

Members are reminded that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests relating to any items of business to be discussed at this meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared a Member must not speak or take part in that agenda item. Any declarations will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

CABINET

**Tuesday, 14 February 2017 at 1000
hours in Committee Rooms 3 and 4,
Council House, Birmingham**

PUBLIC AGENDA

1. NOTICE OF RECORDING

Chairman to advise/meeting to note that this meeting will be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Internet site (www.birminghamnewsroom.com) and members of the press/public may record and take photographs. The whole of the meeting will be filmed except where there are confidential or exempt items.

2. APOLOGIES

To Follow

3. FINANCIAL PLAN 2017+

Joint report of the Chief Executive and the Strategic Director – Finance and Legal.

Attached

4. ANNUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT

Report of the Chief Executive.

Attached

5. PENSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR STAFF TRANSFERRED OUT OF CITYSERVE FOLLOWING OUTSOURCING BY A CITY COUNCIL SCHOOL

Report of the Strategic Director for People.

Attached

6. INNOVATION BIRMINGHAM LIMITED SITE DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION

Report of the Strategic Director – Finance and Legal.

- Attached** 7. **URBAN INNOVATIVE ACTIONS – APPROVAL TO ACCEPT GRANT AND FULL BUSINESS CASE**
- Joint report of the Strategic Director of Change and Support Services and the Acting Strategic Director of Place.
- Attached** 8. **PEDDIMORE – EMPLOYMENT SITE**
- Report of the Strategic Director for Economy.
- Attached** 9. **STEP FORWARD: UPSKILLING FOR LIFE**
- Report of the Strategic Director for Economy.
- Attached** 10. **HOUSING CLEARANCE PROGRAMME**
- Report of the Strategic Director for Economy.
- Attached** 11. **MIGRATION – BIRMINGHAM CITY OF SANCTUARY POSITION STATEMENT**
- Report of the Strategic Director for People.
- Attached** 12. **SCHEME FOR CO-ORDINATED ADMISSIONS TO SCHOOLS, ADMISSION NUMBERS AND ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2018/19**
- Report of the Strategic Director for People.
- Attached** 13. **HOUSING RENT, SERVICE CHARGES AND OTHER CHARGES 2017/18**
- Report of the Acting Strategic Director of Place.
- Attached** 14. **BIRMINGHAM COUNCIL HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 201/18 TO 2019/20**
- Report of the Acting Strategic Director of Place.
- Attached** 15. **COMMUNITY LIBRARY SERVICE TIERED DELIVERY MODEL**
- Report of the Acting Strategic Director of Place.
- Attached** 16. **PLANNED PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES (MARCH 2017 - MAY 2017)**
- Report of the Director of Commissioning and Procurement.
- Attached** 17. **APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**
- Report of the City Solicitor.
18. **OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**
- To consider any items of business by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) that, in the opinion of the Chairman, are matters of urgency.

19. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

That in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, which includes exempt information of the category indicated, the public be now excluded from the meeting:-

(Exempt Paragraph 3)

PRIVATE AGENDA

Attached 20. INNOVATION BIRMINGHAM LIMITED SITE DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION

Report of the Strategic Director – Finance and Legal.

(Exempt Paragraph 3)

Attached 21. PLANNED PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES (MARCH 2017 - MAY 2017)

Report of the Director of Commissioning and Procurement.

(Exempt Paragraph 3)

22. OTHER URGENT BUSINESS (EXEMPT INFORMATION)

To consider any items of business by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) that, in the opinion of the Chairman, are matters of urgency.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC

Report to:	CABINET	
Report of:	The Chief Executive	
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017	
SUBJECT:	ANNUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT	
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 003045/2017	
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>	
Relevant Cabinet Member(s) or	Councillor Ian Ward – Deputy Leader	
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Mohammed Aikhlaq – Corporate Resources & Governance	
Wards affected:	ALL	
1. Purpose of report:		
<p>1.1 This report sets out the Council's approach to pay policy in accordance with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and takes account of the final guidance for Openness and Accountability in Local Pay as issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government. The purpose of the statement is to provide transparency with regard to the Council's approach to setting the pay of its employees (excluding those working in local authority schools).</p>		
2. Decision(s) recommended:		
<p>That Cabinet:</p> <p>2.1 Note the proposed pay policy statement for the Council for 2017-18 that will be presented for approval at City Council 28 February 2017.</p>		
Lead Contact Officer(s):	Claire Ward Assistant Director Workforce Strategy	
Telephone No:	07500882942	
E-mail address:	claire.ward@birmingham.gov.uk	
3. Consultation		
<p>3.1 <u>Internal</u></p> <p>The Deputy Leader has been consulted on the content of the Pay Policy statement. The changes to the Joint National Council Chief Officers Pay (referred to as JNC officers) and Grading framework have been the subject of trade union and individual consultation.</p> <p>3.2 <u>External</u></p> <p>The Council's Pay Policy is compliant with nationally negotiated terms and conditions.</p>		

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies plans and strategies?

Yes the principles applied within the pay policy are compliant with the Council's framework for a modern Council and the People Strategy.

**4.2 Financial Implications
(Will decisions be carried out within existing finance and Resources?)**

The Pay Policy is aligned with the requirements of the budget that has been set for 2017-18. All employee costs will be met by resources identified in the Council's Business Plan and Budget 2017 that is due to be presented to Full Council in February 2017.

4.3 Legal Implications

In determining the pay and remuneration of all of its employees, the Council will comply with all relevant employment legislation. This report makes recommendations in accordance with the duties contained within the Localism Act 2011 in relation to the preparation of a pay policy statement for each financial year

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty (see separate guidance note)

The Pay Policy Statement has no adverse impact through the implementation of the policy as it is a confirmation of established policies and not a change. The Council's pay and grading frameworks outlined in the policy for National Joint Council (NJC) officers have been subject to a full equality impact assessment at the point of adoption. See appendix A for further information.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

5.1 The Council is statutorily required to undertake an annual review of its pay arrangements and publish these making particular reference to the following:

- The methods by which, salaries of all employees are determined.
- The detail and level of remuneration of its most senior employee's i.e. 'chief officers', as defined by the relevant legislation.
- The detail and level of remuneration of the lowest paid employees
- The relationship between the remuneration for highest and lowest paid employees
- The Committee(s)/Panel responsible for ensuring the provisions set out in this statement are applied consistently throughout the Council and recommending any amendments to the full Council.

The above details can be found in the attached Appendix A - Birmingham City Council Pay Policy statement 2017-18.

5.2 In 2016-17 the Council undertook a fundamental review of its pay and grading framework for its JNC cadre known as "Senior Officers" for this purpose. The changes to the pay and grading of senior officers will take effect on 1st July 2017 and the details of this can be found in Annex 2 of appendix B.

6.	Evaluation of alternative option(s):
6.1	In determining its grading structure and setting remuneration levels for all posts, the Council takes account of the need to ensure value for money in respect of the use of public expenditure, balanced against the need to recruit and retain employees who are able to meet the requirements of providing high quality services to the community, delivered effectively and efficiently and at times at which those services are required.
7.	Reasons for Decision(s):
7.1	To ensure that the Council fulfils its obligations to have a reasoned and transparent pay policy.

Signatures	<u>Date</u>
Deputy Leader – Councillor Ian Ward	
.....
Chief Executive – Mark Rogers	
.....

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:
Relevant Officer's file(s) on the matter, save for confidential documents
List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
Appendix A - Equalities
Appendix B – Birmingham City Council Pay Policy statement 2017-18

**REPORT TO CABINET
Date 14 February 2016**

PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2017/18 – EQUALITY IMPACT INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Summary of Findings

The Pay Policy Statement is published annually as a requirement of Section 38 to 43 of the Localism Act 2011. The purpose of the statement is to provide transparency with regard to the Council's approach to setting the pay of its employees (excluding those working in local authority schools) by identifying;

- The methods by which, salaries of all employees are determined.
- The detail and level of remuneration of its most senior employee's i.e. 'chief officers', as defined by the relevant legislation.
- The detail and level of remuneration of the lowest paid employees
- The relationship between the remuneration for highest and lowest paid employees.
- The Committee(s)/Panel responsible for ensuring the provisions set out in this statement are applied consistently throughout the Council.

The policies referred to in this statement have not been changed or updated and will have been subject to equality impact assessment at the time of their adoption.

Equality Act 2010

The Executive must have due regard to the public sector equality duty when considering Council reports for decision.

The public sector equality duty is as follows:

1	<p>The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act;(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
2	<p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
3	<p>The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.</p>
4	<p>Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) tackle prejudice, and(b) promote understanding.
5	<p>The relevant protected characteristics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Marriage & civil partnership(b) Age(c) Disability(d) Gender reassignment(e) Pregnancy and maternity(f) Race(g) Religion or belief(h) Sex(i) Sexual orientation



Pay Policy Statement

2017/18

Contents

1.	Introduction and Purpose	3
2.	Legislative Framework	3
3.0	Senior Management Remuneration policy	3
3.1	Senior Management Positions	4
3.2	Recruitment to Senior Management Positions	7
3.3	Additions to Salary of Senior Officers	7
3.4	Payments on Termination	8
3.5	Comparators Influencing Pay Levels	8
4.0	Non-Senior Officers	9
4.1	Recruitment	9
4.2	Lowest Paid Employees	9
4.3	Accountability and Decision Making	11
5	Publication	11
Annex 1 - Birmingham City Council – JNC Pay Spine		12
Annex 2 - Birmingham City Council – New JNC Pay Structure		13
Annex 3 - Birmingham City Council – NJC Pay Spine		14

1. Introduction and Purpose

This Pay Policy Statement sets out the Council's approach to pay policy in accordance with the requirements of Section 38 to 43 of the Localism Act 2011 and takes account of the final guidance for 'Openness and Accountability in Local Pay' as issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government. The purpose of the statement is to provide transparency with regard to the Council's approach to setting the pay of its employees (excluding those working in local authority schools) by identifying;

- The methods by which, salaries of all employees are determined.
- The detail and level of remuneration of its most senior employee's i.e. 'chief officers', as defined by the relevant legislation.
- The detail and level of remuneration of the lowest paid employees
- The relationship between the remuneration for highest and lowest paid employees
- The Committee(s)/Panel responsible for ensuring the provisions set out in this statement are applied consistently throughout the Council and recommending any amendments to the full Council.

Once approved by the Full Council Meeting, this policy statement will come into immediate effect for the 2017/18 financial year and will be subject to review again for 2018/19 in accordance with the relevant legislation prevailing at that time. If the pay policy needs to be amended during the current financial year, any amendments will be subject to approval.

2. Legislative Framework

In determining the pay and remuneration of all of its employees, the Council will comply with all relevant employment legislation. This includes; the Equality Act 2010, Part Time Employment (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000, Fixed Term Employees (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2002, The Agency Workers Regulations 2010 and where relevant, the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Earnings) Regulations.

The Council pays due regard to the Equal Pay requirements contained within the Equality Act, the Council ensures there is no pay discrimination within its pay structures and that all pay differentials can be objectively justified through the use of an equality proofed job evaluation scheme that directly relates an employee's salary to the requirements, demands and responsibilities of the role.

3. Senior Management Remuneration Policy

For the purposes of this statement, senior officer means 'chief officers' as defined within S43 of the Localism Act 2011. The 'Chief Executive is employed under the terms and conditions of the Joint National Council for Chief Executives and all other senior officers are under the terms and conditions for Joint National Council for Chief Officers.

The Council currently determines pay levels through a job evaluation process and grading structure that has been specifically designed for senior positions that determines the pay range for senior officers as defined by the Localism Act 2011. Performance related progression within the pay range is normally consolidated into base pay, however for the 2016/17 'My Appraisal' year this will be a non-consolidated payment. There will then be a temporary freeze on performance related progression for the financial years 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 as part of budget savings. For this period where an employee is not at the top of their pay range their salary will be reviewed annually and may be increased from time to time at the discretion of the Council. There is no obligation during this period to award a performance related pay increase. There will be a cost of living increase of 1% applied on 1st April 2017 for senior officers as part of national pay bargaining arrangements. See Annex 1 for the current senior officer pay structure.

The Council has recently completed a consultation exercise to review and change the evaluation and pay structure for senior officers. This change is to take effect from 1st July 2017 so will not be in place at the time of publishing this statement. When the change is completed relevant updates will be made to this statement to reflect any change to senior officer remuneration. See Annex 2 for the proposed new senior officer pay structure and outcome against positions.

Those employees working in senior positions do not receive overtime payments and all other pay related allowances are the subject of either nationally or locally negotiated rates, having been determined from time to time in accordance with collective bargaining machinery and/or as determined by Council Policy. In determining its grading structure and setting remuneration levels for all posts, the Council takes account of the need to ensure value for money in respect of the use of public expenditure, balanced against the need to recruit and retain employees who are able to meet the requirements of providing high quality services to the community, delivered effectively and efficiently and at times at which those services are required.

In particular, it is Council's policy that no Chief Officer or Senior Officer (paid under JNC conditions of service for Senior Officers) is paid a supplement for Returning Officer duties, whether in respect of local elections or national elections (e.g. General Elections, elections for European Parliament, national referenda etc.). Fees paid in respect of these elections by Government are used to supplement the pay of non-senior officer employees who have worked on the relevant election.

3.1 Senior Management Positions

Chief Officers

The posts falling within the statutory definition for Chief Officers of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, which covers the statutory officers and those others that report to the Chief Executive, are set out below:

- a) Chief Executive - The head of paid service defined under section 4(1) of that Act

The salary for the above post falls within a range of 10 incremental points from £186,168 rising to a maximum of £224,422. There is no additional supplement paid for returning officer duties incorporated into this role.

- b) City Solicitor - Monitoring Officer defined under section 5(1) of that Act.

The salary for the above post falls within a range of 7 incremental points between £100,135, rising to a maximum of £109,080.

- c) Strategic Director (People) - A statutory chief officer designated under section 2(6) of that Act. This position has responsibility for both Children as Director of Children's Services (DCS) and Adults as Director of Adult Social Services (DASS).

The salary for the above post falls within a range of 7 incremental points between £140,911, rising to a maximum of £156,568.

- d) Executive Director Children's Services - A statutory chief officer defined under section 2(6) of that Act.

The salary for the above post falls within a range of 7 incremental points between £132,613 rising to a maximum of £140,264.

- e) Strategic Director (Finance and Legal) – Section 151 Officer - A statutory chief officer defined under section 2(6) of that Act.

The salary for the above post falls within a range of 7 incremental points between £140,911, rising to a maximum of £156,568.

- f) Strategic Director (Major Projects) - A non-statutory chief officer defined under section 2(7) of that Act.

The salary of the above post falls within a range of 7 incremental points between £140,911, rising to a maximum of £156,568.

- g) Strategic Director (Place) - A non-statutory chief officer defined under section 2(7) of that Act.

The salary of the above post falls within a range of 7 incremental points between £140,911, rising to a maximum of £156,568.

- h) Strategic Director (Change and Support Services) – A non-statutory chief officer defined under section 2(7) of that Act.

The salary of the above post falls within a range of 8 incremental points between £140,911, rising to a maximum of £156,568.

- i) Strategic Director (Economy) - A non-statutory chief officer defined under section 2(7) of that Act.

The salary of the above post falls within a range of 8 incremental points between £140,911, rising to a maximum of £156,568.

- j) Assistant Chief Executive – A non-statutory chief officer defined under section 2(7) of that Act. This is a fixed term arrangements until December 2017.

The salary of the above post falls within a range of 8 incremental points between £84,281 rising to a maximum of £93,645.

- k) Director of Public Health – A statutory post under section 73A (7) of the NHS Act 2006

The salary of the above post falls within a range of 8 incremental points between £75,249, rising to a maximum of £101,451. There are also two statutory payments made in relation to this role.

Deputy Chief Officers

The positions in the table below are deputy chief officers as mentioned in section 2(8) of that Act, i.e. officers that report directly to any of the chief officers above:

APPENDIX B

Position Title	Directorate	Salary Range
Director - Customer Services	Change & Support Services	£92,709 - £103,010
Director - Human Resources	Change & Support Services	£101,137 - £110,171
Service Director - Commissioning and Procurement	Change & Support Services	£92,709 - £103,010
Assistant Director - Corporate Strategy *	Change & Support Services	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Corporate Communications	Change & Support Services	£75,853 - £84,281
Director - LEP	Economy	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Transportation & Connectivity	Economy	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Employment	Economy	£71,639 - £79,598
Assistant Director - Planning & Regeneration **	Economy	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Highways & Infrastructure	Economy	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Financial Strategy	Finance & Legal	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Shared Services	Finance & Legal	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Finance Economy	Finance & Legal	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Financial Services	Finance & Legal	£80,067 - £88,963
Head of Service ***	Finance & Legal	£53,440 - £69,359
Director - Property Services	Major Projects	£84,281 - £93,645
Service Director - Commissioning Centre of Excellence	People	£107,417 - £119,352
Service Director - Health and Wellbeing	People	£101,137 - £110,171
Assistant Director - Children Services NWC	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Childrens Services East	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Children in Care	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Childrens Services South	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Early Help	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Safeguarding & Development Services	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Consultant in Public Health ****	People	£80,067 - £88,963
Chief Social Worker Officer	People	£80,067 - £88,963
Service Director - Housing Transformation	Place	£92,709 - £103,010
Service Director - Sports & Events	Place	£92,709 - £103,010
Service Director - Regulation & Enforcement	Place	£92,709 - £103,010
Director - Waste Management	Place	£92,709 - £103,010
Assistant Director - Finance Place	Place	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Culture and Visitor Economy	Place	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Principal Head of Adult Education	Place	£75,853 - £84,281

* Currently seconded outside BCC

** There are two posts that carry out this role

*** There are ten posts that carry out this role

**** There are two posts that carry out this role

Although not required by statute for the policy statement the following are other senior officer positions within Birmingham City Council.

Position Title	Directorate	Salary Range
Assistant Director - ICT	Change & Support Services	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Human Resources Operations	Change & Support Services	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Workforce Strategy	Change & Support Services	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Customer Services	Change & Support Services	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Organisational Development	Change & Support Services	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Revenues & Benefits	Change & Support Services	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Commissioning Centre of Excellence *	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Children with Complex Needs	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Access to Education	People	£84,281 - £93,645
Assistant Director - Delivery	People	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Workforce	People	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Education & Infrastructure	People	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Business Change	People	£80,067 - £88,963
Assistant Director - Pathways & Participation	People	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Service Integration	Place	£75,853 - £84,281
Assistant Director - Waste Management	Place	£75,853 - £84,281

*There are currently three positions that carry out this role

The senior officer positions will continue to be reviewed on a regular basis as part of the overall savings that have to be made by the Council due to the savings targets faced by local authorities in general over the next few years.

3.2 Recruitment to Senior Management Positions

When recruiting to all posts the Council will take full and proper account of its own Equal Opportunities, Recruitment and Redeployment policies. Permanent appointments made to chief officer (CO) and deputy chief officer (DCO) positions are all made by the JNC appointments panel that is a sub-committee of Council Business Management. Either appointments are made by the Chief Executive or delegated officer.

The determination of the remuneration to be offered to any newly appointed chief officer will be in accordance with the local JNC pay structure (further details can be found in Annex 1) and relevant policies in place at the time of recruitment. Where the Council is unable to recruit to a post at the designated grade, it will consider the use of temporary market forces supplements in accordance with its relevant policies.

Where the Council remains unable to recruit under an employment contract, or there is a need for interim support to provide cover for a vacant substantive senior management position, the Council will, where necessary, consider and utilise engaging individuals under 'contracts for service'. These will be sourced through the relevant procurement process ensuring the Council is able to demonstrate the maximum value for money benefits from competition in securing the relevant service.

3.3 Additions to Salary of Senior Officers

The Council does not apply any bonus to the salary of senior officers, however progression within the salary scales is performance related as mentioned under 3.0. There is no element of earn back for senior manager's salaries and any incremental progression is currently consolidated into basic pay. As part of the recent consultation, access to performance related incremental progression within the grades will temporarily cease until April 2021 as part of budget savings.

In addition to basic salary, set out below are details of other elements of 'additional pay' which are chargeable to UK Income Tax and do not solely constitute reimbursement of expenses incurred in the fulfilment of duties;

The following are applicable to all senior manager positions

- A mileage allowance is paid to all employees using their own vehicle for work purposes and the payments are linked to the approved HMRC rates (For current HMRC mileage rates please see <http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/pay/exb/a-z/m/mileage-expenses.htm>)
- There are currently no salary supplements or additional payments for undertaking additional responsibilities such as shared service provision with another local authority or in respect of joint bodies.
- Market forces supplements are paid where it is justified in order to fulfil a role or retain an officer within a role.

3.4 Payments on Termination

The Council's approach to statutory and discretionary payments on termination of employment of senior managers, prior to reaching normal retirement age, is set out in accordance with Regulations 5 and 6 of the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2006, Regulations 12 and 13 of the Local Government Pension Scheme (Benefits, Membership and Contribution) Regulations 2007.

The power to increase statutory redundancy payments will be exercised to the extent permissible under the 2006 Regulations so that the amount which could be paid would be no more than the difference between the redundancy payment to which the employee is entitled by statute and the payment to which he would have been entitled if there had been no limit on the amount of a week's pay used in the calculation of his redundancy payment. Where the power to make discretionary compensation in relation to additional periods of membership under the Pension Regulations is exercised the amount of compensation shall not exceed 104 weeks' pay. If the employee receives a redundancy payment the equivalent amount shall be deducted from the discretionary compensation otherwise payable.

Any other payments falling outside the provisions or the relevant periods of contractual notice shall be subject to a formal decision made by the full Council or relevant elected members, committee or panel of elected members or officer with delegated authority to approve such payments.

3.5 Comparators Influencing Pay Levels

For the purpose of context in the local government sector, Birmingham City Council is not only the largest local authority in the UK, but also the largest unitary authority in Europe serving over one million residents and has a revenue budget of c £3.1bn. The Council needs to maintain competitive pay levels in order to attract suitable candidates for more senior positions that can demonstrate sufficient skills, experience and capacity required at this level as would be evidenced for example by fulfilling a comparable role in a large complex local authority. There is a very small pool from which to recruit with other authorities offering very competitive salaries considering their size. As a comparison the Core Cities group of councils that represents those of the largest eight economies outside London in England, chief executive remuneration ranges from £160,000 to over £200,000. For Liverpool and Manchester that serve a population of less than half of that of Birmingham, both the top salaries are over £200,000.

As part of its overall and ongoing monitoring of alignment with external pay markets, both within and outside the sector, the council will use available benchmark information as appropriate.

4. Non Senior Officer Employees

Based on the application of an analytical job evaluation process, the Council uses the nationally negotiated pay spine as the basis for its local grading structure with additional spine points. Performance related progression within the pay range is normally consolidated into base pay, however for the financial year 2017/18 this will be a non-consolidated payment where it is applicable. There will then be a temporary freeze on performance related progression for the financial years 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 as part of budget savings. For this period where an employee is not at the top of their pay range their salary will be reviewed annually and may be increased from time to time at the discretion of the Council. There is no obligation during this period to award a performance related pay increase. The Council presently adheres to national pay bargaining in respect of the national pay spine with the most recent increase effective 1st April 2017. See Annex 1 for the current BCC pay structure.

4.1 Recruitment

New appointments will normally be made at the minimum of the relevant grade, although this can be varied where necessary to secure the best candidate. From time to time it may be necessary to take account of the external pay market in order to attract and retain employees

with particular experience, skills and capacity. Where necessary, the Council will ensure the requirement for such is objectively justified by reference to clear and transparent evidence of relevant market comparators, using appropriate data sources available from within and outside the local government sector.

4.2 Lowest Paid Employees

The lowest paid employee's under a contract of employment with the Council are employed on full time equivalent (FTE) salary in accordance with the minimum spinal column point (SCP) currently in use within the Council's grading structure. As at 1 April 2017, this is will be £15,014 per annum (SCP6). See Annex 4 for the BCC NJC Pay Structure

The Council has chosen to pay a supplement to ensure the minimum FTE salary is £15,701 based on the 'UK Living Wage' equivalent of £8.25 per hour. Following the recent review of the UK living wage this has risen to £8.45 per hour which is an equivalent of £16,082 FTE salary and will be implemented with effect from 01 April 2017 in line with the Council's policy to apply the revised rate on the April following its announcement. For the purpose of this pay policy statement the lowest paid employee's will be defined as those on a FTE salary of £16,082 based on the UK living wage hourly rate of £8.45 per hour. This supplement paid for the 'UK Living Wage' should not be confused with the 'National Living Wage'.

The statutory guidance under the Localism Act recommends the use of pay multiples as a means of measuring the relationship between pay rates across the workforce and that of senior managers, as included within the Hutton 'Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector' (2010). The Hutton report was asked by Government to explore the case for a fixed limit on dispersion of pay through a requirement that no public sector manager can earn more than 20 times the lowest paid person in the organisation. The report concluded that the relationship to median earnings was a more relevant measure and the Government's Code of Recommended Practice on Data Transparency recommends the publication of the ratio between highest paid salary and the median average salary of the whole of the authority's workforce. Whilst the ratio between the highest and lowest paid employees within the Council does not exceed 20 times, the Council does not set a ratio ceiling within its pay policy for senior officers.

The following tables illustrate various pay differentials between the salary of the Chief Executive and the lowest paid full time equivalent employee, median employee pay and average employee pay

APPENDIX B

Pay Differential between Chief Executive and lowest paid full time equivalent employees	CEX salary	186168
	Lowest FTE salary	16082
	Pay Multiple	11.5:1

Pay Differential between Chief Executive and the median pay for full time equivalent employees	CEX salary	186168
	Median salary	22658
	Pay Multiple	8.21:1

Pay Differential between Chief Executive and the average pay for full time equivalent employees	CEX salary	186168
	Average salary	25573
	Pay Multiple	7.27:1

The following tables illustrate the various pay differentials between Chief Officers (excluding the Chief Executive) and the lowest paid full time equivalent employee, median employee pay and average employee pay.

Pay Differential between the average of Chief Officers pay and the lowest paid full time equivalent employee	Average Chief Officer salary	91822
	Lowest FTE salary	16082
	Pay Multiple	5.70:1

Pay Differential between the average of Chief Officers pay and the average pay for a full time equivalent employee	Average Chief Officer salary	91822
	Average salary	25573
	Pay Multiple	3.59:1

Pay Differential between the median of Chief Officers pay and the median pay for a full time equivalent employee	Median Chief Officer salary	88962
	Median salary	22658
	Pay Multiple	3.92:1

4.3 Accountability and Decision Making

In accordance with the Constitution of the Council, the JNC Committee are responsible for decision making in relation to the recruitment, pay, terms and conditions and severance arrangements in relation to employees of the Council.

5 Publication

Upon approval by the full Council, this statement will be published on the Councils Website www.birmingham.gov.uk/cosd and will also be available in additional formats by request. In addition, for employees where the full time equivalent salary is £50,000 or more, excluding employer superannuation contributions, the Councils Annual Statement of Accounts will include the number of employees in bands of £5,000.

Annex 1

Birmingham City Council – Senior Officer Pay Spine

This is the locally negotiated pay spine for senior officers covered by JNC terms and conditions of employment. These rates are effective from 01 April 2016.

BCC Grade	Spinal Column Point	FTE Salary
L01	1	71639
	2	72965
	3	74292
	4	75618
	5	76945
	6	78272
	7	79598
L02	9	75853
	10	77257
	11	78662
	12	80067
	13	81471
L03	14	82876
	15	84281
	17	80067
	18	81549
	19	83032
L04	20	84515
	21	85997
	22	87480
	23	88963
L05	25	84281
	26	85841
	27	87402
	28	88963
	29	90524
L06	30	92084
	31	93645
	33	92709
	34	94426
	35	96142
	36	97859
	37	99576
L07	38	101293
	39	103010
	41	101137
	42	103010
	44	104662
	45	106498
	46	108335
L08	47	110171
	49	107417
	50	109406
	51	111395
	52	113384
L08A	53	115373
	54	117363
	55	119352
	75	132613
L08	76	133888
	77	135163
	78	136438
	79	137714
	80	138989
L10	81	140264
	57	140911
	58	143521
	59	146130
	60	148745
L10	61	151358
	62	153964
	63	156568
	65	186168
	66	193819
	67	197644
	68	201470
L10	69	205295
	70	209120
	71	212946
	72	216771
	73	220597
	74	224422

APPENDIX B

Note that SCP43 is no longer in use following the 1 January 2015 pay award

Annex 2

Birmingham City Council - Senior Pay structure 01 July 2017

The new pay structure is significantly different to the current pay structure and has only four grades that relate to four main roles

Role	Grade Band	Min £	Max £
Chief Executive	B04	173,995	213,143
Strategic Director	B03	130,090	159,360
Service Director	B02	97,263	119,148
Assistant Director	B01	72,720	89,082

Outcome of above structure against senior officer roles

Statutory Chief Officers

Position Title	Directorate	Salary Range
Chief Executive	Chief Executive's Office	£173,995 - £213,143
Assistant Chief Executive	Chief Executive's Office	£72,720 - £89,082
Strategic Director - Change & Support Services	Change & Support Services	£130,090 - £159,360
Strategic Director - Economy	Economy	£130,090 - £159,360
Strategic Director - Finance & Legal Services	Finance & Legal	£130,090 - £159,360
Interim City Solicitor	Finance & Legal	£97,263 - £119,148
Strategic Director - Major Projects	Major Projects	£130,090 - £159,360
Strategic Director - People	People	£130,090 - £159,360
Executive Director - Children's Service	People	£97,263 - £119,148
Service Director - Public Health *	People	£97,263 - £119,148
Strategic Director - Place	Place	£130,090 - £159,360

Annex 2 continued

Deputy Chief Officers

Position Title	Directorate	Salary Range
Director - Customer Services	Change & Support Services	£97,263 - £119,148
Director - Human Resources	Change & Support Services	£97,263 - £119,148
Service Director - Procurement	Change & Support Services	£97,263 - £119,148
Assistant Director - Corporate Strategy *	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Corporate Communications	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Director - LEP	Economy	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Transportation & Connectivity	Economy	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Employment	Economy	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Planning & Regeneration **	Economy	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Highways & Infrastructure	Economy	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Financial Strategy	Finance & Legal	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Shared Services	Finance & Legal	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Finance Economy	Finance & Legal	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Audit	Finance & Legal	£72,720 - £89,082
Head of Service ***	Finance & Legal	£53,974 - £70,053
Director - Property Services	Major Projects	£97,263 - £119,148
Service Director - Commissioning Centre of Excellence	People	£97,263 - £119,148
Service Director - Health and Wellbeing	People	£97,263 - £119,148
Assistant Director - Children Services NWC	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Childrens Services East	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Children in Care	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Childrens Services South	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Early Help	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Safeguarding & Development Services	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Consultant in Public Health ****	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Chief Social Worker Officer	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Service Director - Housing Transformation	Place	£97,263 - £119,148
Service Director - Sports & Events	Place	£97,263 - £119,148
Service Director - Regulation & Enforcement	Place	£97,263 - £119,148
Director - Waste Management	Place	£97,263 - £119,148
Assistant Director - Finance Place	Place	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Culture and Visitor Economy	Place	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Principal Head of Adult Education	Place	£72,720 - £89,082

* Currently seconded outside BCC

** There are two posts that carry out this role

*** There are ten posts that carry out this role

**** There are two posts that carry out this role

Annex 2 Continued

Other Senior Officers

Position Title	Directorate	Salary Range
Assistant Director - ICT	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Human Resources Operations	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Workforce Strategy	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Customer Services	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Organisational Development	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Revenues & Benefits	Change & Support Services	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Commissioning Centre of Excellence *	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Children with Complex Needs	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Access to Education	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Delivery	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Workforce	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Education & Infrastructure	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Business Change	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Pathways & Participation	People	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Service Integration	Place	£72,720 - £89,082
Assistant Director - Waste Management	Place	£72,720 - £89,082

* There are three positions that carry out this role

Annex 3

Birmingham City Council – NJC Pay Spine

The Birmingham City Council pay spine is based on nationally negotiated rates through the National Joint Council. These rates are effective from April 2017.

