments is:

S17 – The number of children with an open S17 assessment is: 1636.

S47 – The no of children with an open S47 assessment and those with an open initial child protection conference is: 132.

There are currently 2 cases awaiting allocation to Social Workers.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

D8 Assistant Directors

Question:

How many Assistant Directors for Education are there in our City including when they were appointed?

Answer:

As was all explained at the member training session last Monday.

There are currently four Assistant Directors for Education.

AD Vulnerable Children – appointed c. 5 years ago. Currently this position being covered by an Acting Assistant Director

AD Education Infrastructure and early years – appointed in 2015

AD Full participation/14 plus pathways – appointed 2016 (50% funded by Birmingham City University)

AD safeguarding in education post created in wake of OfSTED's criticisms in June 2016. Currently filled on interim basis with plans to advertise the post nationally.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

D9 Roles

Question:

What are each of the Assistant Directors for Education roles and responsibilities?

Answer:

As was all explained at the member training session last Monday.

AD Vulnerable Children – covers all SEND and inclusion (Special Educational Needs Assessment and Review Service, Access to Education – educational psychology service, communications and autism team, pupil and school support), links with special schools, mainstream schools with resource bases, liaison with SENDIASS (the SEND Independent and Advice Support Service)

AD Education Infrastructure and EY – covers Early Years, Admissions and Place Planning, pupil placements and fair access protocols, education infrastructure, lead officer for liaison with DfE and RSC on academisation and free schools.

AD Full participation/14 plus pathways – covers relations with schools with sixth forms, FE colleges, universities, employers, full participation in education, training and work, reduction of NEETs and school and governor support. Currently also Travel Assist and budget planning.

AD safeguarding in education – all aspects of safeguarding including children missing from education, exclusions, links with children's social care, alternative education, independent school links, the virtual school and looked after children's education service, resilience of schools to extremist pressures, quality assurance of the BEP contract for school improvement and Cityserve.

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

E1 Trees

Question:

How many trees has the Council planted in each Ward for the last 5 years?

Answer:

The table below illustrates those trees planted via Parks Services (non-highways trees) and those planted via Amey (Highways trees).

Ward	Non-highways						Highways					Grand Total	
	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	Total - 5 years	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16		Total - 5 years
Acocks Green	500	0	0	1000	500	2000	19	19	36	42	53	169	2169
Aston	0	3	5	0	10	18	7	40	21	54	9	131	149
Bartley Green	1507	656	210	1518	300	4191	13	54	34	1	85	187	4378
Billesley	0	0	1500	500	767	2767	90	21	40	45	91	287	3054
Bordesley Green	0	0	0	10	0	10	32	6	89	21	6	154	164
Bournville	10	5	0	8	0	23	23	29	37	94	23	206	229
Brandwood	0	10	60	0	1000	1070	20	33	52	32	18	155	1225
Edgbaston	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	8	20	35	79	84
Erdington	10	3010	1000	0	0	4020	51	22	34	17	53	177	4197
Hall Green	0	302	0	0	1	303	66	37	66	163	36	368	671
Handsworth Wood	10	10	0	0	0	20	51	33	26	115	32	257	277
Harborne	0	5	15	0	0	20	80	14	15	40	12	161	181
Hodge Hill	1003	0	10	500	508	2021	27	27	32	26	64	176	2197
Kings Norton	0	510	0	6	0	516	21	24	54	65	26	190	706
Kingstanding	20	0	1000	500	755	2275	40	35	29	11	15	130	2405
Ladywood	10	6	0	8	1	25	8	2	2	9	11	32	57
Longbridge	20	18	2000	4001	2024	8063	25	30	32	31	80	198	8261
Lozells & East Handsworth	12	10	10	10	0	42	41	19	5	9	16	90	132
Moseley & Kings Heath	0	10	0	0	0	10	27	5	13	17	8	70	80
Nechelles	0	8	0	0	0	8	17	51	10	22	30	130	138
Northfield	10	0	20	0	0	30	19	62	32	128	17	258	288
Oscott	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	63	68	64	25	288	288
Perry Barr	0	0	1105	1020	290	2415	26	34	34	49	60	203	2618
Quinton	0	0	0	0	505	505	71	36	120	55	22	304	809
Selly Oak	0	0	8	6	1	15	17	13	41	16	30	117	132
Shard End	1000	1001	500	0	500	3001	51	20	8	39	48	166	3167
Sheldon	20	0	174	510	500	1204	65	114	37	48	26	290	1494
Soho	808	10	10	15	10	853	9	3	6	22	5	45	898
South Yardley	10	5	0	6	0	21	19	30	32	33	31	145	166
Sparkbrook	10	10	10	10	10	50	3	2	9	14	9	37	87
Springfield	10	0	0	10	10	30	19	14	34	18	35	120	150
Stechford and Yardley North	0	0	500	0	0	500	24	34	34	29	42	163	663
Stockland Green	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	29	28	10	25	148	148
Sutton Four Oaks	0	0	0	1000	0	1000	48	22	10	29	11	120	1120
Sutton New Hall	0	320	210	15	520	1065	66	18	38	30	20	172	1237
Sutton Trinity	316	10	0	0	0	326	22	22	16	23	16	99	425
Sutton Vesey	0	15	10	0	10	35	34	23	41	88	40	226	261
Tyburn	1000	1005	0	2008	250	4263	49	28	17	33	178	305	4568
Washwood Heath	0	712	0	0	0	712	42	9	8	7	11	77	789
Weoley	0	10	0	0	0	10	44	71	59	52	21	247	257
Total	6291	7661	8357	12661	8472	43442	1417	1157	1307	1621	1375	6877	50319