BCC Grade	Spinal Column Point	FTE Salary
GR1	006*	15014
	007*	15115
	008*	15246
	009*	15375
	10*	15613
GR2	11*	15807
	12	16144
	13	16512
	14	16781
	15	17072
	16	17419
	17	17772
	18	18070
GR3	19	18746
	20	19430
	21	20138
	22	20661
	23	21268
	24	21962
	25	22658
	26	23398
	27	24174
	28	24964
GR4	29	25951
	30	26822
	31	27668
	32	28485
	33	29323
	34	30153
	35	30785
	36	31601
	37	32486

BCC Grade	Spinal Column Point	FTE Salary
GR5	38	33437
	39	34538
	40	35444
	41	36379
	42	37306
	43	38237
	44	39177
	45	40057
GR6	46	41025
	47	41967
	48	42899
	49	43821
	50	45234
	51	46658
	52	48079
	53	49513
GR7	54	50929
	55	52455
	56	53974
	57	55513
	58	57310
	59	59178
	60	61111
	61	63110
	62	65185
	63	67328
	64	70053

* Indicates the payment of a living wage enhancement that would equate to an FTE salary of £16,082 with effect from 01 April 2017.

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	Strategic Director for People
Date of Decision:	14th February 2017
SUBJECT:	PENSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR STAFF TRANSFERRED OUT OF CITYSERVE FOLLOWING OUTSOURCING BY A CITY COUNCIL SCHOOL
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002982/2017
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s)	Councillor Brigid Jones – Children, Families and Schools Councillor Majid Mahmood – Value for Money & Efficiency
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Cllr Susan Barnett – Schools, Children and Families Cllr Mohammed Aikhlaq– Corporate Resources and Governance
Wards affected:	ALL
1. Purpose of report:	
1.1	This report outlines the current practice of the City Council in respect of pension arrangements of Council employees where a school which is currently purchasing cleaning and/or catering services from Cityserve and subsequently chooses to secure these services from another provider and staff TUPE over to the new provider. It highlights that at present there is no overall Council policy as to when the Council will enter into a Pension Admission Agreement where the new provider wishes to obtain Admitted Body Status (ABS) and thereby allow transferring staff to remain members of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). It makes recommendations in respect of future policy and practice.
2. Decision(s) recommended:	
That Cabinet:	
2.1	Agrees to honour the existing commitments for the Council to enter into Pension Admission Agreements and act as guarantor thereby enabling transferring employees to remain as members of the Local Government Pension Scheme in respect of the schools identified in Appendix A to this report.
2.2	Agrees that in future the policy will be that the Council will require new service providers to take out a bond to cover any actuarially assessed risk associated with continuing membership of the LGPS.
2.3	Notes that the Council will ensure that the new policy position is clearly communicated to all schools which use the services of Cityserve.
2.4	Delegates authority to the Executive Director for Education to enter into future Pension Admission Agreements in respect of Cityserve staff who transfer to private sector providers.
2.5	Notes that the Executive Director for Education shall provide an annual report to the relevant Cabinet Members in relation to all decisions made under recommendation 2.4.
2.6	Authorises the City Solicitor to negotiate, execute and complete all necessary documents to give effect to the above recommendations.
Lead Contact Officer(s):	Claire Ward Assistant Director Workforce Strategy
Telephone No:	07500882942
E-mail address:	claire.ward@birmingham.gov.uk

<p>3. Consultation</p> <p>3.1 <u>Internal</u></p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Schools and the Cabinet Member for Value for Money & Efficiency have been consulted and agree that the proposals may go forward for an Executive decision.</p> <p>There has been dialogue with the trade unions regarding the proposed change in policy and how the Council will fulfil their obligations in respect of TUPE and ensure that any affected employees understand the implications.</p> <p>3.2 <u>External</u></p> <p>We have consulted with Schools that have received a commitment to act as a guarantor and welcome proposals to streamline the process and speed this up. We will ensure that the change of policy and the potential implications are clearly understood and appreciated by all schools that may be affected in the future.</p>	<p>4. Compliance Issues:</p> <p>4.1 <u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u></p> <p>Yes the proposals contained within this report support the ambition to improve the wellbeing of our children and young people.</p> <p>4.2 <u>Financial Implications</u> <u>(Will decisions be carried out within existing finance and Resources?)</u></p> <p>This report considers the financial implications of any new transfer of staff to a new provider in terms of the future pension arrangements. The proposals in this report suggest that any additional costs would be borne by the new provider. There are separate arrangements for any costs associated with Equal pay that may fall on the Council. These will be assessed on a case by case basis</p> <p>4.3 <u>Legal Implications</u></p> <p>The Fair Deal for Staff Pensions guidance issued by HM Treasury in 2013 requires that where staff who are members of a public sector pension scheme move from the public sector to an independent contractor by way of transfer under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 ("TUPE"), such staff should continue to be members of the public service pension scheme they were in immediately prior to the transfer. The guidance explicitly states that it applies to local authority maintained schools.</p> <p>4.4 <u>Public Sector Equality Duty (see separate guidance note)</u></p> <p>The proposed policy will be applied consistently across the School community. No disparate impact has been identified.</p>
--	--

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

- 5.1 Recently we have seen a small number of schools who have decided to appoint a private sector provider to replace Cityserve which is the Council's in-house school meals and cleaning provider. Typically, an average of (5 FTE) staff are employed at each school. Historically, there has been an expectation that the City Council will enter into a pensions Admission Agreement at the request of the LGPS so that staff transferring to the new private sector provider (under TUPE Regulations 2006) can remain members of the Local Government Pension Scheme.
- 5.2 The obligations on the Council where their staff transfer to a new employer but where the services are not being provided to the Council but to its maintained schools, are set out at paragraph 4.3 above. Where the Council are amenable to the transferring staff remaining members of the pension fund, the LGPS require the Council to sign an Admission Agreement as it contains a clause whereby the Council agree to indemnify the LGPS if the new employer fails to make the requisite pension contributions in respect of the transferring staff. In this scenario it is possible to ask the new employer to take out a bank bond of the value of the actuarially assessed risk which would offer some protection in respect of the potential liabilities the Council has incurred by entering into the pensions Admissions Agreement.
- 5.3 There are a number of schools that have made the decision to change provider and the City Council has made a commitment or the school could argue that they made a reasonable assumption that it will act as a guarantor for the transferees in order to facilitate the TUPE transfer process. A list of the Schools in the process of managing the transfer in this situation can be found in Appendix A of this report. As a values based organisation and as good partners to our schools, it proposed that where we have made a clear commitment or the schools have reasonably assumed that we would take this approach, then this should continue to be honoured.
- 5.4 Whilst to date there have been no instances where the Council has actually had to make good its obligations in relation to an indemnity given in an Admission Agreement, it does not mean that such a scenario is not possible. Given the level of financial challenges facing the Council, it is suggested that to continue with the current practice is exposing the City Council unnecessarily to future risk. Therefore it is proposed to actively change policy; so that in all future instances save those listed in Appendix A the City Council will not enter into Admission Agreements to provide an indemnity unless the new employer takes out a bank bond to underwrite the potential liabilities identified by an actuarial assessment. It should be understood that the proposed approach ensures that schools remain free to choose their suppliers whilst ensuring that the Council follows common practice of mitigating potential longer term financial risks arising from the transfer.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

- 6.1 Consideration has been given to continuing with the current practice as this is the easiest way for a transferee to ensure that it is fulfilling its obligations in respect of pensions. However on balance the view is that this unnecessarily exposes the City Council to potential future risk and that in the current financial climate that is neither affordable nor practicable.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):
7.1 To ensure that the Council fulfils its obligations to schools whilst also minimising the level of risk for the Council where such transfer of services takes place.

Signatures	<u>Date</u>
Cabinet Member, Children Families and Schools Councillor Brigid Jones
Cabinet Member, Value for Money & Efficiency Councillor Majid Mahmood
Strategic Director for People Peter Hay

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:
Fair Deal for Staff Pensions – non-statutory guidance – HM Treasury – October 2013
List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
Appendix A – Schools with existing commitment to act as guarantor for Admitted Body Status for the LGPS

Report Version	<u>V10</u>	Dated	<u>20 /01/17</u>
-----------------------	-------------------	--------------	-------------------------

School	Service	Planned leaving date	New Contractor
Brays	Cleaning	TBC once ABS is secured	Enviroserve UK
Minworth	Catering	TBC once ABS is secured	Dolce
New Oscott	Catering	TBC once ABS is secured	Dolce
Penns	Catering	TBC once ABS is secured	Dolce
Wylde Green	Catering	TBC once ABS is secured	Dolce
Sundridge	Catering	TBC once ABS is secured	Dolce

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	Strategic Director- Finance and Legal
Date of Decision:	14th February 2017
SUBJECT:	INNOVATION BIRMINGHAM LIMITED SITE DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 001780/2016
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> N/A O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s) or Relevant Executive Member for Local Services:	Leader
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Cllr Mohammed Aikhlaq- Corporate Resources and Governance
Wards affected:	Nechells

1. Purpose of report:
1.1 To outline strategic initiatives in relation to Innovation Birmingham Ltd (IBL) Group. The exempt matters for consideration are contained in the accompanying report on the private agenda

2. Decision(s) recommended:
That Cabinet:
2.1 notes the report

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Elaine Peach
Telephone No:	0121 303 3938
E-mail address:	Elaine.peach@birmingham.gov.uk

3.	Consultation
	Consultation should include those that have an interest in the decisions recommended
3.1	<p><u>Internal</u></p> <p>Officers from Planning and Regeneration, Birmingham Property Services, Procurement, Finance and legal have been involved in the preparation of this report</p>
3.2	<p><u>External</u></p> <p>Cllr John Clancy, Cllr Lisa Trickett and Cllr Timothy Huxtable who are nominated by the City Council to the Board of IBL have been sent a copy of this report and they support the proposal</p> <p>The Chief Executive of IBL has been fully involved in the preparation of this report</p>
4.	Compliance Issues:
4.1	<p><u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u></p> <p>The proposals in this report support the delivery of attracting investment into the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) area. This contributes to the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+ priority of a strong economy.</p>
4.2	<p><u>Financial Implications</u></p> <p>The financial implications are set out in the accompanying private report</p>
4.3	<p><u>Legal Implications</u></p> <p>Investment in economic development at the Science Park is made pursuant to the general power of competence contained in S1 Localism Act 2011. S123 of the Local Government Act 1972 obliges the Council to dispose of land for the best price reasonably obtainable. Section 111 Local Government Act 1972 allows the Council to do anything which is calculated to facilitate or is conducive or incidental to the discharge of its functions</p>
4.4	<p><u>Public Sector Equality Duty</u></p> <p>An initial Equality Assessment (Ref EA001847) has been undertaken and is attached at Appendix 1. There are no adverse implications identified from the recommendations in this report and a second stage EA is not required</p>

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:	
5.1	The IBL Group which is wholly owned by the City Council operates the Innovation Birmingham Campus, part of 14 acre Birmingham Science Park Aston site adjacent to Aston University. Since its creation in 1982 it has assisted the growth of over 600 businesses and helped to shape, support and develop Birmingham's innovation agenda as a home for entrepreneurs, early stage companies, university spin outs and more mature businesses aligned to the knowledge economy and technology industry.
5.2	The Innovation Birmingham Campus currently comprises Faraday Wharf, iCentrum and Universities Centre. Faraday Wharf which opened in 2001 is an Innovation Centre for start-up and early stage digital technology businesses. iCentrum and Universities Centre both opened in 2016 providing flexible office space for innovative digital businesses and a collaborative workspace and training environment aimed at reducing barriers to effective collaboration between early stage micro enterprises/small businesses and Birmingham's five universities.
5.3	The land from which IBL operates is owned directly by the City Council, but the physical assets are owned directly by IBL
5.4	The City Council has built up the IBL Group to a position of strategic importance to the City and the Region. There are currently over 150 businesses on the Campus, most employing 1-5 people, but several now employ 20-30 so that over 1,100 people are now engaged on the site
5.5	There is potential for further significant growth on the site, with around 90,000sq. ft remaining to be developed. As part of the process to consider the growth options for IBL, the Board has produced and endorsed a Master Plan setting out the basis for the continued physical development of the site
5.6	To enable IBL Group to enter the next stage of strategic development, the accompanying private report sets out options in relation to the City Council's ownership of the IBL Group

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):	
6.1	The evaluation of options is set out in the accompanying private report

7. Reasons for Decision(s):	
7.1	To inform Members of the current position regarding strategic initiatives in relation to the IBL Group

Signatures	<u>Date</u>
Cabinet Member
Chief Officer

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:
--

None

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
--

Appendix 1 Equality Analysis

Report Version	<u>4</u>	Dated	<u>31 January 2017</u>
-----------------------	-----------------	--------------	-------------------------------

Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Innovation Birmingham Limited Site Development And Expansion
Directorate	Corporate Resources
Service Area	Birmingham Property Services - Major Projects
Type	New/Proposed Function
EA Summary	To outline strategic initiatives in relation to Innovation Birmingham Ltd (IBL) Group.
Reference Number	EA001847
Task Group Manager	felicia.saunders@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Date Approved	2017-01-30 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	eden.ottley@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	eden.ottley@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a New/Proposed Function.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Function and expected outcomes?

To outline the long term growth potential of Innovation Birmingham Limited (IBL) Group and to consider options in relation to the City Council's ownership of the IBL Group

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Children: A Safe And Secure City In Which To Learn And Grow	Yes
Health: Helping People Become More Physically Active And Well	Yes
Housing : To Meet The Needs Of All Current And Future Citizens	Yes
Jobs And Skills: For An Enterprising, Innovative And Green City	Yes

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	No
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Not Relevant	No
Disability	Not Relevant	No
Gender	Not Relevant	No
Gender Reassignment	Not Relevant	No
Marriage Civil Partnership	Not Relevant	No
Pregnancy And Maternity	Not Relevant	No
Race	Not Relevant	No
Religion or Belief	Not Relevant	No
Sexual Orientation	Not Relevant	No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

The proposals support the delivery of attracting investment into the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) area. This contributes to the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+ priority of a strong economy.

Planning Officers have been consulted and at this stage there are no direct implications likely to negatively impact the local community.

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

Consultation and engagement has been undertaken with Councillor John Clancy, Cllr Lisa Trickett and Cllr Timothy Huxtable who are nominated by the City Council to the Board of IBL, Officers from Planning and Regeneration, Birmingham Property Services, Finance and Legal who will have an interest in the issue and the Chief Executive of IBL as the manager of IBL.

The City Council has built up the IBL Group to a position of strategic importance to the City and the Region. There are currently over 150 businesses on the Campus, most employing 1-5 people, but several now employ 20-30 so that over 1,100 people are now engaged on the site.

There is potential for further significant growth on the site, with around 90,000 sq ft remaining to be developed. As part of the process to consider the growth options for IBL, the Board has produced and endorsed a Master Plan setting out the basis for the continued physical development of the site.

To enable IBL Group to enter the next stage of strategic development, the City Council is considering options in relation to its ownership of the IBL Group.

There have been no issues raised which impact the wider community negatively, therefore a full equality assessment is not required at this stage.

4 Review Date

30/07/17

5 Action Plan

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	Strategic Director for Change and Corporate Services and the Acting Strategic Director of Place
Date of Decision:	14th February 2017
SUBJECT:	URBAN INNOVATIVE ACTIONS - APPROVAL TO ACCEPT GRANT AND FULL BUSINESS CASE
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002918/2017
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Councillor Ian Ward, Deputy Leader of the Council
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Zafar Iqbal, Economy, Skills and Transport
Wards affected:	Ladywood and Soho

1.	Purpose of report:
1.1	This report seeks to inform the Cabinet of a new innovative project targeting a deprived area of the city which aims to lift people out of poverty by linking them and their talents to macro-assets in their neighbourhood. The total cost of the project is £3.13m (€3.65m).
1.2	To accept £2.51m (€2.91m) grant allocation from the EU's Urban Innovative Actions (UIA) programme for the Unlocking Social and Economic Innovation Together! (USE-IT!) Project.
1.3	Approve the use of £127,953 (€148,426) of BCC contribution to the total 20% match funding resources for this project making a total project budget of £3.13m (€3.65m). NB Grants received from the EU will be paid to the council in Euros. This report uses the exchange rate of 1.16 to show the figures in sterling. The actual rate applied will be that prevailing at the time of receipt.

2.	Decision(s) recommended:
	That the Cabinet:
2.1	Approves the Full Business Case for the Unlocking the Social and Economic Innovation Together! Project at a total cost of £3.13m (€3.65m).
2.2	Accepts the grant award of £2.51m (€2.91m) from the Urban Innovative Actions Programme for the USE-IT! Project
2.3	Approves the use of £127,953 (€148,425) of BCC match funding resources for this project which is 20% of £639,764 (€742,126) total BCC project budget. Match funding is made up of existing salaries within the Place Directorate and Change and Support Services Directorate.
2.4	Approves BCC to be the Accountable Body for the project
2.5	Authorises the City Solicitor to review and complete the legal documentation for the USE –IT! Project on behalf of the City Council as the Lead Authority.

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Lloyd Broad, Head of European & International Affairs
Telephone No:	0121 303 2377
E-mail address:	Lloyd.broad@birmingham.gov.uk

3.	Consultation
3.1	<p><u>Internal consultations pre-May 2016:</u></p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with the Place Directorate (Homes and Neighbourhoods, Ladywood District) Employment Team, Digital Birmingham, Planning and Regeneration, Commissioning Centre for Excellence (Supporting People Knowledge), Equalities and Social Cohesion (officer responsible for policy support to the Child Poverty Commission). Councillor John Cotton attended the initial partner consultation on 5 February 2016. An update on the emerging proposal was sent via email to the Cabinet Members for Neighbourhood Management and Homes, Inclusion and Community Safety, Health and Social Care, Learning and Culture on 17 February. Ward Councillors for the area were also consulted and supported the project.</p> <p><u>Internal consultations post-May 2016:</u></p> <p>Consultations continued with the relevant Cabinet Members in December 2016. Councillors consulted included the Cabinet Members for Health and Social Care, Jobs and Skills, Transparency, Openness and Equality, Housing and Homes, Clean Streets, Recycling and Environment who all expressed their support for the project. Extensive consultations were also conducted with all local councillors. Three of them, Cllr Carl Rice, Cllr Albert Bore and Cllr Kath Hartley, attended the first project stakeholder meeting on the 16th of December 2016 and expressed their support for the project (http://www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/birmingham).</p> <p>Officers from: City Finance and Legal Services, Procurement and Property Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report.</p>
3.2	<p><u>External</u></p> <p>The Project was developed in consultation with partners including Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust, Right Care Right Here partnership, University of Birmingham, Birmingham City University, iSE (Institute for Social Entrepreneurs) - providing development opportunities for social enterprises, KPMG, BVSC, Brushstrokes, Karis Neighbour Scheme, Localise West Midlands, Health Exchange CIC. Sandwell MBC are supportive of the bid and will be part of the broader consultative partnership.</p> <p>The project fits in the Greater Icknield Masterplan and has been thoroughly consulted with Birmingham and Sandwell Development, Planning and Employment Teams.</p>
4.	Compliance Issues:
4.1	<p><u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u></p> <p>The project fully aligns to the Council's Transforming Neighbourhood Strategy and will also build on the Ladywood District Jobs and Skills Plan.</p> <p>The project will be a catalyst to developing greater Community resilience and to developing stronger connections between the community and key infrastructure projects and macro assets such as the Midland Metropolitan Hospital and Icknield Port Loop development.</p> <p>The proposal contributes towards <i>Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+</i>. It contributes specifically to the following key strategic outcomes: 1. Strong economy, 4. Thriving local communities and 5. A healthy, happy population.</p>

It responds to the following objective identified in the Council's Budget 2016-2017:

- Economic growth and jobs – the project will stimulate economic developments and provide support for job creation, skills training and sustainable business growth which will impact greatly on the prosperity and wellbeing of the relevant communities (Greater Icknield - Ladywood and Soho Districts).

It fits strategically and timely with the Greater Icknield Masterplan.

Furthermore it shows the Council tangibly acting in an 'enabling' capacity with other local authority partners, the third sector and Higher Education (HE). The project consortium is built of 15 local partner organisations which are listed in the Full Business Case (Annex 1).

4.2 Financial Implications (decisions will be carried out within existing finance and resources)

The total cost of the project is £3.13m (€3.64m). This is funded as follows:

		€m	£m approx.	*Monthly average exchange rate from January'17 (1.16)
Grant	80%	€2.91	£2.51	
Matched Funding from project partners including BCC's match	20%	€0.73	£0.62	
Total Bid	100%	€3.64	£3.13	

Grant conditions will be detailed in the Grant Agreement between the European Commission and the City Council, based on the activities described in the project application.

Birmingham City Council as Accountable Body will manage the project and ensure that funds are spent to deliver the outputs as specified in the grant agreement. The European Commission may seek to clawback funding if expenditure is deemed ineligible according to European Commission regulations, or if funding is claimed for activities/outputs that did not take place. Partnership Agreements will be put in place between the Council and each delivery partner, to ensure that the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement are complied with and reduce the risk to the Council of clawback. The Partnership Agreements will allow performance and financial risks to be formally managed and mitigated by the Council as the Lead Authority

Costs associated with the funding agreement and undertaking the 'Lead Authority' role will be recovered from programme management resources included within the Project. First advance payment will be sent to BCC 90 days after the Subsidiary Contract signature. BCC will then defray partners on the basis of their quarterly claims submitted to the Contract Manager.

	<p>Birmingham City Councils' total budget will be allocated as follows:</p> <p>Total budget = £639,764 (€742,126)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BCC staff = £362,165 2. Office and Administration (15% flat rate of staff budget heading) = £54,325 3. Formative evaluation (commissioned externally) = £115,566 4. Services (room hire, transport, dissemination event) = £65,843 5. Improvement fund for the Ladywood Health and Community Centre (preparing space for social enterprises) = £30,000 6. Project related travel (including foreign travel) = £7,123 7. Equipment for BCC staff = £4,741 <p>The BCC match funding amounting to £127,953 (€148,425) will be comprised of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place Directorate £30,000 contribution from within existing approved budgets; • Staff time costs of existing City Council staff = £97,953. <p>All 15 partners in the partnership were required to identify a total of 20% match funding; most of which is over 3 years from 1 March 2017 – 31 October 2019 (eligible project start date is November 2016 and retrospection is allowed by the European Commission to account for the project preparation and Initiation Phase that was planned from 1 November 2016 – 28 February 2017). There is a subsequent 4th year for project closedown and dissemination activities. No match funding is required for the final year. These match funding commitments have been confirmed in writing by the project partners.</p> <p>There will not be any on-going revenue consequences to the City Council when this project is completed.</p>
4.3	<p><u>Legal Implications</u></p> <p>Under the general power of competence in Section 1 Localism Act 2011, the Council has the power to enter into the arrangements set out in this report and they are within the boundaries and limits of the general power of competence in Sections 2 and 4 Localism Act 2011. Legal and compliance issues associated with the EU grant and project will be resolved within the conditions of grant aid.</p>
4.4	<p><u>Public Sector Equality Duty</u></p> <p>Initial Equality Analysis (EA001241) has been performed in March 2016 and was submitted with the Cabinet Report on the 22 March 2016 seeking the approval to bid. The Cabinet endorsed the Analysis on the 22 March 2016.</p>

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:	
5.1	<p><u>Key dates:</u></p> <p>The Urban Innovative Actions Programme is a new EU funded programme, launched in December 2015. The Programme funds innovative, bold and creative ideas to tackle urban challenges. The Programme is a rare opportunity for the city and its partners to experiment and test how new and unproven solutions work in practice and how they respond to the complexity of real life.</p> <p>The first UIA call for proposal was launched in February 2016. Following approval by Cabinet on 22 March 2016, Birmingham City Council led a partnership bid into the EU's new Urban Innovative Actions Programme under the Urban Poverty theme.</p> <p>The official results were announced on 12 October 2016. Birmingham was one of only 18 EU cities (and the only UK City) selected out of 378 applications submitted under the first call for proposals. This approval followed a rigorous 3-stage assessment process by the Urban Innovative Actions secretariat.</p> <p>Offer letter was sent to Birmingham City Council from the UIA Secretariat on 2 November 2016 (attached as appendix 2).</p>
5.2	<p><u>Project Implementation</u></p> <p>Subject to Cabinet Approval, project Delivery Phase will be from 1 March 2016 – 31 October 2019 (+ 1 year for project closedown and dissemination).</p> <p>Project Initiation Phase has started on 1 November 2016 (the project can claim expenditures retrospectively and the eligible project start date has been confirmed as 1 November 2016). The proposed project has until the end of February 2017 to successfully complete the Project Initiation Phase and sign Partnership Agreements with all 14 local delivery partners. Contract negotiations are ongoing with the UIA Secretariat and the grant will be confirmed after this phase is completed. All requirements have been fulfilled and tasks completed on time. Partners' match funding has been confirmed (see Full Business Case attached).</p>
5.3	<p><u>Background:</u></p> <p>The project titled USE- IT! (Unlocking Social and Economic Innovation Together) totals £3.13m (£3.64m) 80% of which will be grant £2.51m (£2.91m), 20% match funding from partners, £0.62m (£0.73m). The USE–IT! Project will be managed by Birmingham City Council on behalf of a consortium of public, HE, private and the third sector partners (15 local partner organisations). £2.51m (£2.91m) grant is available over 3 years (+1 year for project closedown and dissemination).</p> <p>The project will test new place-based approaches to urban poverty in Ladywood and Soho, focussing on the interconnectedness of a number of causal factors that contribute towards cyclical poverty. The project will Unlock Social and Economic Innovation Together (USE-IT!) in deprived neighbourhoods; linking citizens (micro-assets) found within the community with macro-assets. The project outcomes and impact has been outlined in the Full Business Case.</p>

5.4	<p>The geographical test-bed is the area of Birmingham from Ladywood, Soho, to the site of the new Midland Metropolitan Hospital in Sandwell. The University of Birmingham identified this as a functional economic area with significant macro assets (e.g.: the new Hospital, four major housing redevelopments) and persistently high levels of multiple deprivation.</p> <p>Reductions in public sector finance, failure of previous public policies and the increasing complexity and fragmentation of initiatives, means that people in many neighbourhoods live with persistent levels of deep-seated poverty.</p> <p>USE-IT! is innovative in that it aims to buck this trend. It will take the learning of previous policy initiatives as a starting point, but will pioneer a new approach. USE – IT! will connect ‘top down’ growth strategies while growing ‘bottom up’ capacity, resilience and solutions to re-shape the offer of public services, and the offer of business, the community and citizens.</p> <p>USE-IT! will empower citizens and stakeholders to identify their economic and social challenges and to produce solutions built upon the assets rooted in the community, creating new economic opportunities and social capital. Detailed measures and deliverables are included in the FBC.</p> <p>There will be Work Packages on the following: Project Management, Communications, Community research, Strengthening civil capacity and finance, Matching jobs skills in the community with demand, Supporting social entrepreneurship. See the attached project summary for further information (Annex 1).</p> <p>The governance for USE-IT! (Appendix A) will be led by an inclusive partnership steering group to drive forward the project implementation and delivery. A particularly innovative feature will be a proposed challenge panel made up of local citizens and we will also invite innovation agencies and specialists e.g. NESTA (http://www.nesta.org.uk/), RSA (https://www.thersa.org/). (Stakeholder analysis has been attached to the Full Business Case Appendix C).</p> <p><u>Context:</u> EU Urban Agenda</p> <p>It should also be noted that the UIA Programme is one of the key funding instruments connected to the EU Urban Agenda, which aims to coordinate European policy and funding aimed at cities in order to get the best outcome. Birmingham City Council is the Co-Chair of the EURO CITIES EU Urban Agenda Working Group and has also been invited to one of the thematic partnerships working on urban poverty at the EU level. Birmingham joins Ile de France (Paris), Lille (France), Brussels Capital Region (Belgium) to progress and better coordinate policy and funding instruments leading to tangible and sustainable positive outcomes for cities in relation to urban poverty. This EU level engagement has positioned the city positively and allowed us to draw down funding for this project.</p> <p>Birmingham is represented on the EU Urban Poverty Platform by the Head of European & International Affairs working with the Acting Strategic Director of Place.</p>
-----	---

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):	
6.1	Do not accept funding offer of £2.51m (€2.91m) UIA/ERDF funding. This option would limit an ability to test new approaches with partners and communities in their neighbourhood and potentially damage the reputation of the City Council.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):	
7.1	To accept the Urban Innovative Actions Programme funding for the USE-IT! Project, up to a maximum grant of £2.51m (€2.91m) to deliver a new and innovative approach to Urban Poverty in one of Birmingham's deprived neighbourhoods.
7.2	To facilitate new partnership arrangements allowing the Council to provide an enabling and brokering role with stakeholders whilst maintaining local leadership and accountability.

Signatures		<u>Date</u>
Councillor Ian Ward Deputy Leader of the Council
Jacqui Kennedy Acting Strategic Director for Place
Angela Probert Strategic Director for Change and Corporate Services

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:	
1	Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+
2	Neighbourhood Plan
3	Report to the Cabinet seeking approval to bid endorsed by the Cabinet on 22 March 2016.