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN
STREETS, RECYCLING AND ENVIRONMENT FROM
COUNCILLOR SUE ANDERSON**

E2 Fixed Penalty Notices

Question:

How many fixed penalty notices have been issued for fly-tipping since powers became available in May?

Answer:

Government introduced on the 9th May 2016 powers to enable fixed penalty notices to be issued in appropriate circumstances for small scale incidents of fly-tipping.

The level of the fixed penalty amount is set by the Council at the current statutory maximum (£400) and their use has to be balanced against the scale of the incident and any clearance costs. The power to issue these fixed penalties is not retrospective and to date no fixed penalties have been issued under the provisions. The burden of proof for issuing fixed penalties is identical to that required for a full criminal prosecution and determination of the appropriateness of their use has to be made under the Council's Regulation & Enforcement Division Enforcement Policy and the Crown Prosecution Service's Code for Crown Prosecutors which sets out evidential and public interest tests.

The Council's Waste Enforcement Unit currently has in progress 401 waste related incidents/investigation, for which 142 are at a stage where the appropriate legal action is being considered. Of these cases, 102 are suspected as occurring after May 2016 and consideration in respect of the potential for fixed penalty notice use is still being considered, however our current position is to refer these matters for the institution of proceedings rather than the lighter option of issuing an FPN.

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

E3 Street Cleansing

Question:

What is the latest street cleansing inspection data, per ward, for the period April-October 2016, covering all 5 categories of the Environmental Quality Survey (Litter, Detritus, Fly-posting, Graffiti and Weed Growth)?

Answer:

2016/17 street cleansing inspection data is given in the table below:

Ward	Litter	Detritus	Fly-posting	Graffiti	Weed growth
	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17
Acocks Green	12.86	25.76	2.86	6.43	10
Aston	45.71	25.71	7.14	15.00	31
Bartley Green	8.57	15.08	0.71	6.43	19
Billesley	2.14	7.14	0.00	2.86	7
Bordesley Green	24.29	10.77	5.71	11.43	6
Bournville	1.43	10.00	2.14	7.14	24
Brandwood	13.57	30.00	2.86	15.00	31
Edgbaston	2.14	10.71	2.14	0.71	7
Erdington	4.29	5.97	0.00	0.00	13
Hall Green	6.43	32.84	3.57	10.00	18
Handsworth Wood	12.86	25.36	0.71	4.29	13
Harborne	5.71	36.57	2.86	6.43	28
Hodge Hill	20.00	13.64	5.71	10.71	17
Kings Norton	5.71	12.10	0.71	12.14	3
Kingstanding	14.29	16.91	0.71	6.43	10
Ladywood	12.14	26.47	7.86	12.86	13
Longbridge	3.57	15.15	1.43	5.00	14
Lozells & East Handsworth	18.57	15.71	5.00	5.71	4
Moseley & Kings Heath	3.57	42.54	2.86	15.00	10
Ward	Litter	Detritus	Fly-posting	Graffiti	Weed growth
	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17	2016/17
Nechells	28.57	11.19	5.71	10.71	6
Northfield	3.57	8.46	2.14	8.57	8