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):	
1.	Full Business Case with attachments
2	Offer letter sent to Birmingham City Council by the UIA Secretariat on 2 November 2016

Report Version	<u>FINAL</u>	Dated	<u>2.02.17</u>
-----------------------	---------------------	--------------	-----------------------

PROTOCOL PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

- 1 The public sector equality duty drives the need for equality assessments (Initial and Full). An initial assessment should, be prepared from the outset based upon available knowledge and information.
- 2 If there is no adverse impact then that fact should be stated within the Report at section 4.4 and the initial assessment document appended to the Report duly signed and dated. A summary of the statutory duty is annexed to this Protocol and should be referred to in the standard section (4.4) of executive reports for decision and then attached in an appendix; the term 'adverse impact' refers to any decision-making by the Council which can be judged as likely to be contrary in whole or in part to the equality duty.
- 3 A full assessment should be prepared where necessary and consultation should then take place.
- 4 Consultation should address any possible adverse impact upon service users, providers and those within the scope of the report; questions need to assist to identify adverse impact which might be contrary to the equality duty and engage all such persons in a dialogue which might identify ways in which any adverse impact might be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, reduced.
- 5 Responses to the consultation should be analysed in order to identify:
 - (a) whether there is adverse impact upon persons within the protected categories
 - (b) what is the nature of this adverse impact
 - (c) whether the adverse impact can be avoided and at what cost – and if not –
 - (d) what mitigating actions can be taken and at what cost
- 6 The impact assessment carried out at the outset will need to be amended to have due regard to the matters in (4) above.
- 7 Where there is adverse impact the final Report should contain:
 - a summary of the adverse impact and any possible mitigating actions (in section 4.4 or an appendix if necessary)
 - the full equality impact assessment (as an appendix)
 - the equality duty – see page 9 (as an appendix).

Equality Act 2010

The Executive must have due regard to the public sector equality duty when considering Council reports for decision.

The public sector equality duty is as follows:

1	<p>The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
2	<p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
3	<p>The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.</p>
4	<p>Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.
5	<p>The relevant protected characteristics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Age (b) Disability (c) gender reassignment (d) pregnancy and maternity (e) Race (f) religion or belief (g) Sex (h) sexual orientation

Full Business Case (FBC)

1. General Information

Directorate	Change and Support Services	Portfolio/Committee	Committee
Project Title	USE-IT! (UNLOCKING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INNOVATION TOGETHER)	Project Code	Forward Plan ref: 0002918/2017
Project Description	<p>Background</p> <p>The UIA Programme is a new initiative of the European Commission that has been launched to address urban challenges. It is the only funding stream that provides an opportunity to tackle urban poverty as a whole without having to deal with fragmented (often conflicting) funding streams. Local authorities were the only organisations invited to bid as it has been proved they are best placed to assess the scale of urban challenges and come up with innovative ideas on how to tackle them.</p> <p>Birmingham City Council is the Co-Chair of the EUROCITIES EU Urban Agenda Working Group and has also been invited to one of the thematic partnerships working on urban poverty at the EU level. This EU level engagement has positioned the city positively and allowed us to draw down funding for this project.</p> <p>Approval to bid was obtained from the Cabinet on 22 March 2016.</p> <p>Full application was duly submitted to the Urban Innovative Actions on 31 March 2016. Birmingham's bid was one of 378 proposals submitted by local authorities from across Europe. We were notified that our application has been accepted on the 12 of October 2016 as the only English project among only 18 projects from Europe.</p> <p>Birmingham proposal titled USE-IT! (Unlocking Social and Economic Innovation Together) totals £3.13m (€3.64m). 80% of which will be grant (£2.51m) and 20% match funding from partners (£0.62m). The USE-IT! Project will be managed by Birmingham City Council on behalf of a consortium of public, HE, private and the third sector partners. The large and innovative partnership brings together 15 local partner organisations as well as Sandwell MBC and KPMG who are associate partners. £2.51m grant is available over 3 years (+ 1 year for project closedown and dissemination).</p> <p>The project budget has been distributed between all 15 partners and all of them are a part of the consortia. Partnership Agreements (Conditions of Grant Aid) will be signed with all 14 partners. Detailed budget profile breakdown, approved by the European Commission has been shown below (point 2).</p> <p>Project proposal:</p> <p>The project will test new place-based approaches to urban poverty in the Greater Icknield transect, focussing on the interconnectedness of a number of causal factors that contribute towards cyclical poverty, like lack of aspirations, distance from the labour market, lack of entrepreneurial support. The project will Unlock Social and Economic Innovation Together (USE-IT!) in deprived neighbourhoods; linking micro-assets found within the community (talents, skills, micro-capital) with macro-assets like large infrastructure projects generating jobs and stimulating local economy.</p> <p>In doing so, the project aims to reduce the demand for public services, whilst also boosting the supplier side through citizens and socially innovative producers.</p> <p>The geographical test-bed is the area of Greater Icknield (Birmingham from Ladywood, Soho, to the site of the new Midland Metropolitan Hospital in Sandwell). The University of Birmingham identified this as a functional economic area with significant macro assets (e.g.: the new Hospital, four major housing redevelopments) and persistently high levels of multiple deprivation.</p>		

Reductions in public sector finance, failure of previous public policies and the increased complexity and fragmentation of initiatives, means that people in many neighbourhoods live with persistent levels of deep-seated poverty.

USE-IT! is innovative in that it aims to buck this trend. USE-IT! will empower citizens and stakeholders to identify their economic and social challenges through Community-led Action Research and to produce solutions built upon the assets rooted in the community, creating new economic opportunities and social capital.

Outcomes

This project's main outcome will be a comprehensive place based model of support (strong partnership working model supported by sustainable financing models) that, if successful, could be transferred to other districts/wards or cities. The project will test the idea of linking large capital investment (in this case the Midland Metropolitan Hospital and Icknield Port Loop Housing development) with micro-assets existing in the community surrounding the investment area i.e. talents, skills, ideas, micro-funding (crowd funding, endowment). In addition to this, a Social Impact Bond scheme is planned to make a positive impact on the public health in the targeted community. This will be launched in the final project phase and has been included in the proposal as an exit and sustainability strategy.

Qualitative outcomes would include a number of social enterprises supported which will be linked to the new hospital and the housing development, i.e. cafes, shops, community gardens etc. The project plans to engage with at least 110 social enterprises and support up to 60 social enterprises (including 15 new start-ups created). 15 local schools will be involved in the social enterprise awareness programme and a total of 45 work placements for the local people will be created within social enterprises.

Employment outcomes within NHS will amount to 225 individuals supported and at least 60 medical jobs filled. The project will also explore pathways into non-medical jobs in NHS for the residents of the Greater Icknield transect. Communities targeted will be from both Birmingham and Sandwell constituencies (50/50 split). Close working relationship has been established with Birmingham Employment team to link residents with the construction sector and other relevant sectors / programmes available (i.e. Youth Promise Plus). This project is unique in that it offers an opportunity for Birmingham Employment Teams to work with Sandwell Employment Teams and allow for cross-referrals and joint actions across geographical boundaries. The aim is to target communities surrounding the main two developments (MMH and Icknield Port Loop Housing Development) and refer people in the community into jobs linked with these large assets.

A part of the project will be an action research project that has been designed to analyse the community and gather data on the scales and reasons of poverty as well as provide answers to questions on how to best support these people out of poverty. A direct impact of this package will be on the people in the community selected as Community Researchers (60 participants). We will support them to raise their aspirations and to access affordable educational and training opportunities.

With residents, local authorities, universities, social enterprise and NHS working as equals, we hope our activities will fundamentally change the way these partners deliver and shape, education and training, investment, business support and community collaborations. We will use the intelligence and results emerging from USE-IT! as a basis for feasibility work to inform how we strengthen and use innovative forms of finance to continue to connect macro-assets and micro-assets longer-term to provide a sustainable way of ensuring the results of the project continue to be supported beyond the UIA programme. We shall do this by putting the residents and their 'lived expertise' at the centre of decision making.

Consultations and strategic fit

The project fits in the Greater Icknield Masterplan and has been thoroughly consulted with Birmingham and Sandwell Development, Planning and Employment Teams.

Consultations continued with the relevant Cabinet Members in December 2016. Councillors consulted included the Cabinet Members for Health and Social Care, Jobs and Skills, Transparency, Openness and Equality, Housing and Homes, Clean Streets, Recycling and Environment who all expressed their support for the project. Extensive consultations were also conducted with all local councillors. Three of them, Cllr Carl Rice, Cllr Albert Bore and Cllr Kath Hartley, attended the first project stakeholder meeting on the 16th of December 2016 and expressed their support for the project (<http://www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/birmingham>).

The key principles of the USE-IT! project are:

- Unlock Social and Economic Innovation Together (USE-IT!)
- Reduce demand for public services
- Boost the supplier side through citizens and socially innovative producers
- Create greater innovation that links major urban developments adjacent to poor neighbourhoods
- Create greater substitutability in the use of resource
- Ensure greater integration of the poor into major developments
- Improve city-regional resilience and sustainable urban development
- Empower citizens and stakeholders to identify their economic and social challenges and produce solutions built upon the assets rooted in the community
- Create new economic opportunities and social capital
- Test the idea of linking large capital investment with micro-assets existing in the community surrounding the investment area (i.e. talents, ideas, micro-funding)
- Engage and support social enterprises

Governance

The governance for USE-IT! will be led by an inclusive partnership steering group to drive forward the project implementation and delivery. A particularly innovative feature will be a proposed Community Challenge Panel made up of local citizens. There is a plan to also invite innovation agencies and specialists (e.g. Nesta, Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce).

All project partners have well defined roles and responsibilities within the eight Work Packages:

1. Birmingham City Council
2. University of Birmingham
3. Karis Neighbour Scheme
4. iSE (Initiative for Social Entrepreneurs)
5. Birmingham Voluntary Services Council (BVSC)
6. Localise West Midlands
7. Smethwick Church Action Network
8. Co-operative Futures
9. Birmingham City University
10. Canal and River Trust
11. Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust
12. Father Hudson's Care (Brushstrokes)
13. Health Exchange CIC
14. Birmingham Chamber of Commerce
15. Citizen Coaching CIC

The following eight Work Packages have been designed:

Work package 1 – Project preparation (Timeframe: 12/2015-10/2016)

Researching, drafting and submitting the bid. (*Lead: Birmingham City Council. Contact: Jennifer.crisp@birmingham.go.uk*)

Work package 2 – Project management (Timeframe: 11/2016-10/2019)

The putting in place of transparent governance structures and processes, to ensure that all project activities are accurately administered and financially compliant with the rules and regulations governing the grant. (Lead: Birmingham City Council, European and International Affairs. Contact: Karolina.medwecka@birmingham.gov.uk and Lesley Poulton, Ladywood District Manager working as Project Partnership Manager. Contact: Lesley.Poulton@birmingham.gov.uk)

Work package 3 – Communication (Timeframe: 11/2016-10/2019)

Managing the communications strategy and actions to enable citizens, public services and academia to come together, practically and meaningfully, to communicate the aims and results of USE IT! (Lead: Birmingham City University. Contact: Susannah.Goh@bcu.ac.uk)

Work package 4 - Community research training: unlocking innovation in Sustainable Urban Development for Deprived Urban Communities (Timeframe: 11/2016-10/2019)

Recruitment and training of 60 Community Researchers (CRs) over the lifetime of USE-IT! These CRs will be enabled to have leadership roles to drive and influence change; they will be trained in research methods aimed at unlocking and linking opportunities in new urban developments. CRs will identify challenges and innovations to problems that traditional public policies have failed.

The work and findings of the Community Researchers will provide community-based intelligence that will feed into all other Work Packages: Their work will inform the creation of a matching skills service to enhance employment support and support for poor communities to spin-out social enterprises that are socially innovative or build economic outputs from existing resources. We will also build on community assets to identify innovative forms of community finance that could be sustainably used longer-term in this area and to support replication. (Lead: University of Birmingham. Contact: P.W.LEE@bham.ac.uk)

Work package 5 - Matching job skills in the community with demand (12/2016-10/2019)

This work package will have a particular (although not exclusive) focus on the health sector, matching job skills in the community with demand. This Work Package will:

- Gather data on existing & future skills shortages in the local economy.
- Link to CRs to discover residents with the appropriate but underutilised qualifications.
- Offer these individuals tailored support to address any immediate day-to-day concerns such as health, legal or benefits advice.
- Pair them with a skills matched mentor.

(Lead: Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust. Contact: James.pollitt@nhs.net supported by Conrad Parke, Sandwell MBC Conrad.parke@sanwell.gov.uk)

Work Package 6 - Social enterprise and social production (Timeframe: 01/2017-10/2019)

This work package takes a place-based approach to supporting residents to trade their way out of poverty and social exclusion by supporting the creation of a community of social entrepreneurs. This innovative approach takes the collective use of 'assets' from the community, private enterprise or the public sector to create new replicable economic models to stimulate social enterprise to address social, economic and environmental issues in this area of Birmingham.

The work package will build a critical mass of social entrepreneurs working to solve issues and react to market opportunities across health, food, technology, education and tourism. This network will develop links between local people, businesses, public sector bodies, local groups and local investors to create a body of likeminded people keen to connect with, and support community-rooted entrepreneurs and social producers. The project plans to engage with at least 110 social enterprises and support up to 60 social enterprises (including 15 new start-ups created). 15 local schools will be involved in the social enterprise awareness programme and a total of 45 work placements for

the local people will be created within social enterprises. (Lead: iSE (Initiative for Social Entrepreneurs). Contact: Sarah.Crawley@i-se.co.uk)

Work Package 7 - Understanding and strengthening community assets and finance (Timeframe: 12/2016-10/2019)

This work package will provide a baseline analysis of current community capital assets and finance going into the community. Crucially, this WP will use the intelligence and results emerging from USE-IT! as a basis for feasibility work to inform how we strengthen and use innovative forms of finance to continue to connect macro-assets (for example businesses with a stake in the area such as developers responsible for key regeneration sites and large institutions such as the NHS Hospital Trust) and micro-assets longer-term to provide a sustainable way of ensuring the results of the project continue to be supported beyond the UIA programme.

This strand will provide support to the social impact bond scheme the project plans to set up in the final delivery year. It may also include recommendations on establishing a community endowment, social bond, crowd-sourced finance etc. This will include an analysis of the resources and interests of potential funding sources / donors and how they align to specific community needs and opportunities that USE-IT! has tested and developed. (Co-Lead: Birmingham City Council and iSE. Contact:

Karolina.medwecka@birmingham.gov.uk and Sarah.crawley@i-se.co.uk)

Work Package 8 – Closure and knowledge transfer (Timeframe: 11/2019-10/2020)

This work package will oversee the administrative closure of the project providing the UIA secretariat with the required administrative documents, final progress report, audited expenditure and final payment claim. It will also ensure the effective knowledge transfer from the project by producing a final qualitative evaluation report (with support from UIA experts) drawing on the main lessons learnt and that captures the main knowledge generated during project implementation, as well as participating in national and / or international conferences to share the main lessons learnt and to explore the possibility to actively transfer the project to other cities across Europe. (Lead: Birmingham City Council. Contact: Karolina.medwecka@birmingham.gov.uk)

Management

Birmingham City Council will act as project's Lead Accountable Body.

Place Directorate will provide partnership management and strategic oversight (0.3 FTE, Head of Ladywood District (GR7)) and the European & International Affairs Team will provide Contract Manager (1x FTE (GR5)) and finance support (0.7 FTE (GR4/5)). Other BCC teams relevant to the content of the project have been engaged in the project design and will continue to be engaged in implementation.

These teams include: Employment, Commissioning Centre for Excellence, Planning and Regeneration.

Birmingham City Council (BCC) will lead the Project Management Work package (see WP2) and co-lead WP7 (as explained above).

Financial Implications (decisions will be carried out within existing finance and resources)

Grant conditions will be detailed in the Grant Agreement between the European Commission and the City Council, based on the activities described in the project application.

Birmingham City Council as Accountable Body will manage the project and ensure that funds are spent to deliver the outputs as specified in the grant agreement. The European Commission may seek to clawback funding if expenditure is deemed ineligible according to European Commission regulations, or if funding is claimed for activities/outputs that did not take place.

A Partnership Contract will be put in place with each delivery partner, to ensure that the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement are delegated accordingly. The Partnership Contract will allow performance and financial risks to be formally managed

and mitigated by the Council as the Lead Authority. First advance payment will be sent to Birmingham City Council 90 days after the Subsidiary Contract's signature. BCC will then defray partners on the basis of quarterly claims submitted to the Contract Manager.

Costs associated with the funding agreement and undertaking the 'Lead Authority' role will be recovered from programme management resources included within the Project.

BCC's total budget of £639,764.03 will be allocated as follows:

1. BCC existing staff = £362,165.11
2. Office and Administration (15% flat rate of staff budget heading) = £54,324.77
3. Formative evaluation (commissioned externally) = £115,566.40
4. Services (room hire, transport, dissemination event) = £65,843.09
5. Small improvement fund for the Ladywood Health and Community Centre (preparing space for social enterprises) = €30,000
6. Project related travel (including foreign travel) = £7,123.28
7. Equipment for BCC staff = £4,741.38

Revenue Consequences

There are no on-going revenue consequences for Birmingham City Council after the close of this scheme.

Legal Implications

Under the general power of competence in Section 1 Localism Act 2011, the Council has the power to enter into the arrangements set out in this report and they are within the boundaries and limits of the general power of competence in Sections 2 and 4 Localism Act 2011.

Legal and compliance issues associated with the EU grant and project will be delivered within the conditions of grant aid.

Public Sector Equality Duty

Initial Equality Analysis (EA001241) has been performed in March 2016 and submitted with the Cabinet Report seeking the approval to bid.

Procurement and Sub-Contracting

Planned sub-contracting activity:

- external evaluation £ 115,566.40 (below OJEU threshold)
- room hire and transport hire = £ 65,843.09 (below OJEU threshold)
- small improvement fund for Ladywood Health and Community Centre to prepare the space for social enterprises = £30,000.00 (below OJEU level)

Commissioning of external evaluation will commence in the 2Q of 2017. Room hire and transport hire are on-going costs related to the organisation of external meetings in the project delivery area. Small improvement works in the Council owned Ladywood Health and Community Centre have been planned for early 2018.

Contract Management and Monitoring

The Council will lead the contract management in respect of all commissioned USE-IT! activity. This activity will also include management of partnership agreements (Conditions of Grant Aid) signed with all 14 project formal partners and will be led by the project Contract Manager supported by project Finance Officers accountable to the Contract Manager. They will ensure delivery and compliance through implementing the

Council's monitoring process set out in detail below. As a minimum the approach will include the following elements:

- written monthly claim submission
- regular verification visits to coincide with claims
- half yearly detailed spot checks involving sample audit procedures
- formal annual contract reviews.

Funding Package

The project is based on a gross value of £3.13m. 80% of which will be grant £2.51m, 20% match funding from partners, £0.62m (exchange rate from the month of the relevant grant payment will be applied). Budget will be used over four financial years (2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20) with an envisaged start date of November 2016 (retrospection is allowed by the European Commission to account for the project preparation and Initiation Phase planned from 1 November 2016 – 28 February 2017). Delivery is planned until 31 October 2019; project closedown and dissemination until 31 October 2020.

In line with EU guidance, this gross value is to be made up as follows:

		€m	£m approx.	Monthly average exchange rate from January'17
Grant	80%	€2.91	£2.51	
Matched Funding from project partners including BCC's match	20%	€0.73	£0.62	
Total Bid	100%	€3.64	£3.13	

The BCC match funding amounting to £127,953 will be comprised of:

- Place Directorate £30,000 contribution from existing approved budgets,
- Staff time costs of existing BCC staff = £97,953

All 15 partners in the partnership were required to identify 20% match funding; most of which is over 3 years from 1 November 2016 – 31 October 2019. There is a subsequent 4th year for project closedown and dissemination activities.

	Partner organisation	£ Total Grant funding	£ Total Match funding
		Financial years 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/2020	
	Birmingham City Council	511,811.22	127,952.80
	The University of Birmingham (UoB)	628,515.39	157,128.84
	Karis Neighbour Scheme	37,941.82	9,485.46
	Initiative for Social Entrepreneurs [iSE]	443,160.34	110,790.09
	Birmingham Voluntary Services Council (BVSC)	18,747.29	4,686.83
	Localise West Midlands	12,413.79	3,103.45
	Smethwick Church Action Network (Smethwick CAN)	21,899.25	5,474.82
	Co-operative Futures	188,965.52	47,241.38
	Birmingham City University	160,994.34	40,248.59
	Canal and River Trust	9,373.65	2,343.41
	Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust	155,426.95	38,856.73
	Father Hudson's Care	37,941.82	9,485.46
	Health Exchange CIC	197,379.21	49,344.80
	Greater Birmingham Chambers of Commerce	29,793.10	7,448.28
	Citizen Coaching CIC	55,889.66	13,972.41
	Total USE-IT!	2,510,253.34	627,563.34
	Commitment to the match funding outlined above from external partners has been confirmed in writing by all partners.		
	Revenue consequences <p>There are not on-going revenue consequences for Birmingham City Council beyond those identified in this report.</p> <p>They City will be the Accountable Body for the EU grant which will involve receiving grant on behalf of partnership. To minimise the risk of clawback the Accountable Body will ensure that all grant conditions are enforced through back to back partnership agreements with all Delivery Partners. This will be managed so as to ensure that there are no on-going capital/revenue implications for BCC. Further details as to how such risks will be managed are included in the Risk Register (Appendix C).</p>		
Links to Corporate and Service Outcomes	<p>The proposal contributes towards <i>Council business plan and budget 2016+</i>. It contributes specifically to the following key strategic outcomes: 1. Strong economy, 4. Thriving local communities and 5. A healthy, happy population.</p> <p>It responds to the following objective identified in the Council's budget 2016-2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Economic growth and jobs – the project will stimulate economic developments 		

	<p>and provide support for job creation, skills training and sustainable business growth which will impact greatly on the prosperity and wellbeing of the relevant communities (Greater Icknield - Ladywood and Soho Districts).</p> <p>The project cuts across portfolio of five Cabinet Members (Cabinet Members for Health and Social Care, Jobs and Skills, Transparency, Openness and Equality, Housing and Homes, Clean Streets, Recycling and Environment).</p> <p>It fits strategically and timely with the Greater Icknield Masterplan.</p>		
Project Definition Document Approved by	N/A	Date of Approval	N/A
Benefits Quantification-Impact on Outcomes	Measure		Impact
	<p><u>WP4 Community Research Training:</u> Unlocking innovation in Sustainable Urban Development for Deprived Urban Communities: 60 community researchers trained over three years, 12 community ambassadors identified, 3000 residents interviewed, 3 analytic reports produced (evaluation of the process conducted), 1 strategy for widening participation in HE developed, 10 dissertations on urban poverty developed on the basis on the community research, 2 MA dissertation for members of the community funded.</p>		<p>Improved dialogue between the community and the organisations delivering support and policies that affect them,</p> <p>Impact on the community: A direct impact of this package will be on the people in the community who will be selected as Community Researchers (60 participants). We will support them to raise their aspirations and to access affordable educational and training opportunities.</p> <p>Improvement of the lives of individuals and communities living in the targeted area (life expectancy, health, etc). This will be measured against another community – not targeted where community researchers will work during the last year of the project delivery.</p> <p>Impact on policy making: Community Researchers will be involved in the Community Challenge Board which will give an opportunity to discuss empowerment and bottom up policy making and shape the strategy for future engagement.</p>
	<p><u>WP5 Matching job skills in the community with demand:</u> The development of a replicable model of identification, engagement and support for migrants with unrecognised overseas qualifications will result in a better utilised human resources in the area that suffers from skills shortages (medical sector).</p>		<p>Outputs will be 225 residents accessing the service and entering job pathways, 60 individuals supported to sustainable (better paid) jobs.</p> <p>The impact of this activity will be two-fold – filling in the skill gap in NHS (primarily medical sector but not only) and supporting individuals living in the community adjacent to the hospital to better paid jobs.</p> <p>The desirable result will be the change of the income profile in the community living nearby the hospital.</p>
	<p><u>WP6 Social Enterprise and Social Production:</u> A tailored programme of support developed for individuals with</p>		<p>Outputs: The project plans to engage with at least 110 social enterprises and support up to 60 social</p>

	entrepreneurial skills who would then set up their own social enterprises and contribute to the economy of their neighbourhood.	enterprises (including 15 new start-ups created). 15 local schools will be involved in the social enterprise awareness programme and a total of 45 work placements for the local people will be created within social enterprises. Impact: will be created by linking the adjacent community with the investment and creating synergy effect on the whole community through unlocking self-determination and self-creation of opportunities.
	WP7 Understanding and strengthening community assets and finance: Sustainable financing models developed for the social enterprises created/developed.	Outputs: two financial models will be tested: Social Impact Bonds and Social Business Investors (Angels). Impact: sustainable finance mechanism provided for social businesses created (exit strategy).
Project Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WP4: 60 community researchers trained over three years, 12 community ambassadors identified, 3000 residents interviewed, 3 analytic reports produced (evaluation of the process conducted), 1 strategy for widening participation in HE developed, 10 dissertations on urban poverty developed on the basis on the community research, 2 MA dissertation for members of the community funded WP5: 225 residents accessing the service and entering job pathways, 60 individuals supported to sustainable (better paid) jobs. WP6: 110 social enterprises engaged and up to 60 social enterprises supported (including 15 new start-ups created). 15 local schools involved in the social enterprise awareness programme and a total of 45 work placements for the local people created within social enterprises. WP7: Sustainable financing models developed for the social enterprises created/developed. 	
Scope	<p>Our initial focus is on residents living in the Greater Icknield area (Birmingham from Ladywood, Soho, to the site of the new Midland Metropolitan Hospital in Sandwell). The University of Birmingham identified this as a functional economic area with significant macro assets (e.g.: the new Hospital, four major housing redevelopments) and persistently high levels of high levels of multiple deprivation.</p> <p>Reductions in public sector finance, failure of previous public policies and the increased complexity and fragmentation of initiatives, means that people in many neighbourhoods live with persistent levels of deep-seated poverty. We will target the community with a large outreach and action research programme looking particularly for individuals with medical skills linking them with NHS jobs (WP5) and entrepreneurial skills referring them to the Social Enterprise support programme (WP6).</p>	
Scope exclusions	<p>Individuals from outside Greater Icknield.</p> <p>Some individuals will be eligible for WP6 support providing that their social enterprises will contribute to the Greater Icknield economy, i.e. move their operations to Ladywood Health and Community Centre or Soho Foundry (Sandwell).</p>	
Dependencies on other projects or activities	<p>The project is dependent upon the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsidiary Contract to be issued by the European Commission (expected before the end of February 2017). Project Partners The success of the project is highly dependent on every individual partner. Every partner has the responsibility to observe the rules that come from the UIA and with the project. They bear the responsibility for outcomes in their individual work packages. They are also responsible for match funding they pledged. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Packages The project can only be successful if all the activities are carried out as Planned – in line with the application form accepted by the EC. • Changes Only two major changes are allowed to be made during the life cycle of the entire project (excluding initiation phase), which means that all stakeholders have to stick to their plans carefully. • Changes in political/economic/labour market context affecting demand or ability to achieve positive employment outcomes – particularly important in case of WP5 working with individuals with unrecognised overseas qualifications.
Achievability	<p>Significant progress has been made in developing an effective and unique delivery partnership and securing the required match funding package at the local level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full application for the project has been submitted on 31 March 2016 and selected for funding by the European Commission's evaluation panel. • Project Initiation Phase (current) needs to be closed and the project needs to move to the Delivery Stage – subject to the UIA Secretariat approval of: 1. Revised application form uploaded, 2. Justification of changes submitted to the UIA Secretariat, 3. Individual Partnership Agreements between BCC and partners established. All requirements have been met within deadlines set up by the UIA Secretariat – deadline for partnership Agreements with delivery partners is end of February 2017. • Regular meetings are held together with all WP-leads every two weeks, which keep all participants up to date. Those meetings are also used to discuss/solve potential issues that may have come up, which makes it possible to work together closely. • A training for all partners took place on 20th January 2017. This training was lead by BCC project management and served to inform everyone about rules and guidelines of the project that have to be realised by each partner. <p>Key risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing project continuity and delivery if / when there are staff changes in the partnership or within the Project Management team (Contract Manager, Partnership Manager and Finance Officer) of the lead partner • Partnership too big to manage – this can delay decisions and make it hard to work towards common objectives and aspirations. • Recruitment of Community Researchers delayed or ineffective. • Lack of sufficient residents with overseas qualifications (NHS relevant) • Delayed identification of social enterprises or potential social entrepreneurs willing to take part in the project • Exchange rate fluctuation – risk will be shared with all delivery partners <p>Risks will be managed to remove or mitigate them as far as possible and a risk register is include at Appendix C.</p>
Project Managers	Karolina Medwecka, 0121 303 3064, Karolina.Medwecka@birmingham.gov.uk
Budget Holder	Lloyd Broad, 0121 303 2377, Lloyd.Broad@birmingham.gov.uk
Sponsor	Lloyd Broad, 0121 303 2377, Lloyd.Broad@birmingham.gov.uk and Lesley Poulton, Head of Ladywood District, Lesley.poulton@birmingham.gov.uk
Project Accountant	Sukki Dhaliwal, 0121 303 4670, Sukki.Dhaliwal@birmingham.gov.uk and Nathan Smallwood, 0121 303 4670, Nathan.smallwood@birmingham.gov.uk
Project Board Members	Lesley Poulton (BCC), Karolina Medwecka (BCC), Susannah Goh (Birmingham City University), Peter W. Lee (UoB), James Pollitt (NHS), Sarah Crawley (iSE); Sukki Dhaliwal (BCC).