City Council – 1 November 2016

Oscott	11.43	10.00	2.86	0.71	16
Perry Barr	10.71	13.57	5.71	6.43	11
Quinton	8.57	17.16	5.00	1.43	13
Selly Oak	4.29	11.94	9.29	13.57	12
Shard End	6.43	21.32	5.71	15.71	22
Sheldon	6.43	30.43	1.43	14.29	19
Soho	25.00	14.93	7.14	7.86	15
South Yardley	11.43	17.91	10.00	19.29	13
Sparkbrook	16.43	20.71	5.71	17.86	13
Springfield	5.71	3.08	3.57	1.43	5
Stechford & Yardley North	10.00	10.16	2.14	13.57	19
Stockland Green	15.00	29.85	4.29	5.00	22
Sutton Four Oaks	0.00	10.29	1.43	0.00	25
Sutton New Hall	1.43	29.23	0.00	2.86	31
Sutton Trinity	1.43	30.00	0.00	0.71	12
Sutton Vesey	3.57	28.79	0.71	4.29	26
Tyburn	12.14	6.52	1.43	5.00	4
Washwood Heath	30.00	13.43	9.29	7.86	10
Weoley	2.14	16.13	5.71	5.00	5
Target (percentage of unsatisfactory inspected sites based on 70 sites inspected per ward)	5	8.35	1	7	0-5

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

E4 Missed Collections

Question:

What is the cost of missed collections given the Council savings target of SN7 to reduce failed waste collections, per year since 2012 including year to date?

Answer:

We do not hold detailed data for missed collection costs, most of which are generally picked up as additional work which is given to scheduled collection rounds within normal working hours. When missed collections are higher additional vehicles are required with an estimated additional cost of £400 - £450 per vehicle per day which collects up to 300 missed collections per day.

The table reflects the worst and best performing weeks for the 4 depots, showing a circa ten-fold improvement between the worst performing week and current performance since the introduction of wheelie bins, and a likely corresponding reduction in costs.

SN7 is a savings target attached to a wider service improvement delivery model for refuse collection.

NUMBER OF MISSED COLLECTION PER 100,000 SCHEDULED COLLECTIONS PER DEPOT			
Depot	PRE WHEELIE BIN	POST WHEELIE BIN	CURRENT PERFORMANCE (Residual)
	Worst performing week	Worst performing week	
Redfern	35 (17 th – 23 rd November 2014)	316 (8 th -14 th December 2014)	10
Perry Barr	34 (25 th – 31 st May 2015)	266 (1-7 th June 2015)	27
Lifford	72 (9 th – 15 th November 2015)	467 (23 rd -29 th November 2015)	37
Montague Street	No domestic collections from here	238 (23 rd -27 th June 2014)	26

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

E5 Ricardo

Question:

How much is the company Ricardo-AEA Limited costing the Council?

Answer:

To date £8,920 has been spent against an approved order of £59,000. Spend against this contract is reported publicly as part of the Council's monthly spend report.

NB The contract value is commercially sensitive and should not be made public.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE**

F1 Value for Money

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member share with this Council the cost of delivering both the Green Waste collection and Bulky Waste collection against the revenue generated from residents paying for each of the services?

Answer:

Green waste collections are undertaken by 11 collection rounds at an annual cost of approximately £1,650,000. They collect 15,000 tonnes per annum (which is rising) and attracts a disposal cost of c.£561,000.

The total service cost is therefore approximately £2.21 million.

Income from c.63,000 customers equates to £2.02 million and the diversion away from costly landfill therefore ensures that this service covers its costs.

This is because green waste, if not collected separately under this chargeable service, would inevitably be presented by residents for collection with their residual waste stream, where the Council is unable to charge for collection. It would increase the residual tonnage to the point where the Council would need to landfill more waste at an increased disposal charge. Landfill is currently c. £120 per tonne whilst green waste composting is c.£37 per tonne.

Bulky waste collection costs are approximately £300,000 per year operating across two collection vehicles collecting c.21,000 orders per annum. Income generated from the service is c.£490,000 per annum so there is a surplus generated.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR LYN COLLIN

F2 Citizens

Question:

How will the Cabinet Member ensure that under the Sustainability and Transformation agenda, social care in Birmingham will receive an improved and more efficient delivery for all its citizens?

Answer:

I would like to thank Cllr Collin for asking me this question, and I also welcome the support and challenge offered by our Health, Wellbeing and Environment Scrutiny Committee as I understood there was a full and proper discussion about the (Sustainable Transformation Plan) STP last week.

In my capacity as Cabinet Member and Chair of our Health and Wellbeing Board I have been very verbal about how our health and care system needs to change over the next few years and that this must be something that is properly aired in public. I was, therefore, especially pleased to see that on Monday, the Birmingham and Solihull STP was only one of two STP's to be reported nationally other sessions will be arranged over the coming few weeks to ensure everyone does get to have a say.

I continue to stress how important it is to the whole local health and care system that social care is properly funded. With that in mind, I raised these issues directly with the then Under Secretary of State for Health 2 months ago. I reminded him of the serious pressures facing the adult care system, which are greater in Birmingham because of the link between deprivation and higher public spending. I pointed out my concerns about the City Council forced to consider reducing services to manage within budget limits as we head into winter. At the same time we are seeing providers withdraw from residential care because the strain of operating has become too great.

I have yet to receive a reply to my letter.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING
AND HOMES FOR FROM COUNCILLOR KAREN TRENCH**

G1 Rough Sleepers

Question:

Previous question 2nd February 2016.

A few weeks ago the Cabinet Member briefed members on work underway to address the problem of rough sleepers. Could he update the Council on what steps have been taken since to tackle this growing problem?

In response to a question from Councillor Tilsley in February (as above) the cabinet member explained that a review of services was taking place.

Can we have an update on this?

Answer:

Further to the previous question on 2 February 2016, the following actions have been taken:

- **A successful Homeless Summit was held on 12 October 2016 with partners and obtained support to work together to reduce homelessness in Birmingham.**
- **A partnership Visioning Day was held on 21 October to initiate a Homelessness Change Programme. Part of this work will include a review of existing accommodation provision and outreach and engagement services.**
- **A multi-agency all out day was undertaken in the City Centre on 25 October to identify the wider public place management issues to feed into action plans for both individuals and locations.**
- **A rough sleepers mapping exercise will be undertaken to further understand the journey of those sleeping on our streets, this is scheduled for early November.**
- **A meeting has been held with a faith organisation to consider a proposal for a new emergency triage and assessment facility for rough sleepers.**
- **Planning has commenced on this year's annual rough sleeper count and cold weather provision.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING
AND HOMES FROM COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE**

G2 Charging more, reducing service

Question

From January the Council is planning to increase the service charge for residents in Birmingham City Council Sheltered Housing schemes as part of the “service review”. Could the Cabinet Member inform me of the total annual revenue expected to be raised from the increase in the service charge and if the revenue raised will be ring-fenced for Sheltered Housing and help reduce the unfair cuts to the Sheltered Housing budget?

Answer:

The sheltered housing service was previously funded through the Supporting People programme, which met the costs of the support officer. Sadly this funding is no longer available which has meant that we need to review how we can continue to provide the service going forward.

Part of the review has looked at increasing service charges and we have carried out a consultation exercise with all residents to help us shape the future model. The outcome of this, along with the proposed service charge increase, will be subject to a full cabinet report which will be presented in due course.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR
TRANSPORT AND ROADS FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER
HARMER**

H1 Nudge campaign reduce reliance on car trips

Question:

Budget line SN2 of the budget and business plan proposes spending money this year and next on a "nudge" campaign to reduce reliance on car trips. It then promises £5m a year in savings in 2018. Can the Cabinet Member set out how these savings will be achieved, reporting on progress towards this objective?

Answer:

SN2 contains a number of measures to reduce the demand for single occupancy journeys into the city centre. This involves improvements to public transport, walking and cycling provision. As part of this overall package of measures, it is important to work with residents, business and visitors to encourage change in behaviour and influence more sustainable choices around how journeys are made.

The Nudge programme element of SN2 therefore supports the wider ambition to manage traffic demand.

The overall savings are still being developed in terms of resultant changes that will be made to transport infrastructure and services. These changes will also need to take into account government directions on air quality.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR
TRANSPORT AND ROADS FROM COUNCILLOR RAY HASSALL**

H2 GIS mapping system - street scene issues

Question:

Line SN9 of the budget and business plan proposes the use of a GIS mapping system to improve efficiency of reporting of street scene issues, promising an annual saving of £55,000. Can the Cabinet Member report on progress towards developing this system, indicating whether the saving will be achieved in the current financial year?