Head of City Finance (HoCF)		Date of HoCF Approval:	
------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--

2. Budget Summary

Capital Costs & Funding (revenue project)	Voyager Code	Financial Year 1 2016/17	Financial Year 2 2017/18	Financial Year 3 2018/19	Financial Year 4 2019/20	Closure 2020/21	Totals £
Total Project Budget							
Birmingham City Council	TA-01869-01	50,155.61	201,584.53	202,994.01	172,098.85	12,931.03	639,764.03
The University of Birmingham (UoB)		34,477.43	268,349.91	262,958.56	219,858.34	-	785,644.23
Karis Neighbour Scheme		1,790.38	16,635.12	15,793.28	13,208.50	-	47,427.28
Initiative for Social Entrepreneurs (iSE)		4,419.89	179,047.12	191,091.32	179,392.10	-	553,950.43
Birmingham Voluntary Services Council (BVSC)		1,300.59	7,803.56	7,803.56	6,526.41	-	32,434.12
Localise West Midlands		-	5,476.03	5,476.03	4,565.17	-	15,517.24
Smethwick Church Action Network (Smethwick CAN)		658.05	9,424.35	9,424.35	7,867.29		27,374.05
Co-operative Futures		-	83,357.41	83,357.41	69,492.07	-	236,206.90
Birmingham City University		11,168.98	67,013.90	67,013.90	56,046.16		201,242.93
Canal and River Trust		650.29	3,901.78	3,901.78	3,263.20	-	11,717.06
Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust		3,885.67	71,593.53	64,696.47	54,108.01	-	194,283.68
Father Hudson's Care		1,790.38	16,635.12	15,793.28	13,208.50	-	47,427.28
Health Exchange CIC		512.07	85,164.02	86,559.40	74,488.53	-	246,724.02
Birmingham Chamber of Commerce (CoC)		-	13,142.48	13,142.48	10,956.41	-	37,241.38
Citizen Coaching CIC		707.59	22,022.10	23,950.28	23,182.10	-	69,862.07
Totals		111,516.93	1,051,150.96	1,053,956.11	908,261.64	12,931.03	3,146,816.70

BCC's budget									
BCC Grant allocation				Match funding contribution				Total	
ERDF (€) (a)		ERDF grant (%)		Public match contribution (€) (b)		Total Contribution (%)		Total Eligible Cost (€)	
511,811.21		80%		127,952.80		20%		639,764.03	
Breakdown of BCC Budget per Work Package/ Budget Line									
Work Package	Staff Costs (£)	Office and administration (£)	Travel and accommodation (£)	External expertise and services (£)	Equipment (£)	Infrastructure and Works (£)	Sub-total (£)	Revenues (£)	Total (£)
WP 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,241.38	0.00	0.00	17,241.38	0.00	17,241.38
WP2	338,384.03	50,757.60	6,959.48	180,925.87	4,741.38	0.00	581,768.36	0.00	581,768.36
WP3	1,292.33	193.85	163.79	311.21	0.00	0.00	1,961.18	0.00	1,961.18
WP4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WP5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WP6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WP7	22,488.76	3,373.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25,862.07	0.00	25,862.07
WP8	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,931.03	0.00	0.00	12,931.03	0.00	12,931.03
Totals (BCC budget)	362,165.11	54,324.77	7,123.28	211,409.49	4,741.38	0.00	639,764.03	0.00	639,764.03
% of total budget	56.61 %	8.49 %	1.11 %	33.04 %	0.74 %	0.00 %	100.00 %	0.00 %	100.00 %
Planned Start date for delivery of the project			Eligible project start date: 1 November 2016 (project will fund the period 1.11.2016 – 28.02.2017 retrospectively)			Planned Date of Technical completion		31 October 2019 (one additional year has been granted for project closure and dissemination 1.11.2019-31.10.2020)	

The above breakdown of Budget per Work Package/ Budget Line is being currently developed by each partner and this will form part of the contractual agreement with them.

3. Checklist of Documents Supporting the FBC

[illegible]

APPENDIX A: USE-IT! GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE



APPENDIX B- USE-IT! Risk register
APPENDIX B - RISK REGISTER for USE-IT! Project

No	Item of Risk	Inherent Risk		Control Measures	Control Measure Managed by	Residual Risk	
		Impact	Likelihood			Impact	Likelihood
2.0	Work Package 2						
	Managing project continuity and delivery if / when there are staff changes in the partnership or within the Project Management team (Project Manager, Partnership Manager, Finance Officer) of the lead partner.	Serious	Probable	We will have clearly documented, agreed roles; second named staff members, partner activities/outputs, agreed actions for partners, guidance and partnership agreements that the new member of staff can access, in addition to one-to-one support from the Project Co-ordinator. All Project Management team staff will have a 3-month notice period, roles will be documented and a clear handover training period will be in place.	Contract Manager, staff members	Medium	Medium
	Exchange rate fluctuations may affect the amount of money received from the European Commission	Serious	Probably	All partners bear the risk of exchange rate fluctuations equally and everybody responds for their part of delivery. BCC's risk will be mitigated by commissioning external expertise element after the grant has been received.	Contract Manager, staff members	Medium	Medium
	The Partnership is too big to manage.	Serious	Possible	a) Strong Project Management team will be put in place who will be based in the locality and will have day-to-day contact with all project partners . The Project Management Steering Group to ensure that operational and strategic management of the project is on track. b) Work Package leads holding meetings with their respective delivery partners and setting up objectives at Work Package levels +co undersigning all reports submitted to the Project Manager	Project Management team, Work Package Leads	Medium	Low
	There are different objectives and aspirations.	Major	Probable	Work Package leads holding meetings with their respective delivery partners and setting up objectives at Work Package levels as well as countersigning all reports submitted to the Project Manager.	Work Package Leads	Medium	Medium
	Taking more time dedicated than allocated.	Major	Possible	Working smart between Work Packages so we don't duplicate efforts.	Project Management and Work Package Leads	Medium	Medium
3.0	Work Package 3						
	Recruitment and retention of appropriate communications and brokerage managers	Serious	Possible	Start recruitment early, look for development opportunity for somebody and make it attractive by linking it with further opportunities.	Project Management and Work Package Leads	Medium	Low
	Lack of regular articulation of requirements from partners to Birmingham City Council could send the project off track.	Serious	Remote	In order to avoid this, there will be regular documented meetings, operations meetings planned at least every quarter.	Birmingham City Council	Medium	Low
	Ensure that the Work Packages work together as one coherent project.	Major	Remote	A strong Project Co-ordination team will be put in place (Project Co-ordinator, Project Support Officer, Finance Officer) who will be based the locality and will have day-to-day contact with all project partners. The Project Management Steering Group (all WP leads and delivery partners will meet collectively a minimum of every 3 months to ensure that operational and strategic management will be offered.	Contract Manager, Partnership Manager, Finance Officer	Medium	Low
	Ineligible or inconsistent financial spend, management or claims.	Serious	Possible	Partner payments will only be released when accurate partner claims are submitted. Partners will be trained and supported to complete claims at an acceptable standard from the start of the project and any inconsistent cost items will need further clarification before payments are released. This will help minimise risk for partners and for us. Ongoing support for all partners around financial management will be offered.	Contract Manager, Finance Officer	Low	Low
	Issues with the quality of deliverables and outputs within agreed resource constraints (budget and staff time).	Serious	Possible	Partners will be briefed on the staff hours/budgets allocated at the start of the project and will be expected to ensure that they set aside sufficient resources to meet the quality required for each output. If the partner is unable to keep to agreed rates we will work with them through our Project Co-ordinator to find a suitable compromise within the overall budget. The Project Management Steering Group will also be a platform for ensuring the project is delivering.	Contract Manager and Work Package Leads	Medium	Low
	Inaccurate or inconsistent records.	Serious	Possible	All partners will use project standard documentation to ensure that we have accurate project records presented in a compliant manner. These records will be monitored at regular intervals (at visits and meetings).	Contract Manager and Work Package Leads	Medium	Low
4	Work Package 4						
	Recruitment of Community Researchers delayed or ineffective.	Serious	Possible	Using existing links to community and using organisations that are already on the ground as a starting using existing links to community and using organisations that are already on the ground as a starting point.	Contract Manager and Partnership Manager	Medium	Low
5	Work Package 5						
	We don't find sufficient residents with overseas qualifications (NHS relevant)	Serious	Possible	Open up a work stream to start considering other non-medical professions within NHS or other sector. Close working with Birmingham and	Project Management and NHS Work Package lead	Medium	Low

Stakeholder	Stake in Project	Potential Impact on Project	What does the Project expect from Stakeholder	Perceived attitudes and/or risks	Stakeholder management strategy	Responsibility
Cabinet Members	Portfolio holder Cllr Ian Ward, Deputy Leader Linked Portfolio USE-IT! Project cuts across 4 portfolios: Cllr Bret O'Reilly, Jobs and Skills Cllr Waseem Zaffar, Transparency, Openness and Equality Cllr Peter Griffiths, Housing and Homes Cllr Paulette Hamilton, Health and Social Care Cllr Lisa Trickett, Clean Streets, Recycling and Environment	High	Political support for project	Supportive	Ongoing involvement through consultation	Portfolio holder
Ward Councillors	Knowledge of issues affecting local community-informing delivery and strategic steer	High	Political support for project	Supportive	Ongoing involvement	Represent Community Interest
UIA Secretariat, Lille, France	Head contract holder and funder on behalf of EU Commission	High	Funding, monitoring and audit framework	Awaiting subsidiary contract from the UIA Secretariat	Establish regular dialogue around contract management	Funder

					and compliance	
Community Challenge Panel comprising of: local citizens, Birmingham and Sandwell third sector organisations, private companies and innovation agencies and specialists e.g. NESTA (http://www.nesta.org.uk/), RSA (https://www.the-rsa.org/).	Link to the outreach organisations on the ground	Medium	Direct links to organisations working in the community - to inform delivery and speed up recruitment of Community Researchers	Delivery partners already have significant relationships established with key organisations	Continuation and deepening of existing relationships	
Birmingham City Council, Place Directorate and European and International Affairs	Manage Work Package 1, 2, 8 and co-manage Work Package 7	High	Local public authority	Managing	Constant communication and regular meetings	Prepare, manage, oversee and close the project
University of Birmingham	Manage Work Package 4 and participate in Work	High	Higher Education and research	Managing	Constant communication and	Manage WP, meet and oversee planned

	Packages 2, 3, 5 and 6				regular meetings	activities as well as report about them
Karis Neighbour Scheme	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Initiative for Social Entrepreneurs(i SE)	Manage Work Package 6, 7	High	Enterprise	Managing	Constant communication and regular meetings	Manage WP, meet and oversee planned activities as well as report about them
Birmingham Voluntary Services Council	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Localise West Midlands	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Smethwick Church Action Network	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Co-operative Futures	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Birmingham City University	Manage Work Package 3	High	Higher education and research	Managing	Constant communication and regular meetings	Manage WP, meet and oversee planned activities as well as report about them
Canal and River Trust	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned

Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust	Manage Work Package 5	High	Infrastructure and (public) service provider	Managing	Constant communication and regular meetings	Manage WP, meet and oversee planned activities as well as report about them
Father Hudson's Care (Brushstrokes)	Delivery Partner	High	Interest groups including NGOs	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Health Exchange (CIC)	Delivery Partner	High	Enterprise	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Birmingham Chamber of Commerce	Delivery Partner	High	Business support organisation	Supportive	Development of strategic relationships with employer representative bodies such as Chambers of Commerce. Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
Citizen Coaching (CIC)	Delivery Partner	High	SME	Supportive	Constant communication and regular meetings	Deliver as planned
KPMG	Associate partner	Low	Private consulting company	Supportive	On-going consultation and active engagement in the first phase of the project	Participates in the project on a pro-bono basis contributing to data baseline analysis.

Appendix D MILESTONE DATES and RESOURCES

Milestone	Start Date	Completion Date
Initiation Stage	1 November 2016	Ongoing (planned end: 28 February 2017)
Project final sign off by BCC Cabinet	February 2017	February 2017
Partnership contracts signed	15 February 2017	28 February 2017
Subsidiary Contract signed with the European Commission	End of February 2017	End of February 17
Establishment of Project Steering Group (top tier governance) and second tier governance (integrated support operational group; employer group)	15 March 2017	31 October 2019
Project delivery commences	1 March 2017	31 October 2019
Communication strategy developed and communication package delivered	11 January 2016	31 October 2019
Start-up activities	1 November 2016	31 May 2017
Publications	1 November 2016	31 October 2019
Digital activity (including use of Shareville online research and information sharing tool)	1 November 2016	31 October 2019
Public events	1 November 2016	31 October 2019

Promotional materials	1 November 2016	31 October 2019
Media relations	1 May 2019	31 October 2019
Final dissemination activity (mandatory)	1 November 2016	31 October 2019
Connections to other EU initiatives	1 November 2016	31 October 2019
WP 4		
Community Research Training: Unlocking Innovation in Sustainable Urban Development for Deprived Communities	1 November 2016	31 October 2019
Recruitment of Community Researchers (CRs), Community Ambassadors, staff and PhD students	13 November 2016	31 October 2017
Community Researcher Training and Support Development: resource building for poor communities to increase resilience and to maximise co-production of social and economic innovation.	1 March 2017	31 October 2019
Action and Community Research: we do not see this as just 'research', all actions lead to a mechanism that affects change. The process of gathering data and making connections is a process of change.	26 April 2017	31 October 2019
Evaluation and innovation development	1 May 2017	31 October 2019
Embedding CR and pedagogic approach to USE-IT! in HE and University Sector	1 November 2016	31 October 2019

WP 5 Matching job skills in the community with demand	10 December 2016	31 October 2019
Workforce skills shortage analysis and evaluation	15 December 2016	31 October 2019
Community skills mapping	10 December 2016	30 June 2017
New Arrival Support Programme (individuals with the right to work)	1 January 2017	31 October 2019
Mentoring Service	1 January 2017	31 October 2019
WP 6 Social Enterprise and Social Production	1 January 2017	31 October 2019
Development of USE-IT! Network and online networking platform	1 January 2017	30 September 2019
Engagement and Market Development	1 January 2017	30 September 2019
Social Enterprise Propeller [SEP] business support programmes	1 January 2017	31 October 2019
Access to employment through social enterprise	1 January 2017	31 October 2019
Business mentors and coaches programme	1 January 2017	30 September 2019
WP 7 Understanding and strengthening community assets and finance	13 December 2016	31 October 2019

Baseline analysis of existing community capital assets and finance going into the community. This will also inform the work of other WPs.	13 December 2016	31 March 2017
Analysis and recommendations of potential forms of innovative finance, schemes or investment	1 February 2017	31 October 2019
Access to micro-finance and social investment for social enterprise	1 January 2017	31 October 2019
WP 8 Closure and knowledge transfer	1 November 2019	31 October 2020
Transfer of knowledge activities	1 November 2019	31 October 2020
Administrative closure	1 November 2019	1 February 2020
Financial closure	1 November 2019	1 February 2020
Sharing lessons learnt and transfer	1 November 2019	31 October 2020
Project wind down and closure	October 2019	October 2019

STATEMENT OF RESOURCES REQUIRED

People	Project Sponsor Project Manager BCC USE-IT! Contract Manager and Partnership Manager supported by Finance Officer - through deployment of some existing posts as match funding and the use of the M&A income element of the project to underpin other existing salaries and grow capacity through the funding of fixed term post and/or secondments. Legal Services Finance Officers Corporate Procurement BCC's Employment Team representative(s) – collaboration within other programmes/streams of funding (i.e. YEI) aligning activities and allowing for cross-referrals
Equipment	Standard equipment e.g. laptops, issued to officers and members of Birmingham City Council staff. Camera for publicity reasons.

PROGRAMME TEAM

Contract Manager, 1 FTE, European and International Affairs (also directly co-managing WP7)

Partnership Manager, 0.3 FTE, Head of Ladywood District, Place Directorate

Finance Officer, 0.7 FTE, European and International Affairs



Région
Hauts-de-France

The President
The Vice-President

Réf : DEU-2016-09-01
Dossier suivi par : Jean-Pierre LEGRAND
Tél : 03 28 82 70 53
Mail : jean-pierre.legrand@nordpasdecalspicardie.fr

Lloyd Broad
Head of European & International
Affairs
Birmingham City Council
The Council House, Victoria Square
B1 1BB Birmingham
UNITED KINGDOM

Lille, 02 NOV. 2016

Objet : Result of the Urban Innovative Actions Initiative Selection Committee

Dear Mr Head,

The Selection Committee composed of the European Commission and the Entrusted Entity, the Regional Council Hauts-de-France, met on 27 September in Brussels to select the projects to be supported in the frame of the first UIA Call for Proposals.

In respect of the Delegation Agreement, implemented by the Regional Council des Hauts- de-France, we have the honour and pleasure to announce the approval of your project USE-IT! Unlocking Social and Economic Innovation Together for which you are the Main Urban Authority.

The Selection Committee has decided to grant the project EUR 2 911 894 supported through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

The Entrusted Entity with his Permanent Secretariat, will be in contact with you soon to provide you with more information regarding project assessment feedback as well as the official start of the project.

We wish you every success in the implementation of your project.

Yours sincerely

Valérie LÉTARD

*Vice-President
Solidarity with the territories,
State-Region Contract ,
European Structural Funds,
Territorie Planning*

Xavier BERTRAND

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	STRATEGIC DIRECTOR, ECONOMY (INTERIM)
Date of Decision:	14 FEBRUARY 2017
SUBJECT:	PEDDIMORE – EMPLOYMENT SITE
Key Decision: YES	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 001943/2016
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved O&S Chairman approved
Relevant Cabinet Member:	THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL – CLLR JOHN CLANCY
Relevant O&S Chairman:	CLLR MOHAMMED AIKHQAQ - CORPORATE RESOURCES AND GOVERNANCE O&S COMMITTEE
Wards affected:	SUTTON NEW HALL
1. Purpose of report: 1.1 The Peddimore site in Sutton Coldfield is allocated in the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) for employment development. The BDP which was adopted by the City Council on 10 January 2017. The developable area of Peddimore site is approx. 71 hectares of which approx. 65 hectares (approx. 160 acres net developable) is in the ownership of the City Council. 1.2 The future disposal and development of the site represents an opportunity to provide a major high quality employment site that will attract significant investment into the City providing thousands of jobs and boosting inclusive economic growth in the City and the wider West Midlands. 1.3 This report seeks approval to progress a process to develop detailed options appraisals that will enable the site to come forward for development following the installation of the main access and key infrastructure. 1.4 The site is shown edged black on the plan attached as Appendix 1 of this report.	
2. Decision(s) recommended: It is recommended that Cabinet:	
2.1 Approves a budget of £400,000 to cover the cost of professional services associated with the preparation of options appraisals and authorises the Director of Property to place orders up to this amount. 2.2 Notes that in April 2017 a further Cabinet report will be presented seeking approval to implement the preferred delivery option enabling full marketing of the site to commence. 2.3 Authorises the Acting City Solicitor to appoint external solicitors to support the project and to negotiate, execute, complete and seal the relevant documents necessary to give effect to the above recommendations.	
Lead Contact Officer(s):	Basit Ali
Telephone No:	0121 464 6771
E-mail address:	basit.ali@birmingham.gov.uk

<p>3. Consultation</p> <p>3.1 <u>Internal</u></p> <p>3.1.1 Sutton New Hall Ward Members have been consulted in the process of adopting the Birmingham Development Plan which was formally adopted by the Council on 10 January 2017. Further consultation with Sutton New Hall Ward Members has been undertaken to advise them of the purpose of this report. Officers will continue to update the Ward Members so that they remain involved and updated on the project. The Leader of the Council and Councillor Stewart Stacey have been consulted and support the matter proceeding. The Strategic Directors for Economy, and Programmes and Projects have been involved in the preparation of the report. Officers in Birmingham Property Services, Legal and Democratic Services and City Finance have also been involved in the preparation of this report.</p> <p>3.2 <u>External</u></p> <p>3.2.1 Extensive public consultation regarding the development of the site for employment use was carried out as part of the Birmingham Plan.</p>	
<p>4. Compliance Issues:</p> <p>4.1 <u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u></p> <p>4.1.1 The proposal contributes towards the strategic outcomes outlined in the 'Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+', specifically Outcome One: A strong economy, by supporting development of a major strategic site, jobs creation; specifically Outcome Four: Creating Thriving Communities through the installation of new highways infrastructure improving connectivity</p> <p>4.2 <u>Financial Implications</u></p> <p>4.2.1 The options appraisal and future development of the Peddimore site will prioritise the installation of a new junction, access and associated infrastructure to service the entire site.</p> <p>4.2.2 A project budget of £400k has been identified to cover the cost of development consultancy advice, technical and legal advice including preparation of the supporting legal and technical documents detailing required outputs from the proposed infrastructure. These costs are incidental to the future disposal and development of the site or part thereof and can therefore be funded from capital receipts in accordance with Government regulations and can be accommodated within the existing plans for the use of capital receipts.</p> <p>4.3 <u>Legal Implications</u></p> <p>4.3.1 Under the general power of competence in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 (The Act) the Council has the power to enter into arrangements set out in this report. They are within the boundaries and limits of the general power of competence set out in sections 2 and 4 of the Act.</p> <p>4.3.2 The Council has a duty to efficiently manage its assets and has the power to hold and dispose of land under Sections 120 and 123 of the Local Government Act 1972.</p> <p>4.4 <u>Public Sector Equality Duty</u></p> <p>4.4.1 An Equality Assessment (EA) number EA001787 is annexed at appendix 2.</p>	

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

- 5.1 The preparation of the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) demonstrated a shortage of large, high quality employment sites to meet the needs of the City's expanding industrial sector. Having considered the availability of sites within the urban area it was demonstrated that the shortage of employment land represented exceptional circumstances which justified the release of the Peddimore site from the Green Belt. This conclusion was supported by the independent Planning Inspector and the BDP has now been adopted by the Council, the Local Planning Authority is currently preparing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which will provide details to guide the form of development at Peddimore. The SPD will be subject to public consultation later this year.
- 5.2 Now that the release has been confirmed the Peddimore site needs to be brought forward for development as quickly as possible given the pressing need to address the current shortage in employment land supply. It is widely recognised that due to its size and location Peddimore is the most significant opportunity in the West Midlands for major employment generation and investment.
- 5.3 In order for the Peddimore site to be developed new infrastructure needs to be installed including a new access point from the A38. In addition to this utilities and services will need to be brought on to the site and distributed to allow development plots to come forward.
- 5.4 This report seeks authority to commence a process to continue engaging commercial consultants, technical and legal advisors. The project team will be tasked with producing a range of development options which will be tested and the recommendation of a preferred option presented for consideration by the Council in April 2017. The advisory team will also prepare all of the technical documents that are needed to support the next stages including site marketing. The legal advice will cover a range of disciplines including development, contracts, construction, procurement and state aid. The services will be procured through existing frameworks. As part of this ongoing process in relation to the project the Peddimore development and Prior Information Notice (PIN) will be launched at MIPIM in March 2017.
- 5.5 The Council will then implement the preferred delivery option that will be the best strategic fit taking on board the risks and opportunities associated with the project. The preferred delivery option will be reported to Cabinet in April 2017 with site marketing and implementation of the recommendations anticipated to commence from May 2017.

6. Evaluation of alternative option:

- 6.1 Not to proceed would mean that the opportunity to deliver a key allocation in the Birmingham Development Plan is delayed and or missed which given the limited land supply available could result in a material loss of investment into the City.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):	
7.1	To seek approval to commence the next stage of the project to complete details options appraisal of the various development options that can be implemented.

Signatures	<u>Date</u>
Leader of the Council – Cllr John Clancy
Strategic Director, Economy (Interim) – Waheed Nazir

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:
1. Birmingham Development Plan

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
1. Appendix 1 – Site plan 2. Equality Assessment EA001787

Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Birmingham Development Plan - Peddimore Employment Site Phase 1 And 2
Directorate	Corporate Resources
Service Area	Birmingham Property Services - Major Projects
Type	New/Proposed Function
EA Summary	The report seeks approval to market the Peddimore site to attract a development partner who will install the infrastructure and undertake development of phase 1.
Reference Number	EA001787
Task Group Manager	felicia.saunders@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Date Approved	2017-01-12 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	eden.ottley@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	eden.ottley@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a New/Proposed Function.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Function and expected outcomes?

The Peddimore site in Sutton Coldfield is in the ownership of the City Council and comprises an area of approx 71 hectares net developable (approx 150 acres) which has been objectively assessed and identified in the Birmingham Development Plan, through an evidence based transparent process, as the best employment use site in the West Midlands region.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Children A Great City To Grow Up In	No
Health - A Great City To Grow Old In	No
Housing - A Great City To Live In	No
Jobs And Skills - A Great City To Succeed In	Yes

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	No
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Not Relevant	No
Disability	Not Relevant	No
Gender	Not Relevant	No
Gender Reassignment	Not Relevant	No
Marriage Civil Partnership	Not Relevant	No
Pregnancy And Maternity	Not Relevant	No
Race	Not Relevant	No
Religion or Belief	Not Relevant	No
Sexual Orientation	Not Relevant	No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

The Birmingham Plan has allocated the Peddimore site for release from the greenbelt for employment use. The development of the site represents an opportunity to provide a major high quality employment site that will attract significant investment into the region providing thousands of jobs and boosting economic growth of the City and the West Midlands region.

The development of the Peddimore site is strongly linked to the Birmingham Development Plan.

The intended outcome of the BDP is that by 2031, Birmingham will be an enterprising, prosperous, innovative and green city, delivering sustainable growth that meets the housing and employment needs of its population.

One of the key purposes of the Plan is to ensure that sufficient land is available for development to meet the city's employment needs.

A fundamental objective of the Plan is to advance equality of opportunity by ensuring the right sites are available to enable development to take place which will be needed to provide jobs that the city's future population will require.

New development can have benefits eg new employment development can bring new jobs but also generate additional traffic movements. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring that the development of the Peddimore site is maximised to its full potential. For example a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will guide development and ensure that there is a safe and inclusive environment created.

This stage of the project requires a development partner to market the site. Once appointed a further EA is required to address all relevant equality aspects as identified prior to the commencement of the infrastructure plans.

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

Sutton New Hall Ward Members have been consulted in the process of adopting the Birmingham Development Plan which was formally adopted by the Council on 10 January 2017. Further consultation with Sutton New Hall Ward Members has been undertaken.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Stewart Stacey and Councillor Waseem Zaffar have been briefed and consulted. The Strategic Directors for Economy, and Programmes and Projects have been consulted with no comments received. Officers in Birmingham Property Services, Legal and Democratic Services and City Finance have been involved in the preparation of this report.

Extensive public consultation regarding the development of the site for employment use was carried out as part of the Birmingham Plan.

The Birmingham Development Plan has been prepared on the basis of a robust and comprehensive evidence base and extensive public consultation throughout the various stages of the plan preparation process.

This has included consultation on the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and on the inspector's Proposed Modifications to the Plan.

A Consultation Statement dated July 2014 details the consultation undertaken on the Plan since the start of its preparation in 2010.

The vision and objectives of the Plan and resulting development of the Peddimore site for employment uses are consistent with the promotion of the equality duty.

The independent inspector's report on the BDP has concluded, that subject to his recommended modifications being made, the Plan is sound and provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the City and releasing land for sustainable employment development.

Policies in the Plan aim to develop Birmingham as a City of sustainable neighbourhoods that are safe and inclusive with locally distinctive character and is fully accessible, connecting and serving all members of Birmingham's diverse communities.

It is concluded that the proposed methodology being proposed to develop the Peddimore site (phase 1) is consistent with the objectives of the Birmingham Development Plan. At the end of the process it has been proposed a further EA assessment will be undertaken and recommendations made to Cabinet to progress the project into the next stage.

The Peddimore site is widely recognised as the most significant opportunity in the region for major employment generation and investment through the development of the site.

A project budget of £400k has been identified to cover the cost of marketing, professional fees and the preparation of legal documents.

There has been ongoing consultation with Members of their respective constituency, who have as representation been consulted on issues of relevance.

There have been no issues raised which impact the wider community negatively at this stage of the project, therefore a full equality assessment is not required at this stage.

However, the project requires a development partner to market the site. Once appointed a further EA is required to address all relevant equality aspects as identified prior to the commencement of the infrastructure plans.


4 Review Date

05/07/17


5 Action Plan

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

FOR ILLUSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY INDICATIVE LAND USE PLAN



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey 100021326.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



A-Z Street Map, if present, reproduced by permission of Geographers' A-Z Map
Co.Ltd. Licence No. A1228.



Peter Jones BSc, FRICS
Director of Property
Birmingham Property Services
PO Box 16255
Birmingham B2 2WT

**SITE AT PEDDIMORE
SUTTON COLDFIELD**



Scale (Main Map)

1:10,000

Drawn

JW

Date

02/02/2017

O.S. Sheet: SP1593SE

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET	
Report of:	Strategic Director, Economy	
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017	
SUBJECT:	STEP FORWARD: UPSKILLING FOR LIFE	
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 003028/2017	
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved	<input type="checkbox"/>
	O&S Chairman approved	<input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s) or Relevant Executive Member for Local Services:	Councillor Brett O'Reilly, Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills	
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Zafar Iqbal, Economy, Skills and Transport	
Wards affected:	Citywide	

1. Purpose of report:
<p>1.1 To update Cabinet on Step Forward, a multi-agency promotional campaign raising awareness of the benefits of increased qualifications levels and encouraging the upskilling of the workforce across Birmingham targeted at employers and residents.</p> <p>1.2 Step Forward will contribute significantly to the delivery of the Birmingham Skills Investment Plan, particularly in helping to close the skills gap amongst people in employment between Birmingham and other core cities and thereby enabling employment progression in the local jobs market.</p>

2. Decision(s) recommended:
That Cabinet:
2.1 Notes the delivery of the Step Forward programme to be launched in March 2017.

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Shilpi Akbar, Assistant Director Employment
Telephone No:	0121 303 4571
E-mail address:	Shilpi.akbar@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

Consultation should include those that have an interest in the decisions recommended

3.1 Internal

Consultation has been undertaken with the Head of Birmingham Adult Education Service, who is supportive of Step Forward, understanding the need for upskilling across the workforce and committing to undertaking workforce development and participating in delivering training. In addition with Human Resources – Assistant Director, Change and Support Services; who supports Step Forward which reinforces the principles of developing and upskilling the workforce, complementing the developing Apprenticeship Strategy to increase the number of people recruited to apprenticeships in BCC and rewarding existing staff through the provision of development opportunities.

3.2 External

Consultation has been undertaken as part of the development of Step Forward including Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP (GBSLEP) Employment and Skills Board, where upskilling of the workforce is a key priority; with the objective as set out in the Strategic Economic Plan to 'Increase business and workforce productivity and competitiveness – particularly by raising skills levels and stimulating demand-led innovation'. Step Forward was approved at the LEP Employment and Skills Board (Jan 17) to be promoted and implemented across the LEP area and the Growth Hub will be utilized as a central point of information for Step Forward.

3.3 Consultation has also been carried out with Trade Unions Unite and Unison, West Midlands Combined Authority, HS2 Ltd, Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Further Education colleges and private training providers as well as a number of local businesses and employers where existing relationships already exist.

3.4 The outcome of the consultation was acknowledgement of the need to improve qualifications levels in Birmingham for those in and out of work, and that partners are supportive of the delivery of a co-ordinated strategy to raise awareness of the impact of higher skills levels and their role in delivering this.

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?

The proposal contributes towards the strategic outcomes outlined in the 'Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+ of: A Strong Economy; Thriving Local Communities; and a great future for young people, specifically the sub-outcomes of: an integrated skills system that reduces the skills gap, supports employers to take on people furthest from the labour market and drives down unemployment; no young person is left behind, and education and employment are used to address inequality and introduce fairness. This is enacted through the delivery of a high profile public relations campaign targeted at employers and individuals to increase the number of people with no/or low level qualifications to reengage in training and improve qualifications levels. Through

Improving qualification levels of the workforce, businesses become more competitive, positively impacting the economy and individuals have increased opportunities within the workforce and enhanced earnings potential. Through a targeted approach, Step Forward will support inclusive growth for all Birmingham citizens, creating opportunities for all residents and focusing on those areas with lower skills levels and higher in-work levels of poverty.