Answer:

The GIS mapping system is part of a wider, ambitious project to transform the way we interact with and provide geographical information to both citizens and staff.

The use of GIS to report street scene issues will allow staff and citizens to quickly and easily report issues, without the need to know which department or service provider would be responsible for the repair and to track progress as the issue is dealt with.

The development of GIS is in the early stages, but once the technologies have been fully implemented and integrated with our service provider systems, it will reduce demand on our contact centre, as staff and citizens will be able to make 'self-service' reports and requests without the need to call the contact centre, leading to a reduction in call volumes and more efficient call handling. The ability of staff and citizens to be able to report issues and obtain status up-dates, at the time of their choosing, will improve the overall customer experience, as it puts them in control of the contact process. This initiative will also support key themes of improving customer insight, supporting channel migration and reducing avoidable contact as we move more of our services, where appropriate to this delivery method and are able to produce higher quality intelligence as a result.

Discussions have already started with service providers and other local authorities who already have similar systems in place and we have already made available on line information relating to Gritting Routes, Grit Bin locations and road works information.

A specialist team has also been set up to explore the wider benefits GIS will provide to the City, such as how we can use the information for analysis and reporting, as well as, co-ordinating planned works, reducing disruption and publishing open data.

The savings identified in the business case due to the anticipated reduction in call volumes and repeat contacts from staff and citizens will be fully realised when the GIS system is fully integrated with both the Council's Customer Relationship Management System and with our Service Providers Management Information Systems, as this will eliminate the need for call handlers to intervene in the majority of transactions. The technological integration necessary to produce the required improvements in customer experience is complex and is one of the critical key dependencies for this project.

This already complex piece of work has been further complicated by the Council's decisions to review both its Web Technology provider and Customer Relationship Management System provider, which is part of a wider customer service transformation project. Subject to the resolution of these challenges, I am confident in being able to go live with the GIS system before the end of the financial year. At which point the savings, due to the reduction in call-handling identified in the Business Case, will begin to be realised.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND
ROADS FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BARRIE**

H3 Car Parks

Question:

Which car parks within the City are currently free of charge?

Answer:

The City Council manages its formal car parks through Highways. Of those formal car parks in the City Centre and in Local Centres the following have no charges:-

Farm Road,	Sparkbrook Ward
Colgreave Avenue,	Hall Green Ward
Hunters Road,	Lozells & East Handsworth

The City Council also owns and maintains a large number of car parking areas linked with housing, parks and public buildings, which serve the facilities associated with them and for which no charge is made.

In many of the above cases, the cost of charging for parking would exceed revenue collected and many have negative effects, for example, on a struggling local centre.

There are also areas of land that are parked on informally, where the land is not held for that purpose.

Other public non-charged car parks are associated with activities that are not council controlled, such as retail outlets, places of worship, hotels and public houses.

In addition, there are a large number of private non-charged car parking spaces that are associated with places of work.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ROADS FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP

H4 Costings

Question:

What is the net cost (enforcement against fines received) for Sutton Coldfield Central Car Parks (Anchorage Road, South Parade, Mill St, Reddicroft, Station Street and Victoria Road) from the hours of 6pm to 7am?

Answer:

The cost of enforcement is held for the area but is not separately held for the car parks as it includes the costs of enforcement for on street parking. The net cost for the named car parks for the stated time period is therefore not available. The PCN income for the period is shown in the tables below.

Period 2015-2016		
Car Park	PCN Issue between 6pm & 7am	PCN Income
Anchorage Road	105	£2,457
Mill Street	47	£1,339
Reddicroft Lower	55	£1,710
Reddicroft Upper	226	£6,588
South Parade	95	£2,150
Station Street	237	£5,375
Victoria Road M/S	2	£75
TOTAL	767	£19,694

City Council – 1 November 2016

Period 2016 - to date		
Car Park	PC N Issu e bet wee n 6pm & 7am	PCN Income
Anchorage Road	18	£400
Mill Street	8	£225
Reddicroft Lower	19	£375
Reddicroft Upper	118	£2,825
South Parade	55	£1,250
Station Street	165	£3,950
Victoria Road M/S	3	£25
TOTAL	386	£9,050

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND
ROADS FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

H5 Maintenance Costs

Question:

What are the maintenance costs for Anchorage Road, South Parade, Mill St, Reddicroft, Station Street and Victoria Road car parks?

Answer:

Based on 2015/16 financial year:

Anchorage Road	£ 0
South Parade	£ 385
Mill St	£ 0
Reddicroft	£ 0
Station Street	£ 0
Victoria Road	£ 21,064

Based on 2016/17 year to date:

Anchorage Road	£ 0
South Parade	£ 165
Mill St	£ 0
Reddicroft	£ 0
Station Street	£ 0
Victoria Road	£ 5,861

All of these car parks will need repairs and maintenance from time to time, which will then show up in the costs for the relevant year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR VALUE FOR MONEY
AND EFFICIENCY FROM COUNCILLOR MEIRION JENKINS**

I1 Procurement

Question:

For each year between 2012 and 2016, what is the breakdown of the proportion of total procurement spend that has been spent with:

- Organisations with less than 50 employees**
- Organisations with between 50-250 employees**
- Organisations with over 250 employees?**

Answer:

The Council only began to record an organisation's size based on the number of employees in April 2013 and this for new suppliers only and only for those organisations that have volunteered it.

There are over 20,000 suppliers registered with the Council and to retrospectively analyse and validate the information requested is something that we are attempting to do but cannot provide the information within the timescale requested.

However, a recent report entitled "Spend Small" produced by Centre for Entrepreneurs (analysing Local Authority spend from 2011 to 2014) has taken BCC spend information published on the website and using their spend repository has ranked Birmingham in the top 20 of Local Authorities, spending 18% of its total procurement spend with small companies.

The definition of a small company that they used was one that met at least two of the following conditions:

- Annual turnover must not exceed £6.5m
- The balance sheet total must not exceed £3.26m
- The average number of employees must be no more than 50.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR VALUE FOR MONEY
AND EFFICIENCY FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

I2 Expressions

Question:

For the last 12 months, what are the details of the number of companies who submitted an expression of interest for a procurement exercise that did not then go on to submit an Invitation to Tender application for that procurement, broken down by:

- **Organisations with less than 50 employees**
- **Organisations with between 50-250 employees**
- **Organisations with over 250 employees**

For context please also provide the total number of expressions of interest for each group above.

Answer:

For all procurements above £25,000 the Council is required by EU regulations to use 'In-tend' (a web based portal) as our system for tendering. The Council, in order to promote good practice, has extended this to all procurements above £10,000 to ensure that the procurement is compliant i.e. includes an evaluation criteria and pricing schedule. The system does not however record the size (by number of employees) of an organisation and therefore the information below only shows the number of organisations that expressed an interest (EOI) and the number that failed to submit a tender but not the number of employees within each organisation.

The information below covers all quotes and tenders above and below OJEU and for the period Sept 15 to Oct 16.

- | | |
|---|------|
| • Number of EOI | 3364 |
| • Number that did not go on to submit a bid | 2783 |

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING FROM
COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

J1 Relevant Statutory Consultees

Question:

The planning application for the Tucker Fasteners Site on the Walsall Road states it has been prepared after discussions with officers at Birmingham City Council and other relevant statutory consultees.

Could the Chair of Planning advise whether Ward councillors and the local neighbourhood planning forum (which was constituted in June this year and applied for recognition in July) are “relevant statutory consultees”?

Answer:

I can advise that Ward Councillors and local neighbourhood forums are not statutory consultees.

Statutory consultees are set out in legislation, and include bodies such as Historic England, the Environment Agency, and Transportation authorities, normally when proposed development is above a certain threshold.

I would advise that public participation in Birmingham is undertaken to a level very significantly in excess of the statutory minimum requirements, as is the case in this instance.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING FROM
COUNCILLOR KAREN TRENCH**

J2 Tucker Fasteners Site - pre-application discussions

Question:

What pre-application discussions have officers of the Planning Department held with the applicants whose application for planning permission of the Tucker Fasteners Site, Walsall Road, was publicised on Wednesday, 19th October 2016?

Answer:

I can confirm that officers have been involved in pre-application discussions regarding this site. Details of pre-application enquiries are not publicised as many have a degree of sensitivity and are commercially confidential. Advice will be given on the basis of planning policy and requirements for information. Where planning permission is required, the scheme would still be subject to a full assessment under the application procedure, and pre-application discussions do not guarantee an approval for the developer.