- 4.2 The Birmingham Skills Investment Plan (BSIP) was incorporated into the Council's Policy Framework at Full Council in April 2016 and contributes towards meeting the vision: 'we recognise that currently there is a gap in the skills of our citizens and those skills demanded by employers.' There is a need to develop greater economic independence and personal resilience among our citizens through the campaign to raise awareness of the benefits of increasing qualifications and the positive impacts this has for individuals and business. The BSIP identifies that the current skills gap is a challenge for everyone, and the purpose of Step Forward is to encourage individuals and businesses to play a role in addressing the skills gap for the benefits of themselves and the wider economy.

4.3 Financial Implications

(Will decisions be carried out within existing finance and Resources?)

Step Forward will be carried out utilising existing staff resources to develop, facilitate and deliver the programme. Existing business engagement activities will be accessed to promote the programme including engaging with Business Charter for Social Responsibility signatories and looking at options for including Step Forward within the requirements of the Charter; Business Growth Programme; Employment and Skills employer engagement activity and cog – a newly launched digital matching platform to promote jobs and training and match employers to jobseekers, managed by the Economy Directorate. This will also be done in conjunction with partners where necessary to access existing media and PR platforms, including GBSLEP Growth Hub, Enterprise Zone and the National Careers Service.

4.4 Legal Implications

The activity being delivered by Step Forward is to promote the upskilling of the workforce, having a positive impact on the local economy and employability of residents in the workplace. The Council has the power to enter into this activity in accordance with the general power of competence conferred by Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011. The proposed activity is within the boundaries and limits on the general power set out in Section 2 and 4 of The Act respectively.

4.5 Public Sector Equality Duty (see separate guidance note)

An initial Equality Impact Assessment (Ref EA001132) has been undertaken as part of the BSIP approved in February 2016 (attached as Appendix 2). Step Forward forms part of the implementation of this plan.

The BSIP provides a way forward to deliver improved skills levels for all Birmingham citizens: young people, unemployed, and those in work to redress and level the playing field for all Birmingham residents who are disadvantaged in the labour market by reason of no skill, low skill or a skills mismatch.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

- 5.1 The BSIP was approved by Cabinet on 16th February 2016, which is a statement of current and future skills needs in the City, linked to jobs and economic growth. The BSIP is intended to address issues that contribute to the mismatch of supply and demand around skills, and to be jointly owned and implemented by stakeholders across the City.
- 5.2 The consequence of not increasing skills levels by 2026 will be:
- 174,000 low skilled people chasing 150,000 low paid skilled jobs – a surplus of 24,000 low skilled workers with an increasing risk of unemployment
 - 85,000 people with intermediate skills will chase 80,000 jobs – a surplus of 5,000 people
 - Employers will struggle to recruit to the estimated 230,000 high skilled jobs with only 184,000 high skilled workers – a shortage of 46,000.
- 5.3 Step Forward forms part of the Implementation Plan of the BSIP and part of the response to some of the issues identified around skills gaps in the workforce. It complements the 'Accelerate' strand of the LEP and West Midlands Combined Authority skills strategies, building on the strength of partnerships already established across Birmingham and initiatives both already in place and in the pipeline to promote increasing skills levels by focusing on GBSLEP growth sectors. Working with partners including the National Careers Service, Chamber of Commerce and GBSLEP, Step Forward will maximise their influence, knowledge, experience and connections to promote the key messages and engage with the target audience.
- 5.4 Skills levels are rising at all levels across Birmingham, and the number with no qualifications is falling, however, rates are also rising nationally, and the gaps are not closing except for those achieving Level 4+ qualifications. The scale of the challenge is significant. There are currently 108,000 working age adults in Birmingham with no qualifications and a further 71,000 qualified to Level 1 only. If the proportion of Birmingham residents with a Level 3 or above qualification was the same as the UK average, an additional 39,000 residents would be qualified to level 3+, and there would be 47,000 fewer residents with no qualifications.
- 5.5 Not only are Birmingham residents as a whole less well qualified than the core city and UK average, but so are those who are in employment. This is true at all qualification levels apart from at level 4+ where Birmingham is slightly above the UK average, although under-performs compared to the core cities average.
- 5.6 Step Forward will target adults and their employers to raise awareness of the benefits of uplifting skills levels on an individual and business level. Birmingham residents need to be ready for the changes in the labour market, to take advantage of the job opportunities requiring higher level skills and for employers to have access to employees with the skills they are looking for. Working in partnership with the public and private sector and employers, a multi-agency promotional campaign will be implemented to encourage the upskilling of the workforce.

5.7 The purpose of Step Forward will be to:

- Improve skills levels so that people have the *right* skills and qualifications to access jobs, particularly for those in work (WMCA SEP)
- Increase skills levels across Birmingham and close the gap between Birmingham and the core cities average
- Promote the benefits to employers and individuals of obtaining higher skills levels to access:
 - employment
 - career progression; and
 - increase lifetime earnings potential
- To promote job opportunities, apprenticeships and career paths within growth sectors, e.g. HS2 and the future jobs market.

5.8 Step Forward will bring together in one access point, the tools and information available to employers and individuals to assist in upskilling including accessing the Apprenticeship Levy, Further Education (FE) provision, Growth Hub funding, advice and guidance, relevant business funding programmes and Advanced Learner Loans. This will be available in a comprehensive format and supported by in-depth skills diagnostic programmes where available (e.g. through the Enterprise Zone).

5.9 The City Council will use its influence as a local authority to promote and raise awareness of Step Forward; firstly where we have direct contact with employers and individuals through a range of channels including the Business Charter for Social Responsibility, Procurement Policy Framework for Jobs and Skills, Business Growth Programme and Birmingham Adult Education Service. In addition, through a high profile PR campaign using our leadership role to influence and raise awareness of the benefits of upskilling and increasing qualifications levels. Impact of this engagement will be monitored to measure uptake of training and qualifications gained to demonstrate the effectiveness of Step Forward. Higher level targets based on GBSLEP and WMCA targets have also been established up until 2026, focusing on closing the gap with Core Cities across qualifications levels. Any noticeable impact will not be felt for a minimum of 2 years due to timescales involved in gaining qualifications and this then being included within official figures and this has been reflected in the targets set.

5.10 The PR strategy will use a range of tools and approaches to promote the benefits of increased qualification levels to both employers and individuals. Working with the BCC Corporate Communications Team and utilising the resources and networks of partner organisations such as GBSLEP Growth Hub and the National Careers Service, a targeted strategy will be implemented, focused on growth sectors including the HS2 Growth Strategy and areas of skills shortage networks and resources.

5.11 A detailed marketing strategy will be developed in February 2017, focusing on 3 strands of delivery. There will be an overall strategy promoting a high level message around upskilling and the resources available to do this, delivered through high profile mediums reaching large numbers of people, e.g. digital billboards. A targeted employer engagement campaign will be delivered, focusing on business benefits and delivered through existing business contact channels as well as through wider media outlets. A campaign will also be delivered focused on individuals promoting benefits including impact on earnings potential and increased labour market opportunities, this will also be targeted at areas of higher deprivation and lower skills levels and in line with growth sectors. This will be delivered through linkages with organisations, services and resources with a strong presence in local communities, including voluntary sector organisations, libraries and community venues, Deputy Leaders who have a strong local presence to direct resources and raise awareness of Step Forward.

5.12 Step Forward will be launched formally in March 2017.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

6.1 **Do nothing** – to do nothing would mean the current skills gaps would remain unchallenged at this level. Step Forward will raise awareness of the benefits of upskilling to businesses and individuals who may not otherwise invest in this, impacting on the qualifications levels in Birmingham and contributing towards closing the gap in skills levels between Birmingham and the Core Cities. Information and guidance on training provision across all sectors and information on the tools and resources available to support learning for individuals and businesses is not currently accessible in one place and therefore difficult to navigate and understand, potentially acting as barrier for people in improving their qualifications levels.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):

7.1 To inform Cabinet of the implementation of the Step Forward programme as part of the overall delivery of the Birmingham Skills Investment Plan.

Signatures

Date

Councillor Brett O'Reilly,
Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills

Waheed Nazir

Strategic Director for Economy

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:

Birmingham Skills Investment Plan approved by Cabinet on 16 February 2016 and adopted by Full Council on 5 April 2016 <http://www.bhampolicycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Birmingham-Skills-Investment-Plan-web-1.pdf>

Birmingham Skills Supply and Demand Report

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):

1. Step Forward Proposal
2. Equality Impact Needs Assessment – Birmingham Skills Investment Plan EA001132

PROTOCOL

PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

- 1 The public sector equality duty drives the need for equality assessments (Initial and Full). An initial assessment should, be prepared from the outset based upon available knowledge and information.
- 2 If there is no adverse impact then that fact should be stated within the Report at section 4.4 and the initial assessment document appended to the Report duly signed and dated. A summary of the statutory duty is annexed to this Protocol and should be referred to in the standard section (4.4) of executive reports for decision and then attached in an appendix; the term 'adverse impact' refers to any decision-making by the Council which can be judged as likely to be contrary in whole or in part to the equality duty.
- 3 A full assessment should be prepared where necessary and consultation should then take place.
- 4 Consultation should address any possible adverse impact upon service users, providers and those within the scope of the report; questions need to assist to identify adverse impact which might be contrary to the equality duty and engage all such persons in a dialogue which might identify ways in which any adverse impact might be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, reduced.
- 5 Responses to the consultation should be analysed in order to identify:
 - (a) whether there is adverse impact upon persons within the protected categories
 - (b) what is the nature of this adverse impact
 - (c) whether the adverse impact can be avoided and at what cost – and if not –
 - (d) what mitigating actions can be taken and at what cost
- 6 The impact assessment carried out at the outset will need to be amended to have due regard to the matters in (4) above.
- 7 Where there is adverse impact the final Report should contain:
 - a summary of the adverse impact and any possible mitigating actions (in section 4.4 or an appendix if necessary)
 - the full equality impact assessment (as an appendix)
 - the equality duty – see page 9 (as an appendix).

Equality Act 2010

The Executive must have due regard to the public sector equality duty when considering Council reports for decision.

The public sector equality duty is as follows:

1	<p>The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act;(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
2	<p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
3	<p>The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.</p>
4	<p>Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) tackle prejudice, and(b) promote understanding.
5	<p>The relevant protected characteristics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Marriage & civil partnership(b) Age(c) Disability(d) Gender reassignment(e) Pregnancy and maternity(f) Race(g) Religion or belief(h) Sex(i) Sexual orientation

STEP FORWARD BIRMINGHAM

Birmingham Skills Accelerator

Project Scoping Report

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1 Introduction

The skills levels of Birmingham and WMCA residents will have a clear impact on future economic growth. Skills matter to employers – increasing profitability and productivity; and individuals – increasing earning potential and opportunities within the labour market.

We know that the demands of the economy and the future workforce are changing, with employers needing and expecting higher level skills to fully compete in the marketplace. Employers and the workforce need to be ready to meet these challenges head on and investing in the right skills now is crucial to success.

If employers cannot recruit people with the right skills, then productivity and the prosperity of the workforce will be hampered. It has been estimated that up to 25% of economic growth could be lost by not investing in skills¹.

This strategy will target adults and their employers to raise awareness of the benefits of uplifting skills levels on an individual and business level. We want Birmingham residents to be ready for the changes in the labour market, to take advantage of the job opportunities requiring higher level skills and for employers to have access to employees with the skills they are looking for. Working in partnership with the public and private sector and employers, a multi-agency promotional campaign will be developed to encourage the upskilling of the workforce.

This campaign will focus on addressing a number of key areas:

1. Birmingham residents in employment are lower skilled than the core cities and UK average
2. Skills levels in Birmingham and the WMCA area are increasing across all levels but the gap with the national average is not closing
3. Future skills projections are for more highly skilled employees in the workplace
4. High proportion of unemployed population have no qualifications – progressing those in employment into better jobs creates space to move into lower skilled roles
5. Mismatch between Birmingham residents qualifications and the occupational mix of jobs on offer in the city, suggesting that in-commuters are taking up a greater proportion of higher occupations, which is likely to have an impact on earnings .

¹ Birmingham Skills Investment Plan 2015

1.2 Purpose

- To improve skills levels so that people have the *right* skills and qualifications to access jobs, particularly for those in work (WMCA SEP).
- To increase skills levels across Birmingham and close the gap between Birmingham and the core cities average.
- To promote the benefits to employers and individuals of obtaining higher skills levels to access
 - employment;
 - career progression; and
 - increase lifetime earnings potential.
- To promote job opportunities, apprenticeships and career paths within growth sectors, e.g. HS2 and the future jobs market.

1.3 Outcomes

Establish and set KPIs for achievements in years 2, 5 and 10. KPIs are to be based on the Birmingham Skills Investment Plan, the GBSLEP Strategic Economic Plan and the WMCA Strategic Economic Plan. Appropriate project milestones will also be agreed.

GBSLEP KPIs include

- Increase the proportion of the working age population with NVQ3+ to the national average by 2030. (50% Birmingham; 51% GBSLEP; 50% WMCA; 57% UK ONS/APS 2015)

WMCA KPIs include


- Average earnings of working age population will be 13% above UK averages with the living wage as the foundation minimum wage (Average gross weekly earnings full-time workers Birmingham residents £ 488.2; WM Region £492.7; UK £527.7 ONS ASHE 2015)
- Proportion of people qualified to NVQ4 or above will have increased to 36% to match the national average (33% Birmingham; 31% GBSLEP; 32% WMCA; 37% Core city average; 37% UK ONS/APS 2015)
- Number with no qualifications will have fallen to 9% to match and then better exceed the national average. (16% Birmingham; 14% GBSLEP; 15% WMCA; 9% UK ONS/APS 2015)

The overarching target should be based on these KPIs in line with agreed timescales. Sub KPIs to be established.

The programme will require pump priming of activity and resources at the outset, the impact will be delayed due to the time taken to achieve higher level qualifications and an incremental uptake. Indicators will therefore lag behind investment.

1.4 The impact of increasing skills levels

Qualifications have an impact on earnings potential. Those with Level 4+ qualifications earn on average £15.69 per hour – over twice the average hourly rate of someone with no qualifications, who earn on average £7.22 per hour.



Skills levels are rising at all levels across Birmingham, and the number with no qualifications is falling, however, rates are also rising nationally, and the gaps are not closing except for those achieving Level 4+ qualifications. The lower skills base of Birmingham is a significant factor in the employment rate at 62% being significantly lower than that of the UK (73%).

The scale of the challenge is significant. There are currently 108,000 working age adults in Birmingham with no qualifications and a further 71,000 qualified to Level 1 only. If Birmingham matched the UK proportion, only 61,000 residents would have no qualifications, 47,000 fewer than the current rate. Looking at higher skills, if the proportion of Birmingham residents with a Level 3 or above qualification was the same as the UK average, an additional 39,000 residents would be qualified to level 3+.

Looking forward, and taking account of the changing workforce and jobs profile in the city, the Birmingham Skills Investment plan identified that 68,000 adults need to improve their qualifications to Level 3 and above over the next 10 years to contribute towards matching the national average.

Not only are Birmingham residents as a whole less well qualified than the core city and UK average, but so are those who are in employment. This is true at all qualification levels apart from at level

4+ where Birmingham is slightly above the UK average, although under-performs compared to the core cities average².

Skills Levels of those in Work

9% of Birmingham residents in employment have no qualifications compared to a core city average of 6% and 5% for the UK.

57% of Birmingham residents in employment are qualified to Level 3+ compared to 62% for core cities and 60% for the UK.

In order to mirror the core cities average:

- 11,000 fewer employed residents would have no qualifications;
- over 21,000 more employed residents would be qualified to Level 3+; and
- nearly 14,000 more employed residents qualified to Level 4+.

Birmingham has a higher proportion of employed residents with 'Other' qualifications (10% of all in employment compared to 6% nationally and 7% for core cities). These are qualifications that cannot be matched to NVQ levels, and may have been acquired overseas. This cohort may therefore be working in jobs that do not fully utilise their skills. To equal the core city average, 10,000 of these employed residents would need to convert to recognised qualifications.

There is a mismatch between Birmingham residents qualifications and the occupational mix of jobs on offer in the city, suggesting that in-commuters are taking up a greater proportion of higher occupations, which is likely to have an impact on earnings. 42% of employed Birmingham residents are in higher occupations³ compared to 47% of those who work in the city. 13% of employed residents are in elementary occupations⁴ compared to 10% of those who work in the city.

Birmingham residents currently earn around £1.40 per hour less than those who work in the city, reflecting the fact that many jobs are taken by in-commuters and that under-skilled and under-

² 43% of Birmingham residents in employment have Level 4+ compared to 42% nationally and 46% for core cities

³ Managers, Directors and Senior Officials; Professional Occupations; Associate Prof & Tech Occupations

⁴

employed⁵ Birmingham residents are not able to take full advantage of the better paid jobs in the city.⁶

Increasing earnings has many benefits for individuals and the economy. Increased spending locally can stimulate business start-ups and growth, and individuals benefit by a higher standard of living and reduced benefits and service dependency.

The skills levels of Birmingham and WMCA residents will have a clear impact on economic growth - if employers cannot recruit people with the right skills then productivity and the prosperity of the workforce will be hampered. It has been estimated that up to 25% of economic growth could be lost by not investing in skills⁷.

Employers are forecasting they want many more people with higher level skills to meet their needs into the future. It is projected that there will be a shortage of 46,000 high skilled workers over the next 10 years. Therefore there is an impetus and strong rationale for businesses to invest in their workforce now, to ensure they remain competitive to meet the demands of the economy.

Investing in higher skill levels needs to be a business priority. Evidence shows that investing in skills increases productivity, supports innovation, the development of more sophisticated production processes and the production of higher quality products. Employees who have undertaken training are more motivated and display improved attitudes and aptitude in the work place. Workers benefit too – those who have been trained while at work are less likely to be made redundant and more likely to be promoted.⁸

1.5 Headlines – what is the key message

STATEMENTS	ACTIONS
➤ Qualifications have a significant impact on earnings potential	➤ 68,000 adults need to improve skills levels to L3+ to contribute to matching national average
➤ On average someone with a Level 4+	➤ Up to 25% of economic growth could be lost by

⁵ Definition of under-employed: (of a person) not having enough paid work or not doing work that makes full use of their skills and abilities.

⁶ (Annual Survey of Hours & Employment 2015 Full-time workers).

⁷ Birmingham Skills Investment Plan 2015

⁸ Measuring the Contribution of Skills to Business Performance CIPD 2006 and other studies cited in this study

qualification on average earns more than twice the hourly rate of someone with no qualifications

- The likelihood of being in employment significantly increases with the increase in qualification levels

not investing in skills

- The majority of new jobs created in the economy will require increasingly higher skill levels.

1.6 Where will jobs be coming from?

There will be significant growth in high, medium and low level occupations in the GBSLEP area by 2030. Although there are forecast to be an extra 68,000 lower skilled jobs, including replacement demand, offering opportunities for lower skilled residents, there will be even more medium and high skilled jobs (100,000). Looking at employment growth only (i.e. not replacement demand) between 2014 and 2024, there will be a reduction in demand for jobs requiring Level 3 qualifications (equivalent to A-level) and below of around 40,000; but an increase in demand for jobs requiring foundation degree level and above of around 90,000.

There are a number of priority sectors that are particularly significant to the economy. Some, such as Business & Professional Services, are large employers, others, such as ICT and Digital & Creative, have a much smaller employment base. The majority of the opportunities identified in these sectors are predominantly in relatively highly skilled areas. Growth in these priority sectors is therefore dependent on businesses being able to tap into a supply of highly skilled workers.

Replacement demand within sectors such as retail and health and social care also needs to be factored in, with opportunities developed for those with lower level skills, although employers in these sectors are demanding increasingly higher skills levels, particularly around customer service, digital and supervisory skills.

The Birmingham Skills Investment Plan identified the level of opportunity in the city for a range of sectors offering potential job openings for those with the right qualifications.⁹

Business and Professional services

- 19,000 new jobs in Birmingham by 2022
- 71,000 jobs to replace workers retiring or leaving the labour market

⁹ Note these are 'baseline' figures and do not take account of future activities undertaken by the city, the LEP and the WMCA designed to stimulate and grow priority sectors

Health and Social Work

- 42,000 job openings including 9,000 in Birmingham by 2022.
- Demand for more professional and managerial positions in the health sector is increasing.
- Higher qualified caring roles are in demand and will make up 75% of the predicted net gain in jobs for this sector.

Information technology

- 7,000 job openings including 4,000 new jobs in Birmingham by 2022
- Sector mostly demands highly qualified people. Many students doing basic IT courses but more need to move into higher level courses if the anticipated demand for IT skills is to be met.

Construction

- 15,000 job openings including 4,000 new jobs in Birmingham by 2022.
- Growth will be due to an increase in skilled trade occupations and professionals.
- Self-employed will make up to 36% of total employment.

Advanced Engineering & Manufacturing

- 11,000 job openings in Birmingham up to 2022
- Total employment will fall from present levels
- Estimated future demand for STEM qualifications will outstrip supply

Wholesale and retail

- 29,000 job openings including 2,000 new jobs in Birmingham by 2022.
- Expansion in this sector will largely be due to an increase in professional and managerial positions.
- The level of churn means a large number of opportunities at the entry level for sales assistants and cashiers.

Education

- 21,000 job openings but a loss of 2,000 jobs on present levels in Birmingham.
- Increased demand for Level 3 and above qualifications, especially degrees.

HS2

The construction of HS2 is likely to require a labour force of 65,000 jobs, with the majority of construction activity taking place between 2017 and 2022. These jobs will be primarily in the fields of design, project management, civil engineering construction and specialist railway engineering **including skills for high speed rail**.

Post build, around 81,000 new permanent jobs will be generated in the wider economy. These jobs are expected to be delivered on a phased basis over a 20 year period through to 2045. On average this will involve an additional 4,000 jobs per year for 20 years across the wider West Midlands area. The majority of

these new long-term jobs are expected to be generated in a range of key target sectors including business, professional & financial services, low carbon **and** advanced manufacturing.

Green Economy

Research from BIS¹⁰ in 2012 shows that the GBSLEP had the 6th largest (by employment) Low Carbon & Environmental Goods & Services sector of all LEPs, with nearly 1,600 companies employing 29,000 people. A report from Sustainability West Midlands¹¹, also in 2012 identified that the West Midlands has international strengths in key growth areas such as:

- low carbon vehicles, including transport infrastructure;
- low carbon buildings, including new build and energy efficiency retrofit;
- low carbon energy, including bioenergy, fuel cells, energy distribution, management and supply chains.

In each of these areas there are:

- significant local market opportunities in the West Midlands and access to markets throughout the UK;
- leading low carbon businesses to work with already based in the West Midlands;
- world class research capabilities and collaboration with industry;
- a skilled workforce and training facilities, with excellent low carbon, manufacturing and engineering skills, and facilities for developing employees' low carbon skills.

2. PROMOTIONAL STRATEGY

2.1. Stage 1 – Setting out the case for increasing skills levels for employers and individuals

Businesses

Setting out the business benefits to investing in the skills of current workforce – what are the headlines?

- Impact on productivity and profitability
- Retaining the best workforce
- Grow your own talent and reduce need to recruit in a limited labour market (impact of Brexit)
- Investing now for future skills needs of the business and the market
- Using their influence to improve employability of workforce
- Playing their part in developing and shaping future workforce and impacting on skills levels of region
- Take a lead in setting out the direction of skills
- Impact on regional economy – growth in GVA and reinvestment back into local economy
- Reduce costs for recruitment and advertising
- CSR – wider social impacts for workforce and local area

¹⁰ Low carbon and environmental goods and services: 2011 to 2012 BIS 2012

¹¹ Low Carbon Investment Prospectus Sustainability West Midlands 2012

- Benefits of apprenticeships

Individuals

- Tangible increase in pay and lifetime earnings potential
- Increase in opportunities and flexibility across work place
- Gaps in labour market and opportunities for people– link to sip
- Impact on life chances of children
- Health and Wellbeing – job satisfaction, sense of achievement
- Less likely to be unemployed
- More likely to be an entrepreneur (i.e. set up your own business)

The statements set out above will be the basis for key facts flyers and promotional information for businesses and individuals.

2.2 Stage 2 – Promotional campaign to engage businesses and individuals

There is a need to translate these key messages into a deliverable promotional campaign that engages with businesses and individuals, creating a buzz around the skills agenda and motivating people and businesses to invest in their future through increasing skills. The promotional campaign will need to consider:

- What the key messages will be
- Target audiences
- Where this will be promoted
- Resources required
- Branding and design
- Marketing materials
- Timescales for delivery
- Social media
- Use of case studies/real life examples
- Scope and level of resource to deliver

The message and the philosophy behind the campaign needs to be adopted and promoted through the whole careers, skills and business support sector, pushing the 'Step Forward Birmingham' programme through a range of contacts and pathways and weaving this message into advice and guidance.

What are the tools available for upskilling?

A key part of the Step Forward promotional campaign will be to raise awareness of the tools that are available to support upskilling. This will provide more information on the products that are

currently available to provide solutions for employers and individuals to improve skills and increase qualifications levels.

This will include:

- **Apprenticeship Levy**
- **Funding for qualifications**
- **Advanced Learner Loans**
- **Apporg**
- **Institute for Technology**
- **Cog.**
- **Skills Engine**

Key partner organisations:

The campaign needs to be aligned with existing services, stakeholders and provision, ensuring the message is embedded into engagement with employers and the message is consistently promoted with business contacts through support programmes and advice and guidance; and with individuals through careers advice and guidance at all levels.

Business Support	Skills Providers	CIAG provision
GBSLEP Growth Hub	The Skills Hub	Schools and FE/HE colleges
BCC Business Support	Institute of Apprenticeships	National Careers Service
Chamber of Commerce	Sector Skills Councils	Birmingham Careers Service
	App Org	Cog.

Targeting the campaign – Employers

Existing business/employer contacts	New businesses/employers	Business Support Programmes/Partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement & Planning contacts - construction & end use • BCC • Acivico • Major employers – JLR, Carillion, Network Rail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail Birmingham • BIDS • Birmingham Business Charter signatures • Wider marketing & promotion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth Hub • BCC Business Support • Chamber of Commerce

Targeting the campaign – Individuals

No qualifications	Skills Providers	Target groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting existing skills into 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing/previous students from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider marketing and promotion

qualifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting overseas quals into UK equivalent • ESOL • Digital • Maths/English 	colleges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector basis – opportunities and pipelines • Geographical - areas with lower skills levels
---	--

2.3 Stage 3 – what are the pathways to improving skills levels?

Getting the message out on skills progression and engaging individuals and businesses in investing in their future skills is one part of the challenge. What also must be delivered for this strategy to work is to ensure that the landscape of training provision is easy to navigate. The training pathways need to be clear and laid out so that people can easily act upon their motivation to take up training and develop skills.

The skills arena can appear complex and confusing for users. Behind the promotional campaign, there needs to be clear information outlining training and progression routes and options, quality advice and guidance on pathways and funding options for individuals and businesses. This would need to be available on a sector basis through a central information point, which is also promoted through the campaign.

A potential platform is already in place through the GBSLEP Growth Hub, providing a central coordination point for business support; and The Skills Hub that coordinates existing skills provision through colleges. This should be investigated to assess future viability and whether it would be appropriate to support, or has the potential to be developed to support the Step Forward programme. Further analysis also needs to be carried out to identify what other skills coordination and diagnostic support is available across the city and for which sectors and how this can be simplified and presented to meet the needs of employers and individuals. This must also take into consideration private sector training providers and potential implications through the Area Based Review of Further Education currently being undertaken.

Consideration must also be given to how in-work training is delivered by local providers, how can the provision become more flexible and suit the needs of businesses and employers and delivered in the workplace. Providers need to develop a menu of options that meet the needs of employers to increase the uptake of in work training.

2.4. Stage 4 – tracking and review

The programme of activity will report into the Birmingham Employment and Skills Board and work alongside the GBSLEP and WMCA.

Milestones will be set based against a more detailed action plan. Once KPIs have been established, tracking processes and evidence requirements can be agreed a reporting schedule put into place reporting to relevant partners and boards.

3. WORK STREAMS

There are 3 work-streams to focus on to capture the entire Birmingham population and raise skills levels for all residents:

IGNITE - ACCELERATE - RETUNE

Phase 1 of this programme of activity will focus specifically on the **Accelerate** workstream, targeting the message at upskilling those in work. Activity will be targeted at both employers and individuals, raising awareness of the impact and benefits of higher level skills.

Phase 2 and 3 will then focus on Ignite to ensure young people are aware of the life benefits of having higher skills levels and the career paths that are available to them, and Retune, focusing on the skills of those that are unemployed or under-employed and enabling them to get back into work through the enhancement of their skills through qualifications.

ACCELERATE

Target: Birmingham residents in work to achieve higher skills levels

3.1 Quick Wins/ Initial areas to focus activity

BCC and Acivico

Examine the internal practices within BCC and Acivico – what support is in place for upskilling the workforce? How can we promote this message internally and support staff to take up training, particularly those that do not have any qualifications?

Retail Birmingham (SMILE Birmingham)

Engage with city centre employers through Retail Birmingham to promote upskilling of workforce, particularly around customer service excellence.

Relaunch of SMILE Birmingham programme. The aim should be for all employees to be trained in customer service to at least Level 2, with a minimum % achieved to receive SMILE Birmingham recognition. Engage with colleges to incorporate Birmingham specific content as developed through BGAP, and accredit colleges/courses with SMILE Birmingham status. New training must be through recognised SMILE Birmingham providers.

Branding, certificate, recognition for employers etc. to be developed

Consultation

Consultation on the strategy and approach now needs to be carried out at a number of levels, particularly with key partners as outlined in 2.2. The strategy is supported by BCC Cabinet and GBSLEP, however, further details and the philosophy of the campaign need to be developed and agreed with all partners. Further work will be carried out to raise awareness of the strategy, gain feedback from partners and ensure it is adopted and implemented effectively. Approval by BCC Cabinet will be sought by December 2016.

A consultation event will be carried out to test out the marketing messages and campaign philosophy. This should include skills providers, trade unions, employers, current students, potential students, and awarding/professional bodies. Focus to be on the key messages, are we getting their attention; is the message right, are we targeting the right people?

3.2 Main Areas of Activity

Implementation with Skills Providers and Business Support

Following the adoption of this strategy at a local and regional level, skills providers, IAG provision and business support programmes will need to be fully aware of the programme, and in a position to support and implement the strategy at a delivery level. If increased numbers of residents/businesses will be enquiring about training and development, the provision needs to be available and consequently support needs to be available to impact on actual participation rates. A detailed programme of activity needs to be agreed to coordinate the appropriate response from skills providers, IAG provision and business support programmes to promote the message around accelerating skills through all contacts and direct and provide guidance on the options available to do so.

Funding Package

Explore options for developing a funding package to support skills development within the workforce. The recent ESIF call for funding (under Priority 2.1) supports relevant programmes around upskilling the workforce around basic skills and encouraging progression in employment.

Skills Diagnostics

Further analysis, building on mapping carried out on current CIAG information (outlined in 2.3) needs to be carried out to understand what level of skills diagnostic is currently available for employers and individuals and how well this is working? Is this a gap in the current provision, or an area for further investment to meet the needs of the programme and support the acceleration of skills? Could a coordinated approach to this be supported by the LEP, linked to the Growth Hub and The Skills Hub?

Social Media

There needs to be a strong emphasis on the use of social media, which has the potential to reach out to large number of people with lower cost implications, particularly in order to attract and sensitise young people to the message. A social media strategy needs to be put in place. Depending on the geographical for Birmingham, this may include support from BCC social media team, using BCC accounts such as Twitter, Facebook etc. and pushing this through Cog. Also utilising other partner social media accounts to reach out to a wider audience.

Breaking down the Target groups

Skills levels for those in employment has been outlined above (Section 1.4). Can this be further broken down based on geography, diversity, age, sector to assist in developing the marketing plan – identifying the audience, directing the resources and what steps need to be put in place to assist skills development.

Strengthen message re diversity of workforce. May be targets set in WMCA devolution deal and BME 2020 initiative which aims to improve number of people from BME communities in employment and progression in employment.

Case Studies/Exemplar Employers

Identify a number of case studies of individuals and businesses that have invested in skills development and seen a positive outcome. Use as part of advertising campaign – real life examples and positive impacts.

Identify a number of businesses that are committed to in work development and push them as market leaders to promote the benefits to business, share their experiences and learning and encourage other businesses to get involved.

Skills City Birmingham Employer Skills Pledge/Kitemark

An outcome of the programme could be to develop a Skills Pledge for employers that sign up to achieving certain outcomes around in work training and development and acknowledging employers that are already performing well and investing in upskilling the workforce. Agree a series of outcomes and targets for employers around training; they can then receive award/kitemark for achieving this. This would tap into CSR requirements and be an opportunity to promote business, share learning with others and develop skills of employees. There may be opportunities to link this in with the Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility (BC4SR).

Other considerations

- What is happening elsewhere nationally and globally?
- Increased employee retention from increased skills – what research is there to prove this – Investors in People, workforce development surveys

- In work poverty
- Side step into growth sectors – how can they retrain and move into growth areas
- In work pipeline

Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Birmingham Skills Investment Plan
Directorate	Economy
Service Area	STP Employment
Type	New/Proposed Policy
EA Summary	The development of a Birmingham Skills Investment Plan (SIP) was a major priority in the Leader's Priority Statement 2014/15. The intent is to produce a SIP that is clearly rooted in an employer led statement of current and future skills needs in the City, linked to jobs and economic growth. The SIP is intended to address the whole range of issues which contribute to the problem of mismatch of supply and demand, and is intended to be jointly owned and implemented by stakeholders across the City.
Reference Number	EA001132
Task Group Manager	jane.newman@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Date Approved	2016-02-05 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	Shilpi.Akbar@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	lesley.edwards@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a New/Proposed Policy.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Policy and expected outcomes?

The development of a Birmingham Skills Investment Plan (SIP) was a major priority in the Leader's Priority Statement 2014/15. The intent is to produce a SIP that is clearly rooted in an employer led statement of current and future skills needs in the City, linked to jobs and economic growth. The SIP is intended to address the whole range of issues such as careers advice in schools, skills gap between current and projected demand, lack of quality apprenticeship routes which all contribute to the problem of mismatch of supply and demand, and is intended to be jointly owned and implemented by stakeholders across the City. This includes training providers, schools, employers. The context for the development of the SIP is set against a complex interaction of social and economic strategies to encourage the retention of skills within the City, the engagement of young people and the attraction of new and growing businesses to Birmingham through the inward investment activity of Marketing Birmingham and the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership as well as the Midlands Engine for Growth. It will support the delivery of the Birmingham Youth Promise and align with the work developing out of the Kerslake Review published in December 2014.

The Birmingham Skills Investment Plan is a partnership statement of policy and actions designed to raise skills in Birmingham and support economic growth as well as level the playing field for all Birmingham residents who are affected by low skills, no skills and barriers to employment. The statistical data that is contained demonstrates that Birmingham as a whole lags behind Core Cities (Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham, Sheffield) and the UK as a whole. Nearly 16% of all working age residents have no qualifications and this rises to 27% for workless people. Our employment rate is the second lowest (behind Liverpool) of all English core cities. The Birmingham economy needs to create even more jobs to close the employment gap with other cities, and an increasing proportion of these will demand high qualifications. Our ambition is to move an extra 70,000 residents into employment by 2026 - increasing the present employment rate of 62% to 67%. This would halve the gap between Birmingham's current employment rate and the UK employment rate. It would also take us above the current English core city average of 66%.

The Plan itself comprises a comprehensive labour market information review as well as a policy statement of actions. The Plan has been developed following extensive consultation with employers and employer organisations, third sector organisations, schools, providers of FE and HE, Chamber of Commerce, Birmingham Education Partnership DWP, internal partners such as the Careers Service, Youth Service. Consultation has been via face-to face interviews, telephone interviews and group consultations with groupings such as the Birmingham Employment and Skills Board and the Birmingham Youth Partnership. The process for developing the SIP was overseen by a Steering Group which included FE, HE, Chamber of Commerce, third sector, DWP and the Skills Funding Agency.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Public Service Excellence	No
A Fair City	Yes
A Prosperous City	Yes

A Democratic City	No
-------------------	----

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	No
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Not Relevant	No
Disability	Not Relevant	No
Gender	Not Relevant	No
Gender Reassignment	Not Relevant	No
Marriage Civil Partnership	Not Relevant	No
Pregnancy And Maternity	Not Relevant	No
Race	Not Relevant	No
Religion or Belief	Not Relevant	No
Sexual Orientation	Not Relevant	No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

The Birmingham Skills Investment Plan is a partnership statement of policy and actions designed to raise skills in Birmingham and support economic growth as well as level the playing field for all Birmingham residents who are affected by low skills, no skills and barriers to employment. The statistical data that is contained demonstrates that Birmingham as a whole lags behind Core Cities and the UK as a whole. Nearly 16% of all working age residents have no qualifications and this rises to 27% for workless people. Our employment rate is the second lowest of all English core cities. The Birmingham economy needs to create even more jobs to close the employment gap with other cities, and an increasing proportion of these will demand high qualifications. Our ambition is to move an extra 70,000 residents into employment by 2026 - increasing the present employment rate of 62% to 67%. This would halve the gap between Birmingham's current employment rate and the UK employment rate. It would also take us above the current English core city average of 66%.

The Plan itself comprises a comprehensive labour market information review as well as a policy statement of actions that are signed up to by stakeholders across the City such as training providers and employer representative bodies. The Plan has been developed following extensive consultation with employers and employer organisations, third sector organisations, schools, providers of FE and HE, Chamber of Commerce, Birmingham Education Partnership DWP, internal partners such as the Careers Service, Youth Service. The process for developing the SIP was overseen by a Steering Group which included FE, HE, Chamber of Commerce, third sector, DWP and the Skills Funding Agency.

The Plan is targeted at raising skills and employment levels across the City for all Birmingham residents and is not targeted on any particular group and therefore there are no adverse implications identified from the recommendations of the Skills Investment Plan

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

The Plan itself comprises a comprehensive labour market information review as well as a policy statement of actions that are signed up to by stakeholders across the City. The Plan has been developed following extensive consultation with employers and employer organisations, third sector organisations, schools, providers of FE and HE, Chamber of Commerce, Birmingham Education Partnership DWP, internal partners such as the Careers Service, Youth Service. The process for developing the SIP was overseen by a Steering Group which included FE, HE, Chamber of Commerce, third sector, DWP and the Skills Funding Agency. The Birmingham Skills Investment Plan is targeted at raising skills and employment levels across the City for all Birmingham residents and is not targeted on any particular group and therefore there are no adverse implications identified from the recommendations of the Skills Investment Plan. Therefore a Full Assessment is not required.

4 Review Date

31/03/17

5 Action Plan

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	Strategic Director Economy
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017
SUBJECT:	HOUSING CLEARANCE PROGRAMME
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002861/2017
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s) or Relevant Executive Member:	Councillor Peter Griffiths – Cabinet Member Housing & Homes
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Victoria Quinn – Housing and Homes
Wards affected:	Kings Norton, Brandwood, Sparkbrook, Sutton Trinity, Washwood Heath and Bartley Green

1. Purpose of report:
<p>1.1 To seek approval for the rehousing of up to 2,665 tenants, the acquisition of 106 privately owned dwellings and the demolition of 1,175 dwellings. This approval is sought on the basis that the properties proposed to be cleared are obsolete and financially unviable.</p>
2. Decision(s) recommended:
<p>It is recommended that Cabinet:</p> <p>2.1 Approve the acquisition of 106 privately owned dwellings and the clearance of 1,175 dwellings, as set out in the Full Business Case, detailed in APPENDIX 1.</p> <p>2.2 Authorise the use of compulsory purchase orders (CPO) to acquire such land as is necessary within the areas identified in the plans in APPENDIX 3, such powers to be exercised under either Section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 or Section 226 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as appropriate for the developments which the CPO will be required to implement.</p> <p>2.3 Delegate to the Acting Strategic Director of Economy and the Cabinet Member Housing and Homes, approval to authorise the acquisition under section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 or section 226 (1) (a) Town and Country Planning Act 1990, of any third party interests within the areas identified in the plans in Appendix 3.</p> <p>2.4 Authorise the Acting Strategic Director of Place to cease lettings and commence the priority rehousing from properties identified in APPENDIX 3.</p> <p>2.5 Note that the procurement of such contracts as are needed to undertake clearance of the properties included in this report will follow in due course.</p>

- 2.6 Authorise the Director of Property to pay statutory and discretionary Home Loss payments and negotiate disturbance compensation to qualifying tenants and home owners.
- 2.7 Authorise the Acting City Solicitor to serve Initial Demolition Notices on the Council tenants residing in the properties identified in APPENDIX 2 based on the intention to demolish and to serve Final Demolition Notices and comply with all associated statutory requirements.
- 2.8 Authorise the Acting City Solicitor to take any steps/enter legal agreements needed to bring the above into effect including, but not limited, to: negotiate, execute and complete all necessary legal documentation to give effect to the above recommendations, and in relation to any in principle CPO, to carry out preparatory work (including land referencing) required prior to the making of such an order.

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Clive Skidmore, Head of Housing Development
Telephone No:	303 1667
E-mail address:	clive.skidmore@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

3.1 Internal

All relevant Ward Members and Executive Members for the Districts within the wards affected by these clearance proposals have been consulted and feedback has been supportive of the city council proposals. The Acting Strategic Director Place and other relevant Senior Officers from the Economy, and Place Directorates have been consulted and are supportive of the report proceeding for an executive decision.

- 3.1.2 Officers from City Finance, Legal Services and Birmingham Property Services have been involved in the preparation of this report.

3.2 External

Local residents have been consulted on the demolition proposals and the majority of residents are supportive of the proposals to clear these properties in most cases. Residents' consultation took place in the form of questionnaires, home visits and drop-in events in the areas concerned, during September and October 2016. There was a very high response rate of 77%, with over 90% of respondents supporting the demolition proposals. A lower level of support from residents was achieved in the case of the ten properties at Bartley Green and Ward End.

The full details of the results of the resident's consultation are in APPENDIX 10

4.	Compliance Issues:
4.1	<u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u>
4.1.1	The demolition proposed in this report will facilitate the development of new homes for a growing city which is a key objective of the City Council. The development of new affordable housing within the City is in accordance with the objectives of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan 2017+.
4.1.2	Fairness to tackle inequality and deprivation, promote social cohesion across all communities in Birmingham, and ensure dignity, in particular for our elderly, and safeguarding for children – by providing new affordable homes, apprenticeships and bursary programme placements.
4.1.3	Prosperity - to lay the foundations for a prosperous City, built on an inclusive economy – by stimulating the construction industry through the Council's housing building programme.
4.1.4	Democracy - to involve local people and communities in the future of their local area and their Public Services – by consulting communities about proposals for new development and ensure that new homes meet local needs and localised targeting of training, education and employment initiatives to complement the house-building programme.
4.1.5	<u>Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility (BBCSR)</u> There are no direct implications for compliance with the BBC4SR, however contracts which are let in due course as a result of these proposals for demolition and construction of new homes will include a mandatory requirement that will form part of the conditions of contracts
4.2	<u>Financial Implications</u>
4.2.1	The total cost of rehousing, CPO, acquisition and demolition is estimated at £29.8m, which will be incurred between 2017/18 and 2023/24. This total is made up of £4.4m revenue expenditure, funded from HRA income, and £25.4m capital expenditure, which is funded from within the overall Public Sector Housing Capital programme financing over the seven year period.
4.2.2	The new proposed clearance programme will be carried out alongside the existing approved clearance programme. The estimated remaining cost of the existing approved clearance programme is £14.9m, which will be incurred between 2017/18 and 2022/23. The details of the total programme are set out in Appendix 1 and summarised in the table below.

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21 to 2023/24	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Proposed Clearance Programme					
Revenue Expenditure	0.4	0.7	0.8	2.5	4.4
Capital Expenditure	2.0	4.6	4.3	14.5	25.4
Total	2.4	5.3	5.1	17.0	29.8
Existing Clearance Programme					
Revenue Expenditure	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.5
Capital Expenditure	8.9	1.9	3.3	0.3	14.4
Total	9.3	2.0	3.3	0.3	14.9
Total Revenue Expenditure	0.8	0.8	0.8	2.5	4.9
Total Capital Expenditure	10.9	6.5	7.6	14.8	39.8
Grand Total	11.7	7.3	8.4	17.3	44.7

Funding for both revenue and capital expenditure elements of the existing and proposed programmes are included within the HRA Business Plan 2017+, as summarised in Appendix 1.

4.3 Legal Implications

4.3.2 Power to acquire land is found in section 123 Local Government Act 1972. The legal powers under which a local authority may make a compulsory purchase order to acquire land for housing contained within section 17 Housing Act 1985 or, if there are additional non-housing uses proposed in any redevelopment then section 226 (1) (a) Town & Country Planning Act 1990. The case for the potential use of such powers is set out in appendix 6 along with relevant human rights considerations in appendix 8.

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

An equality assessment No. EA001676 is attached. This demonstrates that there are no disproportionate impacts on residents within the protected categories.

The Equality Assessment is included in Appendix 5.

5. **Relevant background/chronology of key events:**

5.1 The Council owns over 62,000 homes, with the average age of these properties being over 65 years. There are a number of drivers which mean that the Council needs to review the future of these properties and demolish a proportion of them. There is an ongoing need to improve and modernise the Council's housing stock, and inevitably there are properties within the stock which have reached the end of their useful life and cannot be economically improved. Some properties suffer from inherent structural defects which are financially not viable to address, whilst others fail to meet resident's aspirations in the 21st century or may open up access to a larger site if they are demolished. The current clearance programme was approved in 2012, and is

substantially completed, with 688 properties having been demolished between 2012 and 2017, and a further 411 properties from this programme carried forward for demolition in future years. Of these 411 properties, 310 are void pending demolition.

- 5.2 This report makes proposals for the demolition of properties within the HRA which have been selected for clearance taking account of the following criteria:
- Major structural defects;
 - High level of financial non-viability;
 - Failure to meet the aspirations of residents;
 - Potential to free up a larger regeneration opportunity;
 - Continuation of an existing major regeneration programme.
- 5.3 The Council has developed an Asset Management Model which identifies groups of properties and ranks those groups in terms of their financial impact on the HRA. A review has been undertaken on specific properties in those property groups which have the highest negative impact on the HRA to assess their financial viability over a 30 year period. This information, together with a qualitative assessment of housing assets, informs the proposed clearance programme in this report. The resultant cleared land will provide sites for the building of new, more energy efficient, council homes and homes for sale.
- 5.4 A master planning and consultation exercise for Druids Heath is already in progress and it is anticipated that proposals for further clearance will be submitted to Cabinet in late 2017. The proposals in this report include 670 properties for clearance at Druids Heath, including 79 privately owned properties. This report seeks specific approval for the clearance and demolition of Heath House as a first step in the regeneration of this area. Specific addresses for the remainder of the properties to be cleared at Druids Heath (including confirmation of the number of properties affected) will be included in the future Cabinet report.
- 5.5 A detailed and comprehensive programme of consultation has been undertaken with residents who are potentially affected by the clearance proposals set out within this report, including door knocking, face to face and telephone interviews. This consultation succeeded in achieving responses from 77% of affected residents, with overall 90% of those in favour of the clearance of their properties. A lower level of support from residents was achieved in the case of the ten properties at Bartley Green and Ward End.
- 5.6 Appendix 2 gives details of the individual properties which are proposed for clearance within this report. Following approval of this report, rehousing of residents from the properties in question will start from April 2017. Empty properties will be demolished and new homes will be constructed on the cleared sites through the BMHT programme. The detailed proposals for each site will be the subject of future reports to the appropriate decision maker.
- 5.7 Residents affected by clearance are entitled by law to financial compensation. Tenants are entitled to a homeloss payment set by statute at £5,800 per household. Owner occupiers are entitled to receive the market value of their property plus 10%. Both tenants and owner occupiers are entitled to a disturbance payment of up to £1,500 towards removals and other expenses. Council tenants are offered an alternative Council property.

5.8 Progress in implementing the proposals set out in this report will be reported back to Cabinet in the annual HRA Business Plan review each February.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

Five potential alternative options have been identified –

1. **Reduce the scale of the proposed clearance or carry out no clearance at all.** The consequences of this approach would be an increased financial pressure to the HRA, as most of the properties identified for clearance require greater levels of investment than the rental income derived from them.
2. **Increase the scale of the proposed clearance programme.** This approach would provide more land for replacement homes, but would reduce the Council's ability to meet demand for social housing and may not be affordable within the HRA.
3. **Demolish the same number of properties, but select different properties.** This may result in lost opportunities to make the best use of existing council housing, and represent an additional financial pressure on the HRA if financially viable properties are demolished whilst less viable properties are retained.
4. **Accelerate the proposed clearance programme and deliver it within a shorter timescale.** This would result in the rehousing of affected tenants and owner-occupiers being substantially more difficult to achieve, and would make it more difficult to meet the needs of households on the Council Housing Waiting List (including those currently in temporary accommodation). The need for CPO in some cases means that assembly of some sites cannot be accelerated.
5. **Deliver the programme over a longer period.** This option would require short term investment costs where there are structural issues and would result in further financial pressures to the HRA as the additional rent generated would not be sufficient to fund the additional investment required.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):

- 7.1 The clearance programme proposed in this report will remove properties from the HRA which are obsolete and financially unviable.
- 7.2 Clearance of these properties will provide land or improve the development potential of land that can be developed for new, higher quality family homes that better meet the current and future housing needs of the citizens of Birmingham and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities.

Signatures	Date
Councillor Peter Griffiths, Cabinet Member Housing and Homes
Waheed Nazir Strategic Director Economy

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COUNCIL HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2012-17 - POST SUBSIDY REFORM – CABINET REPORT 26 SEPTEMBER 2011 2. Clearance of Properties at the FORDROUGH /HOULDEY ROAD - CABINET REPORT 26 January 2016 3. MOVING FORWARD THE MEADWAY REGENERATION PROGRAMME – CABINET REPORT 16 March 2015 4. Clearance of Properties at 140 - 142 SHARD END CRESCENT and 445 – 431 THE HEATHWAY, B34 7AD – Chief Officer Approval 27 December 2015 5. Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan 2017+.

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full Business Case 2. List of Clearance Properties 3. Plans of Clearance Area 4. Risk Register. 5. Equality Assessment 6. Justification for Compulsory Purchase Order. 7. Planning and Policy Context of Proposal. 8. Article 1 and Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights 9. Stakeholder Management Plan 10. Resident Consultation Results 11. Project Milestones

Full Business Case (FBC)			
1. General Information			
Directorate	Economy	Portfolio/Committee	Housing
Project Title	Housing Clearance	Project Code	Various
Project Description	<p>The project is to clear obsolete properties from a number of locations across the city. These are –</p> <p>Kings Norton – clearance of four tower blocks and 251 low rise properties in support of the long running regeneration programme.</p> <p>Druids Heath – clearance of Heath House, plus in principle approval to the clearance of an additional number of homes (up to 622) as part of a major regeneration of this outer city estate;</p> <p>The Poplars – clearance of financially unviable older peoples housing which fails to meet residents aspirations;</p> <p>Properties at Alfred and Beach Roads, Sparkbrook – clearance of properties which are in need of substantial structural works and are not economical to repair;</p> <p>Properties at Monmouth Road, Bartley Green – clearance of properties to create a larger site for development of new homes;</p> <p>Properties at Ward End Park Road – clearance of properties to enable access to a larger development site.</p>		
Links to Corporate and Service Outcomes	<p>The demolition proposed in this report will facilitate the development of new homes for a growing city which is a key objective of the City Council. The development of new affordable housing within the City is in accordance with the objectives of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan 2017+.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairness to tackle inequality and deprivation, promote social cohesion across all communities in Birmingham, and ensure dignity, in particular for our elderly, and safeguarding for children – by demolishing obsolete homes which do not meet residents' aspirations and replacing them with new high quality homes. • Prosperity - to lay the foundations for a prosperous City, built on an inclusive economy – clearance of obsolete stock will create opportunities for 		

	<p>redevelopment and stimulate the construction industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Democracy - to involve local people and communities in the future of their local area and their Public Services – communities have been consulted about the proposals to redevelop their homes, and the planning of new developments will provide opportunities for local people to be involved in shaping the future of their neighbourhood. 		
Project Definition Document Approved by	<i>n/a</i>	Date of Approval	
Benefits Quantification- Impact on Outcomes	Measure		Impact
	Demolition of 1,064 HRA properties and 101 private dwellings in Kings Norton, Druids Heath, Sparkbrook and Sutton Coldfield.		Demolition of obsolete and non-viable properties
	Demolition of 10 properties in Washwood Heath and Bartley Green		6.32 acres of land released for housing development
	Demolition of 28 HRA bedsits /flats and one house in Sutton Coldfield		0.85 acres of land released for housing development in Sutton Coldfield
	Demolition of 407 HRA properties and 11 leaseholders at Kings Norton		Approximately 16 acres of land released for housing development in Kings Norton
	Demolition of 37 HRA properties and 11 leaseholders at Sparkbrook		0.42 acres of land released for housing development in Sparkbrook
	Demolition of 591 HRA properties and 79 owner occupiers at Druids Heath		Up to 26 acres of land released for housing development in Druids Heath
Project Deliverables	<p>The Project will deliver:</p> <p>A 7 year Demolition Programme for clearance of elements of the city's housing stock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 city tower blocks – demolish 467 dwellings Kings Norton 5 phase of the area regeneration scheme – demolish 251 low-rise dwellings Druids Heath area regeneration scheme– demolish 370 low-rise dwellings. The Poplars, Sutton Coldfield – Demolish 28 Bedsits& Flats and 1 House 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sparkbrook Maisonettes- Demolish 48 Bedsits & Flats • Bartley Green - Demolish 8 Flats • Washwood Heath - Demolish 2 Houses <p>Acquire private properties, using Compulsory Purchase Powers if necessary, by 31 March 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 city tower blocks – acquire 12 properties • Kings Norton 5 phase of the area regeneration scheme – acquire 11 properties • Druids Heath area regeneration scheme – acquire 67 properties (approximate). • Sparkbrook Maisonettes – acquire 11 properties • Bartley Green – acquire 5 properties <p>Provide opportunities for the reconfiguration of the city's housing stock by releasing 51.6 acres of development land, by 31 March 2023, to meet the needs of communities in the future:</p> <p>The totals are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demolition of 1175 dwellings over 7 years 2. Rehousing of up to 2138 council tenants 3. The acquisition of 106 private properties
Scope	The scope of the project includes rehousing of tenants and owner occupiers, acquisition of third party interests, application for CPO, and demolition.
Scope exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequent redevelopment of the sites • Procurement.....
Dependencies on other projects or activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of suitable accommodation to allow the rehousing of affected tenants and owner occupiers
Achievability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has a track record of successfully rehousing residents from approximately 200 properties per annum, using CPO powers where necessary and proceeding with demolition to create sites ready for the development of new homes.
Project Manager	Colette McCann, Senior Service Manager (Investment & Development), Economy
Budget Holder	Rob James, Service Director (Housing), Place
Sponsor	Clive Skidmore, Head of Housing Development and Regeneration, 0121 303 1667
Project Accountant	Guy Olivant: Head of City Finance - Housing
Clearance Project Board Members	Colette McCann, Justin Brennan, Tina Rowlands, Allyson Marke Wilson, Nick Ward, Jane Cornell, Ian Chaplin, Adrian

	Jones, Stuart Hancox		
Head of City Finance (HoCF)		Date of HoCF Approval:	

FINANCIAL TABLES

NEW CLEARANCE PROGRAMME

	Year 1 2017/18	Year 2 2018/19	Year 3 2019/20	Year 4 2020/21	Year 5 2021/22	Year 6 2022/23	Year 7 2023/24	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT								
Void Pending Demolition Costs	327	376	406	410	433	274	0	2,226
Council Tax	95	291	407	448	470	363	136	2,210
Total Expenditure	422	667	813	858	903	637	136	4,436
Housing Revenue Account Income	(422)	(667)	(813)	(858)	(903)	(637)	(136)	(4,436)
PUBLIC SECTOR HOUSING CAPITAL								
Rehousing Costs	1,262	1,300	1,459	1,497	1,535	927	0	7,980
Acquisition Costs	621	2,023	1,614	1,457	2,178	1,972	0	9,865
Removal Costs	2	7	5	5	7	6	0	32
Demolition Costs	0	1,123	1,195	1,367	1,652	1,286	667	7,290
CPO Costs	110	110	0	0	0	0	0	220
Total Capital Expenditure	1,995	4,563	4,273	4,326	5,372	4,191	667	25,387
Funding from Public Sector Housing Capital Account	(1,995)	(4,563)	(4,273)	(4,326)	(5,372)	(4,191)	(667)	(25,387)

**EXISTING APPROVED CLEARANCE
PROGRAMME**

	Year 1 2017/18	Year 2 2018/19	Year 3 2019/20	Year 4 2020/21	Year 5 2021/22	Year 6 2022/23	Year 7 2023/24	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT								
Void Pending Demolition Costs	57	3	0	0	0	0	0	60
Council Tax	347	47	5					399
Total Expenditure	404	50	5	0	0	0	0	459
Housing Revenue Account Income	(404)	(50)	(5)	0	0	0	0	(459)
PUBLIC SECTOR HOUSING CAPITAL								
Rehousing Costs	405	87	64	0	0	0		556
Acquisition Costs	6,578	1,145	1,601	0	0	0		9,324
Removal Costs	60	87	87	0	0	0		234
Demolition Costs	1,762	493	1,483	100	100	100		4,038
CPO Costs	183	80	55	0	0	0		318
Total Capital Expenditure	8,988	1,892	3,290	100	100	100	0	14,470
Capital Financing								
HRA Revenue Contributions	(6,264)	(1,734)	(2,934)	(100)	(100)	(100)	0	(11,232)
Grant	(2,724)	(158)	(356)	0	0	0	0	(3,238)
Total Capital Financing	(8,988)	(1,892)	(3,290)	(100)	(100)	(100)	0	(14,470)

TOTAL HRA EXPENDITURE	826	717	818	858	903	637	136	4,895
TOTAL HRA INCOME	(826)	(717)	(818)	(858)	(903)	(637)	(136)	(4,895)
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE	10,983	6,455	7,563	4,426	5,472	4,291	667	39,857
TOTAL CAPITAL FINANCING	(10,983)	(6,455)	(7,563)	(4,426)	(5,472)	(4,291)	(667)	(39,857)

Appendix 2 -SCHEDULE OF PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED FOR CLEARANCE

NEW CLEARANCE PROGRAMME

	Year 1 2017/18	Year 2 2018/19	Year 3 2019/20	Year 4 2020/21	Year 5 2021/22	Year 6 2022/23	Total
Housing Revenue Account Properties							
Kings Norton - High Rise	0	42	42	41	42	0	167
Kings Norton - Low Rise	95	16	40	50	39	0	240
Druids Heath - High Rise	48	48	48	48	48	48	288
Druids Heath - Low Rise	0	48	50	58	73	74	303
The Poplars	20	9	0	0	0	0	29
Beach and Alfred Road	13	12	12	0	0	0	37
Monmouth Road	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Ward End Park Road	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total Housing Revenue Account	176	180	192	197	202	122	1,069
Owner Occupier Properties							
Kings Norton - High Rise	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kings Norton - Low Rise	3	4	2	1	1	0	11
Druids Heath - High Rise	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
Druids Heath - Low Rise	0	8	10	12	19	18	67
The Poplars	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beach and Alfred Road	3	4	4	0	0	0	11
Monmouth Road	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Ward End Park Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Owner Occupier	8	23	18	15	22	20	106
Total Properties	184	203	210	212	224	142	1,175

EXISTING APPROVED CLEARANCE PROGRAMME

	Year 1 2017/18	Year 2 2018/19	Year 3 2019/20	Year 4 2020/21	Year 5 2021/22	Year 6 2022/23	Total
Housing Revenue Account	81	6	0	0	0	0	87
Owner Occupier	12	2					14
Total Properties	93	8	0	0	0	0	101
TOTAL HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	176	180	192	197	202	122	1,069
TOTAL OWNER OCCUPIER	20	25	18	15	22	20	120
TOTAL PROPERTIES	196	205	210	212	224	142	1,189

The Large Panel System Blocks (LPS)

The Council has fifty LPS blocks. These blocks are potentially structurally defective and may require expensive investment works in order to remedy such structural issues as are identified. This report includes a proposal to demolish ten of these blocks.

The clearance of the four LPS blocks in Kings Norton will open up a significant site for future housing development, linking into other strategic area improvements that are already in progress.

Six blocks have been identified for clearance at Druids Heath, where there is the most concentrated level of LPS Blocks in the city, with 15 blocks throughout the area. This report includes a specific proposal to clear Heath House, with the remaining five blocks to be identified as part of the estate master-planning that is already underway.

King Norton – Three Estates

The clearance and redevelopment programme at Kings Norton is well underway following the Big Change proposal approved by Cabinet in 2007. To date some 300 properties have been demolished and over 300 new homes built on the estate. 264 properties for which approval for clearance has already been given by Cabinet as part of the 2012-17 programme will be cleared between 2017 and 2019. Future clearance is proposed on 240 unviable Council owned homes on the Pool Farm Estate and 11 owner occupied homes, in addition to the 4 LPS blocks identified above. Action will mainly be concentrated on low-rise flats, most of which are of non-traditional construction, with the defective structural issues associated with this type of construction.

Druids Heath

Druids Heath has been identified as an area that requires significant investment and regeneration. There is a need to improve the character and quality of the physical environment of the estate as a whole.

The area is currently the subject of a study, where clearance and retention issues are considered across the whole stock.

The aim of this study is, in the first instance, to produce a Master plan and an Option Investment Strategy which will be supported by a minimum of 3 option appraisals, a viability statement and a Housing Revenue Account Investment Plan. This information will be used to inform strategic investment decisions of the City Council, Homes & Communities Agency and Partner Agencies.

In addition to the six LPS blocks mentioned above, this report is seeking approval for the clearance of 370 low-rise properties, including 11 leaseholder properties. The addresses of these properties will be identified following the masterplanning exercise and will be included in the future Cabinet report.

Sheltered Housing – The Poplars

The Poplars sheltered housing scheme occupies a location in Sutton Coldfield and includes 24 bedsits 4 flats & 1 house. The Poplars scheme has suffered from chronic under-occupation for a number of years, even though it sits within an area of Sutton that has a high housing demand. This is due to the very small size of the individual bedsit flats which do not meet residents' aspirations in the 21st century.

Of the 28 units, there are currently 18 empty. There is low demand for bedsits generally on the housing waiting list and this type of accommodation is particularly difficult for people with a physical disability, as they are unable to manoeuvre wheelchairs and walking frames around parts of the accommodation. A lack of a suitable lift at The Poplars compounds the problem for users of the first floor.

Maisonettes in Alfred & Beach Road

There are structural issues with the four blocks of flats on Alfred & Beach Roads, Sparkbrook which make these blocks financially unviable. There is a relatively high percentage of owner occupation at the blocks with 11 of the 48 properties owned by leaseholders. Cleared land at The Poplars, Alfred and Beach Road will be available for future development.

Clearance to enable Housing Growth

A vacant site of 1.21 acres is situated to the rear of properties on Ward End Park Road (Ward End) and could be suitable for a housing development, if access can be provided. The demolition of numbers 59 & 61 will be the most effective way of providing access to release this development land.

At Monmouth Road, Bartley Green, clearance of four high rise blocks has already taken place. However the redevelopment of this site is compromised by the presence of eight low rise flats. The demolition of the remaining four properties in Della Drive (2 to 5) and four properties in Penrith Croft (2 to 5) would release a 5.11 acre site for housing development.

It is therefore proposed to include the Ward End Park and Monmouth Drive sites in the Clearance Programme to enable housing development schemes to proceed.

Bartley Green Ward

Private Properties

Della Drive: 2, 5

Penrith Croft: 2, 4, 5

Total number of private properties in Bartley Green Ward: 5

HRA Properties affected:

Della Drive: 3, 4

Penrith Croft: 3

Total Number of HRA properties affected: 3

Total number of private and HRA properties affected in Bartley Green Ward is: 8

Brandwood Ward

Private Properties:

Heath House: 39, 41

Total number of private properties in Brandwood Ward: 2

HRA properties affected

Heath House: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51

Total number of HRA properties affected: 48

Total number of private and HRA properties affected in Brandwood Ward is: 50

Note: A detailed list of properties to be demolished in Druids Heath Estate will be available once the master-planning exercise is completed in 2017.

Kings Norton Ward Area 1

Private Properties:

Gildas Avenue: 37, 59, 78

Total number of affected private properties in Kings Norton Ward Area 1 is: 3

HRA Properties:

Bentmead Grove: Block 1, flat 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, block 3, flat 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, block 5, flat 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, block 7, flat 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Sisefield Road: 1, 3, 5, 7

Gildas Avenue: 25, 27, 29, 31, Block 33, flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Block 35, flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 61, 63, 65, 67, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48

70, 72, 74, 76, 80, 82, 84, 86, 88, 96, 98, 100, 102

Barratts Road 59, 61, 63, 65

Little Hill Grove: 25, 27, 29, 31, 40, 42, 44, 46

Total number of affected HRA properties in Kings Norton Ward Area 1 is: 95

Total number of private and HRA properties affected in Kings Norton Ward Area 1 is: 98

Kings Norton Ward Area 2

Private properties:

Sisefield Road: 86, 88, 90, 92

Total number of private properties affected in clearance area year 2 is 4

HRA properties affected:

Barratts Road: 6, 8, 10, 12, 18, 20, 22, 24

Sisefield Road: 72, 74, 76, 78, 126, 128, 130, 132

Total number of HRA properties affected: 16

Total number of private and HRA properties in Kings Norton Ward Area 2 is: 20

Kings Norton Ward Area 3

Private properties:

Barratts Road: 44

Little Hill Grove: 5

Total number of private properties affected: 2

HRA properties affected:

Barratts Road: 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46, Block 48, flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Block 50, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Block 52 Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Little Hill Grove: 1, 3, 7, Block 15, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Hillmeads Road: Block 68, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Total number of HRA properties affected: 40

Total number of private and HRA properties in Kings Norton Ward Area 3 is: 42

Kings Norton Area 4

Private Properties:

Hillmeads Road: 37

Total number of private properties affected in clearance area 4 is 1

HRA properties affected:

Hillmeads Road, Block 29, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Block 31, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 33, 35, 39, Block 41, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, Block 67, flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Heathside Drive: Block 78, Flats 1, 2, 3, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121

Total number of HRA properties affected in clearance area year 4 is 50

Total number of private and HRA properties in Kings Norton Ward Area 4 is: 51

Kings Norton Ward Area 5

Private Properties

Arrow Walk: 7

Total number of private properties affected in clearance area 5 is 1

HRA Properties affected:

Arrow Walk: Block 1, flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Block 3, flat 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, no. 5, 9, 11

Hillmeads Road: 1, 3, 38, 40, 42, 44, Block 46, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Block 48, Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Walkers Heath Road: 103, 105, 119, 121, 123, 125

Total number of HRA properties affected: 39

Kings Norton Ward High Rise

Private Properties: Nil

HRA Properties affected:

Lavender House: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43

Heather House: Flat 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43

Burdock House: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43

Barberry House: Flats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43

Total number of HRA properties affected: 167

Sparkbrook Ward

Private Properties

Beach Road: 11, 21, 31, 37, 39a, 45, 45a, 47, 57

Alfred Road: 23, 25

Total number of private properties affected in Sparkbrook Ward is: 11

HRA properties affected

Beach Road: 15, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33, 35, 37a, 39, 41, 41a, 43, 43a, 47a, 49, 49a, 51, 51a, 53, 53a, 55, 55a, 57a, 59, 59a

Alfred Road: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21

Total number of HRA properties affected is: 37

Total number of private and HRA properties affected in Sparkbrook Ward is: 48

Sutton Trinity Ward

Total number of private properties affected in Sutton Trinity Ward: NIL

HRA properties affected

Poplar Avenue: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 43

Total number of HRA properties in Sutton Trinity Ward is: 29

Total number of private and HRA properties affected in Sutton Trinity is: 29

Washwood Heath Ward

Total number of private properties in Washwood Heath Ward: NIL

HRA properties:


Ward End Park Road: 59, 61

Total number of HRA properties in Washwood Heath Ward: 2

Total number of private and HRA properties affected in Washwood Heath Ward is 2

APPENDIX 3 - Plans

Kings Norton low-rise



Pool Farm Clearance Programme Kings Norton

Scale: 1:2,500 @A3
Date: 22/12/2016
Drawn: Jon Wilson
Path: P:\WardGIS\Housing\Pool Farm Clearance.mxd




Walton House
Director of Planning and Regeneration
1 Lancaster Circus
Birmingham
B2 3QS




© Crown Copyright and database right 2016. Ordnance Survey (oscopyright).
This map is not to be used for any other purpose, in any form, without the express permission of the Ordnance Survey.
A 2.5m Map, if present, reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey.
Aerial Photography, if present, Copyright GeoEye 2016.

Produced by the Survey & Mapping Team, GIS, Corporate Resources, 10 Woodcock Street, Birmingham, B1 4AB. Tel 0121 303 3867


Kings Norton High Rise Blocks




Druids Heath – Heath House




Beach & Alfred Road, Sparkbrook




The Poplars, Sutton Coldfield



Bartley Green



Washwood Heath



APPENDIX 4 - RISK REGISTER

Risk	Probability	Impact	Mitigation strategy	Resource implications	Owner
Failure to achieve rehousing of Council tenants	Low	Medium	A rehousing assessment has been carried out which demonstrates that rehousing can be achieved in the timescales.	The cost of rehousing can be met over the period 2017-2023. If rehousing is not achieved, there will be additional costs incurred to the HRA.	Collette McCann, Senior Service Manager
Failure to achieve rehousing of owner occupiers	Medium	Medium	CPO will be actioned at the earliest opportunity.	The cost of acquisitions can be met over the period 2017-2023. If rehousing is not achieved, there will be additional costs incurred to the HRA.	Collette McCann, Senior Service Manager
Failure to deliver clearance and demolition within cost envelope	Low	Medium	The Council has extensive experience in managing such programmes, and robust programme management will ensure costs are controlled.	Projected costs have been included within the HRA Business Plan 2017-23. Should the costs of clearance exceed the projected level, funding will be reallocated from elsewhere within the capital programme for the relevant year (s),	Collette McCann, Senior Service Manager

APPENDIX 5



Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Renewal Of City Council Housing Stock
Directorate	Economy
Service Area	P&R Planning And Development
Type	New/Proposed Function
EA Summary	This EA looks at the consultation that has been undertaken to seek the views of the residents affected by the recommendations of the Renewal of City Council Housing Stock Cabinet report.
Reference Number	EA001676
Task Group Manager	shahid.s.iqbal@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Date Approved	2016-12-08 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	clive.skidmore@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	richard.woodland@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- ◆ Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a New/Proposed Function.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Function and expected outcomes?

The Renewal of City Council Housing Stock Cabinet report will make a decision on the future of 555 properties in Birmingham. The affected 555 properties have been identified through an option appraisal process that focused on the physical and financial viability of the properties as well as input from local housing teams.

The properties are all considered to be low quality and requiring significant amounts of investment in order to make them financially viable and improve their condition to enable sustainability. The report recommends that the 555 properties are replaced with new high quality sustainable homes and to re-house the occupiers of the 555 properties.

The poor condition of some of the stock is not suitable for occupiers who have specific needs and can have an adverse effect on them and in general is simply not a long term solution to the housing needs of the occupiers. The decision will support the aspirations of the occupiers and ties in with the City's strategic themes such as providing more housing as well as the opportunity to improve health and well-being, and creating employment and training opportunities in the future when sites become available for development.

To support this recommendation, consultation was undertaken with the 555 properties affected and the results of the consultation (discussed further in the report) shows that over 90% of respondents are in favour of the recommendations which they believe will help to improve their quality of life.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

A Strong Economy Yes

Safety And Opportunity For All Children Yes

Children: A City To Grow Up In Yes

Thriving Local Communities Yes

A Healthy City Yes

A Modern Council Yes

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders? Yes

Will the policy have an impact on employees? No

Will the policy have an impact on wider community? Yes

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics Relevant Full Assessment Required

Age Not Relevant No

Disability Not Relevant No

Gender Not Relevant No

Gender Reassignment Not Relevant No

Marriage Civil Partnership Not Relevant No

Pregnancy And Maternity Not Relevant No

Race Not Relevant No

Religion or Belief Not Relevant No

Sexual Orientation Not Relevant No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

The proposal to make a decision on the future of 555 properties across Birmingham affects residents across six Wards in Birmingham; Kings-Norton, Sparkbrook, Brandwood, Bartley Green, Sutton Trinity, and Washwood Heath.

The property-type is varied and included flats within maisonettes, flats within high / medium rise blocks, traditional / non-traditional houses, and sheltered accommodation and the properties were a variety of bedroom sizes ranging from 1 bedroom to 4 bedroom accommodation. Also, the occupation covers a mix of different communities that are to be affected and this is consistent with the current geo-graphical profile of the City. Initial research undertaken confirmed that there were 555 properties in total to be consulted, of which (according to Northgate), 511 were occupied, 44 were void, and there were 29 Leaseholder properties in total.

An extensive consultation was undertaken during September / October 2016, to advise local residents that are affected by the proposal. The consultation involved members of the BMHT team as well as local housing team colleagues. The consultation was undertaken by providing an information pack that contained a detailed information letter about the proposal, the consultation programme, a questionnaire to be completed and returned by resident's, a facts sheet, an equality monitoring form, and a freepost return envelope for the completed questionnaire.

The information pack was posted out to all of the affected residents and this was followed up with on-site drop in sessions that were in the foyer of one of the tower blocks for example, from late morning through to early evening. At the same time as the drop-in sessions, staff undertook door-knocking exercises to provide face-to-face communication for those that were unable to attend the drop-in sessions and to give people further opportunity to express their view(s). This was done on several occasions during a two weeks period, across the wards at differing times to allow opportunity for people throughout the day.

The result of the consultation is as follows:

No. of properties affected Occupied Void Tenant Leaseholder Total responses Yes No Don't know

555 511 44 526 29 393 354 23 16

Total % 92% 7.92% 94.77% 5.22% 76.91% 90.08% 5.85% 4.07%

The result of the consultation shows overwhelming support in favour of the recommendations of the Cabinet Report.

A closer analysis by each of the protected characteristic groups shows no particular pattern that would raise any concern about any adverse impact on any particular group where a particular group is easily identifiable. For example:

- . The Poplars (sheltered block for the elderly) in Sutton Trinity is made up of 29 units but only 9 are occupied. Of the 9 occupied, 6 occupiers were in favour of the proposal and 2 were not in favour.

- . The Maisonette block in Sparkbrook is occupied almost entirely by families from BME communities and of a particular Religious group, and again of the 48 properties there, 41 responded and there were 36 in favour and only four not in favour. There is no particular evidence to suggest that the responses are related to any particular protected characteristic and is more in line with the local community makeup of Sparkbrook and that area of the Ward in particular.

- . The four medium rise blocks in Kings Norton have a higher proportion of single people living there and of the 132 responses from the total 167 flats, 126 people were in favour and only 3 people were not in favour. There is no particular pattern to show if this is because of any of the protected characteristics.

- . The Monmouth Road properties however, reveal a 50/50 split between being in favour and not in favour, however, this is due to the fact that there are only two family houses affected and is too small a sample to draw any particular conclusion - even with the availability of equality monitoring data.

(A full breakdown of the consultation data can be found in appendix 10 of the Cabinet Report).

If the Cabinet report is approved, then the six years re-housing programme will commence. The re-housing process is very thorough and is carried out in accordance with Birmingham City Council's Allocation's Policy which is fully compliant with Equality laws.

The analysis on the initial assessment is that the project will contribute to equality of opportunity by improving Residents standard of housing. Through the development of the scheme and thorough consultation with residents no potential to disproportionately disadvantage any protected group has been identified within the scope of the project.

All of the protected groups in question will benefit from a better quality of housing. If nothing were done then a continued decline in the quality of housing would lead to a number of significant problems, often most acutely felt by protected groups, such as inappropriate accommodation and typologies types as well as health related issues and over-crowding. As such it is felt that there is no need to conduct a full assessment.

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

The analysis on the initial assessment is that the project will contribute to equality of opportunity by improving resident's standard of housing. Through the development of the scheme and thorough consultation with residents no potential to disproportionately disadvantage any protected group has been identified within the scope of the project.

All of the protected groups in question will benefit from a better quality of housing. If nothing were done then a continued decline in the quality of housing would lead to a number of significant problems, often most acutely felt by protected groups, such as inappropriate accommodation and typologies types as well as health related issues and over-crowding. As such it is felt that there is no need to conduct a full assessment.

4 Review Date 28/02/17

5 Action Plan -There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

APPENDIX 6

THE JUSTIFICATION FOR COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER (CPO)

DCLG Guidance on Compulsory Purchase Process October 2015 provides advice to acquiring authorities in the preparation and submission of compulsory purchase orders and the matters that the Secretary of State can be expected to take into consideration when reaching a decision on whether to confirm an order. All of these requirements will need to be met in each case before a CPO can be authorised for either an empty property or a vacant/undeveloped site

A CPO should only be made:

1. where there is a compelling case in the public interest. Each case will need to be examined individually, however bringing forward land for housing development/redevelopment schemes (thereby ensuring that sufficient homes are provided to meet the needs of the city's citizens) is clearly capable of being in the public interest.
2. the Council should be sure that the purposes for which the CPO is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. The Secretary of State confirming the order will take a balanced view between the intentions of the acquiring authority, the concerns of those with an interest in the land affected and the wider public interest. Each case will need to be examined individually, and CPO will only be authorised where the Council has balanced the various interests but considers that the use of compulsory purchase powers in that case is justified.
3. The Council should have a clear idea of how it intends to use the land which it is proposing to acquire. In respect of land for housing purposes, the Council will obtain planning permission for housing development on the site.
4. Resources are likely to be available within a reasonable time-scale to deliver the proposals - the Council has the funding available to fund the acquisition of empty homes and undeveloped sites. Details of the funding available for the specific CPO will be provided prior to the decision to authorise a CPO for a specific site or property.
5. The Council should show that the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any impediments to implementation. Planning consent will be sought for housing led development.
6. CPO should be a last resort. The Council will endeavour to negotiate voluntary acquisition of a property rather than acquire by CPO if possible. Negotiations will continue after the CPO is made.
7. The CPO should only be made if it will provide qualitative or quantitative housing gain. This information will be provided at the time it is decided to proceed with a CPO
8. The CPO should be in accordance with national and local planning policy. More detail is provided in appendix 7.

9. When using section 226 (1) (a) Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to justify CPO, the acquiring authority must not exercise the power unless they think that the proposed development, redevelopment or improvement is likely to contribute to achieving the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the area for which the acquiring authority has administrative responsibility. The redevelopment of vacant and often poorly maintained land to address the shortage of land for new housing will generally contribute to the promotion or improvement of the economic social and environmental well-being within this the City of Birmingham.
10. The Council will have regard to matters relevant under the public sector equality duty in deciding to proceed with compulsory acquisition. In this instance see appendix 5 to this report

Planning and Policy Context

The proposed clearance and redevelopment will be guided by and be in accordance with the following planning policy:

National Planning Policy Framework.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) sets out the Government's planning policies, emphasising the promotion of sustainable development and the economic, social and environmental roles that the planning system must play. Key themes in pursuing sustainable development are given as including replacing poor design with better design, improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure and widening the choice of high quality homes.

Core planning principles set out in the Framework include seeking high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, encouraging the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed and promoting mixed use developments.

The Birmingham Development Plan.

The Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) was subject to Examination in Public during late 2014 and a positive Inspector's report and proposed Modifications received in March 2016. The plan was adopted by the Council in January 2017. The plan sets out a strategy that will guide development, growth and regeneration of the city up to 2031. The plan's key focus is delivering growth to accommodate the projected increase in the city's population by delivering 51,100 new homes, a 5 year supply of 96Ha of employment land and associated facilities and infrastructure to support these levels growth. The plan includes a wide range of policies that promote and support development including the regeneration focussed growth of several key areas of the city. A number of the thematic policies relate to the promotion of sustainable neighbourhoods, the location of new housing, the type size and density of new housing, affordable housing and housing regeneration. Druids Heath and Maypole and Kings Norton Three Estates are two of the areas specifically mentioned in policy TP31 which sets out that the regeneration and renewal of existing housing areas will continue to be promoted to ensure that high quality accommodation and environments are provided in line with the principles of sustainable developments. This policy also sets out that other areas will come forward for regeneration over the plan period.

Design Guidance.

Places for All and Places for Living (supplementary planning guidance adopted in 2001) continue to provide the urban design principles that guide development in the city. Redevelopment proposals following clearance will be prepared within the context of these documents. This includes the promotion of mixed-use development, creation of perimeter blocks with clear definition of public and private realm, and the establishment of quality places with the creation of focal space, attractive streets and an improved environment.

The Kings Norton Planning Framework (Non-statutory framework adopted 2010).

The Planning Framework sets out detailed proposals for the comprehensive regeneration of the Pool Farm, Primrose and Hawkesley Estates. In addition to new housing, the framework proposes improved shopping provision, community facilities, access to local employment opportunities, and environmental and infrastructure improvements. The main details include

- Demolition of approximately 870 poor quality dwellings, replacing them with around 1400 new family homes.
- Improved shopping facilities, including a new local centre fronting onto Redditch Road.
- New road infrastructure to replace the existing Primrose estate layout, including a new route from Redditch Road to Shannon Road to provide better access to / from the estates and the new food store.
- Green space provision will be remodeled and enhanced, including a new 'village green' at Primrose.

ARTICLE 1 AND ARTICLE 8 OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACTS 1998 AND THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Section 6 Human Rights 1998 Act prohibits public authorities from acting in a way that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights ("The Convention.") There are 2 main articles of The Convention, which are applicable to the recommendations in this report.

ARTICLE 8

"Everyone has the right to respect for private and family life, his home and his correspondence."

"There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

ARTICLE 1 of the FIRST PROTOCOL

"Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties. "

Guidance

Article 8 applies where a local authority is considering disturbing residents' private and family lives and removing them from their homes. It may also be relevant where residents who, although not directly affected by removal or dispossession, suffer significant disruption to their lives as a consequence of the authority's actions.

Article 1 of the First Protocol applies where a local authority is considering the use of CPO powers to acquire private interests, and where it is proposing to dispossess residents of their homes.

The approach to be taken to give effect to rights under The Convention is also reflected in paragraph 17 of ODPM Circular 06/2004:-

"A Compulsory Purchase Order should only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest. An acquiring authority should be sure that the purposes for which it is making a Compulsory Purchase Order sufficiently justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected, having regard, in particular, to the provisions of Article 1 of the

First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights and, in the case of a dwelling, Article 8 of the Convention”.

The European Court of Human Rights has recognised in the context of Article 1 of the First Protocol that “regard must be had to the fair balance that has to be struck between the competing interests of the individual and of the community as a whole”, i.e. compulsory purchase must be proportionate. Both public and private interests are to be taken into account in the exercise of the Council’s powers. Similarly, any interference with Article 8 rights must be “necessary in a democratic society” i.e. the proposed interference must be necessary. In pursuing a CPO, the Council has to carefully consider the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest having regard also to the availability of compensation for compulsory purchase.

Consideration of Human Rights Issues

Article 8(1) provides that everyone has the right to respect for his/her property but Article 8(2) allows the State to restrict the rights to respect for the property to the extent necessary in a democratic society and for certain listed public interest purposes e.g. public safety, economic wellbeing, protection of health and protection of the rights of others.

In considering Articles 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol of The Convention in the context of dispossession and compulsory purchase, it is necessary to answer the following:

Does a right protected by these Articles apply?
Is the interference in accordance with law?
Does the interference pursue a legitimate aim?
Is the interference necessary in a democratic society?

Does a right protected by these Articles apply?

ARTICLE 1 of the FIRST PROTOCOL

“Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions...”
Clearly the dispossession of an owner of their property through CPO and enforced rehousing will impinge on this right. Also, as a tenancy is a possession under this provision, the rights of tenants must be taken into consideration. The Council must therefore consider all the possible justifications for this interference as detailed in considerations (b), (c) and (d) set out below.

ARTICLE 8

Article 8.1 provides that everyone has the right to respect for his/her private and family life, home and correspondence. Article 8.2 allows the State to restrict these rights to respect to the extent necessary in a democratic society and for certain listed public interest purposes.

The essence of this right lies in the concept of respect for the home as a right to privacy, in the same context as private and family life and correspondence. Article 8.1 does not concern itself with the person’s right to the peaceful enjoyment of their home as a possession; this is dealt with under Article 1 of the First Protocol.

Clearly Article 8 does apply and therefore it is necessary for the Council to consider the possible justifications for the interference (Article 8(2)) as follows:

Is the interference in accordance with law?

There is a clear legal basis for making the CPO under the Housing Act 1985 or the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Does the interference pursue a legitimate aim?

The CPO is necessary to ensure the supply of sufficient homes to meet the needs of a growing city.

Is the interference necessary in a democratic society?

This requires a balanced judgement to be made between the public interest and the rights of individuals, and the rights and freedoms of others.

Conclusion

The Council has considered the effect of the above articles of The Convention and decided that, on balance, it is in the general public interest and of benefit to the community to make the CPO over and above the interest of the individuals affected.

Interference with Convention rights is considered by the Council to be justified. The Council in making this Order has had particular regard to meeting the alternative housing needs of the affected households, and the rights of individuals to compensation in accordance with the Land Compensation Act 1973 (as amended.) and the Land Compensation Act 1961 and Compulsory Purchase act 1965 is considered to be both necessary and proportionate in that the land to be acquired is the minimum to achieve this Scheme's objectives

APPENDIX 9 - Stakeholder Management Plan

Stakeholder	Stakeholder's Interest	Influence Impact	What does the project board expect from the stakeholder	Perceived attitudes and/or risks	Stakeholder management strategy	Responsible
Cabinet Member – Homes and Neighbourhoods	Endorses Full Business Case	High/ Critical	Political support	Supportive	Consult during development stage and provide progress reports during delivery as required	Strategic Director
Affected Residents	Tenants and leaseholders interest	High	Expression of views on proposals	Residents' views heavily support proposal	Consult by post, public open-days, phone & home visits	Development Team, Clearance Team & District Teams
Kings Norton Councillors	Housing Regeneration Area under development within the Three Estates	High	Political support	Supportive	Consult during development stage and provide progress reports during delivery as required	Development Team & Clearance Team
Brandwood Councillors	Druids Heath proposed Housing Development Area.	High	Political support	Supportive	Consult during development stage and provide progress reports during delivery as required	Development Team & Clearance Team

Sparkbrook Councillors	Beach & Alfred Road Maisonettes	High	Political support	Supportive	Consult during development stage and provide progress reports during delivery as required	Development Team & Clearance Team
Sutton Trinity Councillors	The Poplars Sheltered Housing Complex	High	Political support	Supportive	Ensure that Members are kept up to date with progress.	Development Team & Clearance Team
Bartley Green Councillors	Eight flats above shops off Monmouth Drive	High	Political support	Supportive	Ensure that Members are kept up to date with progress.	Development Team & Clearance Team
Washwood Heath Councillors	Two properties	High	Political support	Supportive	Ensure that Members are kept up to date with progress.	Development Team & Clearance Team

APPENDIX 10 - RESIDENTS' CONSULTATION

RESPONSE TO DEMOLITION PROPOSALS		Residential units	Occupied residential units	Response for occupied residential units	Supportive		Not Supportive	Don't Know
		Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	Number
Kings Norton High-Rise Tower Blocks								
	Barberry	42	42	79.04%	126	94.45%	3	3
	Burdock	42	42					
	Heather	41	41					
	Lavender	42	42					
Druids Heath High-Rise Tower Block		50	47	63.83%	26	86.67%	2	2
Kings Norton – Pool Farm Estate		251	231	74.03%	157	91.81%	7	7
Sparkbrook Maisonettes		48	47	87.23%	36	82.50%	3	2
Sutton Trinity Sheltered Complex		29	9	100%	6	66.67%	2	1
Bartley Green Flats above Garages		8	8	87.50%	2	28.57%	4	1
Washwood Heath Properties		2	2	100%	1	50%	1	
TOTAL		555	511	76.91%	354	90.08%	22	16

APPENDIX 11

PROJECT MILESTONES

	Kings Norton Tower Blocks	Kings Norton Low Rise	Druids Heath High Rise	Druids Heath Low Rise	The Poplars	Beach and Alfred Road	Monmouth Road	Ward End Park Road
Druids Heath Masterplanning completion			September 2017	September 2017				
Issue IDNs	March 2017	March 2017	October 2017 (Beech House March 2017)	October 2017	March 2017	March 2017	March 2017	March 2017
Commence CPO work	April 2017	April 2017	April 2018	April 2018		April 2017	April 2018	
Commence HRA tenants rehousing	April 2018	April 2017	April 2017	April 2018	April 2017	April 2017	April 2018	April 2018
Commence Private Property Acquisitions	April 2018	April 2017	April 2018	April 2018		April 2017	April 2018	
Conclude CPO work	October 2018	October 2018	October 2019	October 2019		October 2018	October 2019	
Conclude HRA tenants rehousing	March 2022	March 2022	March 2023	March 2023	March 2019	March 2020	March 2019	March 2019
Conclude Private Property Acquisitions	March 2022	March 2022	March 2023	March 2023		March 2020	December 2019	
Procurement of Demolition Contractors	June 2019	June 2018	June 2018	June 2019	November 2018	December 2019	November 2018	November 2018
Commence Demolition	October 2019	October 2018	October 2018	October 2019	March 2019	April	March 2019	March 2019
Conclude Demolition	March 2023	March 2023	March 2024	March 2024	March 2020	March 2021	March 2020	March 2020

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	Strategic Director for People
Date of Decision:	14th February 2017
SUBJECT:	MIGRATION – BIRMINGHAM CITY OF SANCTUARY POSITION STATEMENT
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 02732/2016
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Cllr Waseem Zaffar – Transparency, Openness and Equality
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Cllr Mohammed Aiklaq – Corporate Resources and Governance
Wards affected:	All

1. Purpose of report:
This report aims to:
1.1 Present to Cabinet for approval Birmingham's City of Sanctuary Position Statement.

2. Decision(s) recommended:
That Cabinet:
2.1 Approves Birmingham's City of Sanctuary Position Statement

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Pip Mayo Head of Service, Commissioning Centre of Excellence
Telephone No:	0121 303 1022
E-mail address:	Pip.Mayo@birmingham.gov.uk
Lead Contact Officer(s):	Pat Merrick Assistant Director, Commissioning Centre of Excellence
Telephone No:	0121 303 6136
E-mail address:	Patricia.merrick@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

3.1 Internal

Birmingham's City of Sanctuary Position Statement has been developed in consultation with colleagues from Social Care, Education, Housing and Public Health

The following Cabinet Members have been consulted during the production of the position statement:

Cabinet Member – Housing and Homes

Cabinet Member – Value for Money and Efficiency

Cabinet Member – Children, Families and Schools

Cabinet Member – Health and Social Care

All have confirmed agreement with Birmingham's City of Sanctuary Position Statement and support the identified responses.

Officers from Finance, Legal and Democratic Services and Procurement have been involved in the preparation of this report.

3.2 External

Birmingham's City of Sanctuary Position Statement has been developed in consultation with the Home Office who have responsibility for developing and implementing the national policy framework. The West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership has also been engaged.

Consultation has been undertaken with key voluntary and community sector organisations and networks to include members of the Birmingham Multi Agency Forum and the City of Sanctuary committee. All have supported the development of the single position statement and have welcomed the measures set out within the statement.

G4S who deliver the accommodation and support service contract to asylum seekers on behalf of the Home Office have also been consulted as part of the development of the position statement.

The Police and the NHS have been consulted and are supportive of the proposals.

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?

The recommendation contained within this report is consistent with:

- A vision for the future of Birmingham City Council Priorities on a set of clear objectives which are Children, Housing, Jobs & Skills and Health.
- Being a fair city: where people are not excluded from opportunities or services because of their background
- Being a democratic city: where citizens are encouraged to participate in civic life and the right to be heard.

4.1.1 Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+

The development of a single position statement for the city on migration supports the council's Business Plan and also addresses the need to ensure more partnership working is undertaken to support the implications of the statement.

4.1.2 Future Council

The recommendations and position statement are consistent with the future council model and sets out to achieve the objectives of Children, Housing, Jobs & Skills and Health.

4.1.3 Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility

Not applicable

4.2 Financial Implications

This report sets out a position statement to support migration with a more uniform approach.

There are a number of resettlement programmes hosted either by the Council or by other agencies within Birmingham with different funding arrangements from the Home Office and other Central Government departments. These programmes provide funding to support the initial work in settling vulnerable individuals and families as part of our commitment to the City of Sanctuary. In the medium to longer term, there may well be financial impacts on the Council's services which cannot be quantified at this stage which goes beyond the initial period and this will need to be considered as part of the Long Term financial plan before further commitments are entered into.

All costs associated with the education pilot post for Syrian refugees will be funded through the government grant received for the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme.

4.3 Legal Implications

Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2000 gives the Secretary of State power to award grants to local authorities for expenditure incurred by them in the provision of welfare services determined by the Secretary of State.

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

An initial Equality Analysis has been undertaken and there were no adverse impacts identified during the development of the single position statement.

5. Relevant background / chronology of key events:

- 5.1 Birmingham City Council has successfully responded to the need to support the migration of individuals into the city for many years. The city is now home to a vibrant mix of communities, some of whom have started new lives here after fleeing persecution in their homelands.
- 5.2 As a consequence of the conflicts in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Eritrea patterns of movement and migration across Europe have changed with an increasing number of people leaving their homes to seek sanctuary in Western Europe.
- 5.3 The European Union requested that all countries within Europe respond positively to offer sanctuary to those in need. Our Government confirmed its support and the Home Office in turn requested support from Local Authorities.
- 5.4 In December 2015 Birmingham became recognised as a City of Sanctuary providing a culture of hospitality and welcome, especially for refugees seeking sanctuary from war and persecution.
- 5.5 A range of discussions have subsequently been held to define the City of Sanctuary position statement with reference to the new patterns of migration, Birmingham's longstanding commitment to asylum seekers and refugees and the needs of all Birmingham residents.
- 5.6 The Birmingham City of Sanctuary Position Statement attached to this Cabinet Report is the outcome of these discussions and reflects a single shared view of how Birmingham will act as a City of Sanctuary.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

- 6.1 A failure to approve a single Position Statement as set out in this Cabinet Report could result in Birmingham's City of Sanctuary provision being disjointed, poorly understood and inadequately co-ordinated between the wide range of partners and stakeholders. Such a situation could in turn result in the City failing to balance well the needs of asylum seekers and refugees with the needs of the existing population which could have a detrimental impact on the lives of citizens and community cohesion.

7. Reasons for Decisions (s):

- 7.1 To approve the Birmingham City of Sanctuary Position Statement and endorse the rollout of the position statement across all council directorates.

Signatures	Date
Councillor Waseem Zaffar Cabinet Member for Transparency, Openness and Equality
Peter Hay Strategic Director for People

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
Appendix 1 – Birmingham City of Sanctuary Position Statement Appendix 2 – EA – Initial Screening

Birmingham City of Sanctuary Position Statement**Background**

Birmingham has long been a place of refuge for individuals arriving to claim asylum in the UK. Birmingham is proud of its diversity and has committed to being a City of Sanctuary, providing a culture of hospitality and welcome, especially for refugees seeking sanctuary from war and persecution.

Refugees have, by definition, experienced forced migration, conflict and upheaval as well as language and cultural transitions. They may have experienced significant traumas such as torture, prolonged periods of uncertainty, loss of and separation from family members, physical and/or sexual violence, as well as poor living conditions.

Over a number of years, Birmingham City Council and partner organisations in the statutory, voluntary and community sectors have responded proactively to the needs of asylum seekers and refugees, successfully supporting the migration of individuals into the city.

Current Issues

Over recent years, the level of migration and profile of those seeking asylum in the UK has become increasingly diverse. To respond to these issues the Home Office is looking to Birmingham, alongside other Local Authority areas, to increase the number of asylum seekers and refugees housed and supported. To facilitate movement and dispersal the Home Office have developed and implemented a number of programmes such as the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme and Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) scheme.

Furthermore, changes in legislation will mean there is a potential for the number of the people left destitute within Birmingham to increase as a consequence of the implementation of these new measures which removes support from those whose appeal rights have been exhausted. Although statutory guidance has not yet been issued it is possible that local authorities could experience an increase in demand for support under the Children Act. All partner agencies will be required to work together to mitigate the impact on individuals, local services and homelessness rates within the city.

With the issues connected with both migration and asylum becoming increasingly complex it is critical that we develop a single coherent position that:

- ✓ Honours our commitment to being a City of Sanctuary
- ✓ Balances the needs of asylum seekers and refugees with the needs of the many other vulnerable citizens living in Birmingham
- ✓ Acknowledges and values the contribution of all support providers working in Birmingham, to include voluntary and community sector organisations

- ✓ Seeks to promote sustainable resettlement

Birmingham's Commitment to Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Birmingham City Council has given its support for asylum seekers and refugees to be relocated to the city via the following routes:

1) Via the Compass Contract

In 2015/16 over 41,000 people made an application for asylum in the UK. Applicants are housed in one of 7 Initial Accommodation Centres across the UK whilst their claim is being made. Those considered to have a claim warranting full assessment are subsequently housed in dispersed accommodation until their claim has been fully determined. The accommodation, transport and support services that asylum seekers can access during this time are provided under contract by the Home Office.

One of the Initial Accommodation Centres is located within Birmingham and accommodation in the city is also used for dispersed accommodation. G4S hold the contract for the management of these services and Migrant Help provide the support services, they are both accountable to the Home Office for its delivery.

Whilst Birmingham City Council and partner agencies, have no direct responsibility for the delivery of services to asylum seekers during the period that their claim is being determined, we are concerned to ensure that those who are resident within Birmingham are appropriately supported.

Birmingham City Council has a safeguarding responsibility to all those resident within the city regardless of immigration status. Where Birmingham City Council becomes aware of safeguarding concerns for asylum seekers the council will work with G4S to respond and resolve any issues as appropriate.

Birmingham City Council also retains responsibility for ensuring that accommodation used meets the required physical standards and holds the necessary planning permission, or licenses, to approve its use by asylum seekers. In considering applications for changes to license agreements or planning permission the council will consider the needs of both asylum seekers and the wider community.

The Council does not support the use of hotel accommodation in Birmingham to house asylum seekers when demand for Initial Accommodation has exceeded supply. The Home Office can continue to utilise hotel provision within the city without the consent of the local authority.

The Council is committed to working in partnership with the Home Office and G4S to facilitate appropriate access to services and enable issues to be proactively addressed.

Furthermore the creation of partnerships with local voluntary and community sector organisations is welcomed to add value to the provision provided via the contract from the Home Office.

2) Under the National Transfer Scheme

The National Transfer Scheme was launched by the Government on the 1st July 2016. The scheme is a voluntary scheme which was established to facilitate the dispersal of unaccompanied asylum seeking children across the UK. Each local authority was requested to take unaccompanied asylum seeking children to a level which equates to 0.07% of their total child population.

There are three strands to the scheme:

- a) Children at Risk – mainly from the MENA (Middle East and North African region)
- b) Lord Dubs Amendment which allows unaccompanied children to be offered safe refuge in the UK.
- c) Spontaneous arrivals

Birmingham has confirmed participation in the scheme and has been welcoming unaccompanied asylum seeking children to the city since the scheme was established. The Council has been working to accept children in line with the set ratio to ensure that the additional demand for service can be managed alongside the provision of services to other vulnerable children.

Local authorities receive grant funding from the Home Office for each validated, approved case. The grant covers the placement costs of the child.

3) Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (SVPRS)

The SVPRS was developed by the Government in January 2014 and enhanced in September 2015 to support the delivery of the UK's commitment to providing humanitarian support to 20,000 Syrian people in need of protection as a consequence of the war in Syria for the duration of this Parliament. Under the terms of the scheme local authorities are provided with funding to cover the costs associated with resettling Syrian refugees for the first 12 months of their stay.

Birmingham City Council, working with partner agencies, was at the forefront of the national response to the Syrian crises, to confirm early acceptance of 50 Syrian refugees into the city. This early commitment was built upon by a cross-party commitment to welcome a further 500 Syrian refugees to the city over the next 4 years.

Resettlement support services for Syrian refugees are being commissioned utilising the Government grant which covers the costs of the refugees during

their initial 12 months of resettlement and the Council has confirmed its support for the piloting of a community sponsorship approach working alongside the Methodist Church which will see a Syrian family supported within this faith based community.

4) Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme

The Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme was announced on 21 April 2016 with a commitment for the UK to resettle up to 3,000 children and their families from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region over the life of the current Parliament under the Children at Risk UNHCR vulnerability category.

Children have been forced to flee their homes, and many lose their schools, friends, aspirations, sense of security and, often, their childhoods. Over half of the refugees in the MENA region are children.

Separation from family members, difficulty accessing basic services and increased poverty make it more likely that children will marry early, work before the legal age or in dangerous and exploitative conditions, drop out of school or face violence in their homes, communities or schools. They also face risks of detention, trafficking, and other forms of exploitation during their displacement. This is why the UK Government decided to set up a dedicated resettlement scheme for vulnerable children.

The scheme will be open to all children deemed to be "at risk" within the MENA region so will not be limited to Syrians. Other nationalities may include but not be limited to: Iraqis, Sudanese, South Sudanese, Eritreans, Ethiopians, Somalis, Afghans and Palestinians.

It will also include mixed families, containing more than one nationality, and those who are stateless. A stateless person is someone who is not considered as a national by any State under the operation of its law.

Birmingham City Council will work in partnership with the Home Office to look at the potential for developing a commitment from Birmingham under this scheme. The funding for this scheme utilises the funding instructions to replicate the payments under the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (SVPRS) and the Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children scheme (UASC).

Birmingham's Position

Our commitment to welcome asylum seekers and refugees has been framed with reference to local services, where appropriate, to support those arriving in the city to achieve sustainable resettlement. This covers the following key elements:

Education and Employment

Birmingham is committed to ensuring that all children entitled to an education can access it while they are in the city, regardless of whether they are a UK citizen, refugee or asylum seeker.

When considering the implications of migration and the transient population moving throughout the city it is vital that the education needs of those children are heard and responded to; the City recognises that access to education is of fundamental importance to the safety and well-being of children arriving and/or settling in Birmingham.

A pilot education partnership post will be developed utilising the funding from the Home Office grant to work with Syrian refugees arriving through the SVPRS to support the families completing the application/appeals process for school places, brokering discussions with schools about the additional requirements of the children and working with schools to develop relationships to provide a positive school placement for the children's education. An evaluation will be undertaken to review the learning from the pilot and the potential to improve access to education for those arriving into the city.

The volume of school places required year on year continues to increase as the city grows and there are ongoing plans to ensure there are sufficient school places to meet local need. Development of an internal pathway between commissioning and education will ensure alignment of school place planning and wider proposals to support asylum seeker and refugee children, so that we are able to meet our commitment to provide education to those arriving through the various migration schemes.

Most adults arriving in Birmingham as refugees require ESOL lessons (English as a Second or Other Language) and other training towards employment. The City Council works in partnership with DWP, providers and the Skills Funding Agency to support this programme with no cost implications for the council.

Health

Refugees and asylum seekers have often experienced significant trauma as a consequence of war, conflict or persecution, which will have impacted upon their mental health and wellbeing. Many will have lived in insanitary conditions, or had limited access to healthcare; as a consequence many may also have developed

physical health conditions. We recognise therefore that asylum seekers and refugees often have unique and complex physical and mental health needs that require identification, diagnosis and comprehensive healthcare attention.

Birmingham is committed to ensure that people have access to the right healthcare service at the right time, but there are considerations that must be noted about the funding and availability of services based on an individual's status within the UK. Working in partnership with the local Clinical Commissioning Groups to ensure that individuals are aware of the services available to them and how to access the provision based on their needs and circumstances.

It is important to note that circumstances experienced by asylum seekers and refugees upon arrival in Birmingham should as far as possible not exacerbate existing health issues, or contribute to the development of new ones.

The identification of existing health issues and the delivery of services to address them are essential elements of a supportive healthcare service for new arrivals and are provided through the local Clinical Commissioning Groups with no cost to the council.

Collaborative partnership working with all providers and organisations across the city can help to improve the access to healthcare provision but also to encourage take up of health assessments for those coming through the asylum process. Measures to maximise health assessment uptake and adequate resourcing for their delivery are essential to address the health needs of new arrivals, and mitigate any impact on the local health economy. Healthcare services and their resourcing need to be flexible to respond to changes in demand and need. This will be achieved by providing feedback and supporting the local Clinical Commissioning Groups to understand the needs of those arriving, especially where information is known prior to the individual's arrival.

Housing

With a city the size of Birmingham, homelessness, destitution and temporary/initial accommodation are just some of the issues that impact both on local communities and the migrant communities entering into the city. As a local authority we are keen to ensure that pathways are available to those newly arrived into the city so that they are able to navigate the system in the most effective way, but this does depend on the scheme and their current status. With the various schemes detailed above delivered within the city, this can lead to what might be seen as unfair access to housing as individuals arriving through different pathways may have access to housing provision. This would be dependent on each individual's circumstances.

Birmingham is committed to working with Home Office and G4S, the local contracted partner for asylum provision, to provide adequate accommodation and licensing of properties in order to support the asylum process. In sourcing accommodation for other schemes such as Syrian resettlement, the local authority remains focused on sourcing property from the private sector so as not to put any additional pressure on

the council and social housing markets in the city. There is also asylum seeker dispersal within the city provided through the government contract with G4S.

There is also work to be undertaken with local communities to support the integration of newly arrived communities, with a shared understanding and common ground on which to build a community foundation.

There is a need for join-up between decisions regarding temporary and permanent accommodation for asylum seeker and refugee families and the provision of school places.

Safeguarding

Statutory organisations in Birmingham work cooperatively to identify and address any safeguarding risks for new arrivals (particularly children). New risks may present themselves as the types of asylum seekers and refugees change over time, and local responses (e.g. accommodation provision) change. It is important that local processes to identify concerns are responsive to these changes.

Community Cohesion

We will work with communities within the city to allow them to support and embrace individuals who arrive into the city through the various pathways. They are the experts on their local area and the support that is available more locally. This includes community integration support, community sponsorship and the development of a mapping of provision across the city. Birmingham will look to develop a single point of information for asylum seekers and refugees who arrive in the city, mapping the service provision available and providing a useful resource.

The community response to asylum seekers and refugees has been one of welcome and support. To coordinate the offers presented Birmingham will look to sign up to the Government online portal to support refugees. This will allow communities, individuals and organisations to offer support of time/goods/services and for the facilitation of those offers to be managed effectively.

Birmingham, as a City of Sanctuary, has committed to welcoming an additional 500 Syrian refugees to our city in the next few years – on top of the 50 we have already accommodated. Birmingham also has the highest number of asylum seekers in the region. As a city, we have long seen our super diversity as an asset and celebrated the benefits of our multi-racial, multi-faith composition. This diversity will help us continue to welcome new migrants, refugees and asylum seekers as we grow, but we recognise that promoting these values alone will not be sufficient. In September 2016 a cross-party statement was agreed which lays out our vision, as a council, for cohesion in Birmingham. Building on this we are developing a strategy that will outline the work the council can do to improve cohesion in the city. However, we recognise that this will be a shared endeavour, and we are working with partners across the city to devise a Birmingham strategy for cohesion. Transparency and openness will be key to this agenda as we seek to ensure that no community feels that they have been overlooked.

Partnership Working

Birmingham City Council alone cannot fully meet the needs of individuals. Birmingham recognises the importance of the work undertaken within the voluntary and community sector organisations and how this work increases the contribution that we are able to make as a city to those vulnerable individuals.

Through strengthening the relationships and partnership working across the city we aim to create a coherent pathway of service provision for asylum seekers with a positive status to remain within the UK. This allows us as a collective to support wider community integration.

Additionally we will work strategically with the voluntary and community sectors to ensure that precarious individuals and families who are the subject of immigration control can access advice, information and legal support with a view to avoiding destitution.

Conclusion

Birmingham is committed to ensure that individuals arriving through the asylum and migration schemes are provided with the appropriate level of care. This will be done in partnership with relevant organisations and through the support of local community groups. Birmingham is committed to welcoming and providing a culture of hospitality and welcome, especially for refugees seeking sanctuary from war and persecution. This will be done in partnership with relevant organisations and with support from local communities.

Birmingham City Council acknowledges that this work needs to be undertaken alongside the fulfilment of its other priorities.



Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Migration City Of Sanctuary
Directorate	People
Service Area	Policy And Commissioning - People
Type	New/Proposed Policy
EA Summary	<p>Birmingham has long been a place of refuge for individuals arriving to claim asylum in the UK. Birmingham is proud of its diversity and has committed to being a City of Sanctuary, providing a culture of hospitality and welcome, especially for refugees seeking sanctuary from war and persecution.</p> <p>The development of a single position statement on migration supports the Councils business plan and also addresses the need to ensure more partnership working.</p>
Reference Number	EA001851
Task Group Manager	sarah.feeley@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Senior Officer	pip.mayo@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	peopleequalitycontrol@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a New/Proposed Policy.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Policy and expected outcomes?

The development of a single position statement on Migration for Birmingham is to enhance the support and information provided to individuals on the provision delivered by other agencies, organisations and partners within the city. Through the development of the position statement Birmingham City Council will detail the migration schemes that are currently active in the city and the ways in which we will collectively respond to these.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Children: A Safe And Secure City In Which To Learn And Grow	Yes
Health: Helping People Become More Physically Active And Well	Yes
Housing : To Meet The Needs Of All Current And Future Citizens	Yes
Jobs And Skills: For An Enterprising, Innovative And Green City	Yes

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	No
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Not Relevant	No
Disability	Not Relevant	No
Gender	Not Relevant	No
Gender Reassignment	Not Relevant	No
Marriage Civil Partnership	Not Relevant	No
Pregnancy And Maternity	Not Relevant	No
Race	Not Relevant	No
Religion or Belief	Not Relevant	No
Sexual Orientation	Not Relevant	No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

Through the development of a single position statement this should bring clarity and connectivity to the complex issue of migration within Birmingham. The outlining of the different schemes and provision within the city will aid services both internally and externally to understand the different schemes, but to also be aware of the wider work programme.

There should be no adverse effect on those arriving into the city through the planned migration routes with services provided through the external funding routes as detailed within the document. This also captures the changes to the Immigration Act and the potential for an increased number of individuals experiencing destitution although it should be noted that there is no evidence to suggest that this would be the case.

There will be no impacts to services or employees internally with the implementation of the position statement.

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

Following the completion of an initial Equality Impact Assessment there are no identified areas which suggest a full assessment is required, therefore this initial assessment is now complete.

4 Review Date

30/06/17

5 Action Plan

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	Cabinet
Report of:	Strategic Director for People
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017
SUBJECT:	SCHEME FOR CO-ORDINATED ADMISSIONS TO SCHOOLS, ADMISSION NUMBERS AND ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2018/19
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002997/2017
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Councillor Brigid Jones, Children, Families & Schools
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Susan Barnett, Education and Vulnerable Children
Wards affected:	All

1. Purpose of report:
<p>1.1 To report the outcome of consultation on primary and secondary school admission numbers and the proposed scheme for co-ordinated admissions to schools and admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for the academic year 2018/2019.</p> <p>1.2 To agree the admission numbers detailed in Appendix 1(a) and agree the proposed scheme for co-ordinated admissions to schools and admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools as detailed in Appendix 2 and 3 for the academic year 2018/2019.</p>

2. Decision(s) recommended:
<p>That Cabinet</p> <p>2.1 Approve the school admission numbers for community and voluntary controlled schools set out in Appendix 1(a), including the proposed change in the Published Admission Number to Thornton Primary School should it revert to a junior school and note the admission numbers and proposed admission numbers for academies and foundation and voluntary aided schools set out in Appendix 1(b).</p> <p>2.2 Approve the proposed scheme for co-ordinated admissions to schools and admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for the academic year 2018/2019 as set out in Appendix 2 and 3.</p>

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Emma Leaman, Assistant Director, Education Infrastructure
Telephone No: E-mail address:	303 8327 Emma.Leaman@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

Consultation should include those that have an interest in the decisions recommended. To this end, consultation on proposed admission numbers, admission arrangements and admission criteria for the September 2018 intake has taken place from the 21 November 2016 to the 9 January 2017 with the following:-

3.1 Internal

- An email was sent to all members inviting comments on the proposed admission arrangements there were no comments received from members.

3.2 External

- Governing Bodies of community and voluntary controlled primary and secondary schools in Birmingham.
- Governing Bodies of academies, voluntary aided and foundation primary and secondary schools (admission authorities) in Birmingham.
- Neighbouring local authorities (admission authorities that share a boundary with Birmingham).
- An email was sent to all Birmingham schools asking them to include in their newsletters details of where parents could view the proposed admission arrangements.
- Information regarding the consultation was included on the Schools Noticeboard.
- The consultation was published on the Birmingham City Website to ensure all Birmingham residents and parents of all children aged between 2 and 18 were consulted with.
- Consulted with the religious bodies representing the schools of a religious denomination.
- The consultation was published on the Be Heard website. Consultation was based on the proposed admission numbers set out in Appendices 1a and the proposed scheme for coordinated admissions to schools (Appendix 2) and proposed admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools (Appendix 3).

Three comments have been received to the consultation, one expressed concern about the continuation of single sex schools. Another was about lack of school places in Boldmere. Another commented on the current process for dealing with applications where families have moved house after the closing date, please see three comments below; -

From a parent

“Please could you either (a) end single sex secondary schools, or, if they must continue, (b) give preferential spaces in local mixed schools for parents of boys and girls over parents of just boys or just girls so that they can go to the same school. Boys to the boys' school, girls to the girls' school, boys & girls to the mixed school. All siblings, regardless of gender, then get the same opportunity to stay together. The current admissions policy shows a disregard for family wishes, and discriminates against those children that have siblings of the opposite sex to them. Their peers that have same sex siblings that can go to school together, but that right is denied to other children purely on the grounds of the gender of the family group. Where we live (Brandwood), there are 7 secondary schools within walking distance of my house. Not one of these will accept both my children. This has to change.”

From a parent

“Vesey ward does not have enough school places for both primary and secondary school children. It is so wrong that children are having to be driven to schools out of area past several other schools when they could be placed in a school local to them. Boldmere School should have an additional class - this would solve the problem in the Boldmere area where there are pockets of residential areas where children cannot get into any local school. There should be an additional arrangement for admissions that provides a school place for children who cannot get into any of their 3 closest schools. If they apply for all 3 within their choices, then if they cannot be allocated any of those 3 schools or a school higher on their choice list, they should be prioritised a place at one of those 3 schools. This would encourage more children and parents to walk or cycle to school, contributing to healthier living and reducing the amount of traffic on the roads inappropriate parking by the schools. Birmingham needs to treat children as human beings and not as a statistic.”

From Assistant Head Teacher

“As the AHT who deals with admission to our Rec classes I have become aware of increasing desperation of parents to obtain a place and the lengths they go to to obtain the place. One of the most common tactics seems to be renting around the time of application but moving before the child actually starts in September. This makes it difficult for the team at Admissions to prove if they ever actually lived there. It is also grossly unfair to the families who are committed to living in the area but didn't get in as they live slightly further away. This is doubly frustrating as these families then get siblings in from a MUCH wider area than the people who apply for a first child from a genuine permanent home. We have a good relationship with the team at Admissions and find them very professional and supportive but increasingly overwhelmed by the sheer scale of this problem. They simply cannot chase up all the concerns we have. We need changes to cut out some of the cheating. I propose no sibling place if you move more than 1KM from school and no moving before the child starts school. I also think careful scrutiny of rental agreements is required-many state 12mth but then further down have a "small print" that states no commitment to stay beyond six months. I have had a conversation with Jason Sheargold about this and local MP Gisela Stuart is also being lobbied by parents.”

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?

Yes – consistent with the Council's policies around education and safeguarding.

4.2 Financial Implications

There are no additional costs for these admission arrangements, all costs will be met from the School Admissions Service budget, Directorate for People.

4.3 Legal Implications

This report exercises powers contained in Part III of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and discharges the duties contained in sections 88C and 88M of the Act and regulations made under the Act (the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 in relation to, respectively, determining the admission arrangements for maintained schools for which the authority is the admission authority and formulating a scheme for co-ordinating the arrangements for the admission of pupils to maintained schools and academies in the authority's area. All admission authorities, of which the local authority is one, are required to set ('determine') admission arrangements annually by 28 February. The arrangements so determined will apply to the next-but-one academic year (i.e. arrangements determined on 28 February 2017 will apply to the academic year 2018/19). Where changes are proposed to admission arrangements, the admission authority must first publicly consult on those arrangements by 31 January. If no changes are made to admission arrangements, they must be consulted on at least every 7 years. The local authority is also required to consult on and thereafter determine on an annual basis a co-ordinated admissions scheme which is to apply to the next-but-one academic year and to inform the Secretary of State that such a scheme has been adopted by no later than 28 February each year.

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

The local authority has a statutory duty to co-ordinate centrally the admission arrangements of all maintained schools and academies in its area. The admission arrangements aim to provide for equality of access by parents and their children. The authority's objective admission criteria do not disadvantage particular social groups or those with special educational needs. An initial Equality Impact Assessment has been completed on 8 July 2014 (EA000124). and the need for a full assessment was not indicated.

The Equality Impact Assessment will be carried forward as part of the School Admissions Business Plan. The School Admissions Business Plan will monitor actions including; managers monitoring the use of the comments, compliments and complaints process taking particular account of equality and diversity; managers to monitor the number of preferences not received and the number of unrealistic preferences received; managers to monitor staff accreditation of the language increment allowance to allow communication with parent/carers in their first language

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

- 5.1 The Local Authority has a statutory duty to determine admission arrangements and publish admission numbers on an annual basis for each community and voluntary controlled school. For voluntary aided and foundation schools, the admission arrangements are determined and an admission number published by each school's governing body following consultation between governing bodies of such schools and the local authority. Admission numbers are based upon the available accommodation in each school and Appendix 1 (a) and (b) sets out the number of places proposed for September 2018. Appendix 2 sets out the proposed scheme for coordinated admissions to schools for 2018 and Appendix 3 sets out the proposed admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for 2018.
- 5.2 Consultation has taken place between 21 November 2016 and 9 January 2017 (minimum 6 weeks), as detailed in paragraph 3 above.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):	
6.1	The consultation has not identified any support for alternative admission arrangements to those proposed.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):	
7.1	To comply with the local authority's duties to determine primary and secondary admission numbers and admission arrangements and to have a single scheme for co-ordinating admissions to schools for 2018/19.

Signatures	<u>Date</u>
Councillor Brigid Jones Cabinet Member, Children, Families & Schools
Peter Hay Strategic Director for People

List of Background Documents used to compile this report:
School Standards and Framework Act 1998
School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012
School Admissions Code issued by DfE - December 2014

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):
1. (a) Community and voluntary controlled primary and secondary admission numbers for September 2018-19 intake. (b) Academies, foundation and voluntary aided and free schools admission numbers for September 2018-19 intake.
2. Proposed Scheme for Co-ordinated Admissions to Schools – September 2018-19
3. Proposed admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools September 2018-19.

Report Version	<u>V2</u>	Dated	<u>3 February 2017</u>
-----------------------	------------------	--------------	-------------------------------

Proposed Published Admission Numbers September 2018

DfE = Department for Education Number

PAN = Published Admission Number

Reception Intake - Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools

Infant, Primary & All-through Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2010	Adderley Primary School	90	90	
2153	Allens Croft Primary School	60	60	
2062	Anderton Park Primary School	90	90	
2479	Anglesey Primary School	90	90	
2300	Arden Primary School	90	90	
2026	Banners Gate Primary School	60	60	
2014	Barford Primary School	60	60	
2239	Bellfield Infant School (NC)	60	60	
2456	Bells Farm Junior and Infant School	30	30	
2017	Beeches Infant School	90	90	
2435	Benson Community School	60	60	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
2025	Birches Green Infant School	60	60	
2297	Birchfield Community School	90	90	
2254	Blakesley Hall Primary School	90	90	
2402	Boldmere Infant School & Nursery	90	90	
2030	Bordesley Green Primary School	90	90	
2002	Bordesley Village Primary School	60	60	
2238	Broadmeadow Infant School	60	60	
2034	Brookfields Primary School	60	60	
2465	Calshot Primary School	60	60	
2039	Canterbury Cross Primary School	60	60	
2312	Chad Vale Primary School	60	60	
2305	Chandos Primary School	60	60	
2040	Cherry Orchard Primary School	60	60	
2251	Chilcote Primary School	60	60	
3002	Christ Church CofE Controlled Primary School and Nursery	30	30	
3432	Clifton Primary School	120	120	
2185	Colebourne Primary School	60	60	
2052	Colmers Farm Primary School	60	60	
2054	Colmore Infant and Nursery School	120	120	
2055	Cotteridge Primary School	60	60	
2191	Court Farm Primary School	30	30	
2060	Cromwell Junior and Infant School and Nursery Class	30	30	
2284	Deykin Avenue Junior and Infant School	30	30	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2454	Elms Farm Community Primary School	60	60	
2294	Featherstone Primary School	60	60	
2475	Firs Primary School	60	60	
2486	Forestdale Primary School	30	30	
2079	George Dixon Primary School	60	60	
2081	Gilbertstone Primary School	60	60	
2296	Glenmead Primary School	60	60	
2087	Grendon Junior and Infant School (NC)	60	60	
2466	Grove School	90	90	
2091	Gunter Primary School	30	30	
2093	Hall Green Infant School	120	120	
2477	Harborne Primary School	90	90	The governing body of Harborne Primary sought approval to expand to 150 from 2016 however complications with the building programme has meant that this programme is delayed for the foreseeable future.
2099	Hawthorn Primary School	30	30	
2313	Heath Mount Primary School	60	60	
2438	Highters Heath Community School	30	30	
3430	Hodge Hill Primary School	120	120	
2429	Holland House Infant School and Nursery	60	60	
2288	Hollywood Primary School	60	60	
2015	James Watt Primary School	60	60	
2005	Kings Heath Primary School	90	90	
2118	Kings Norton Junior and Infant School	60	60	
2115	Kingsland Primary School (NC)	45	45	
2441	Kingsthorpe Primary School	60	60	
2321	Kitwell Primary School and Nursery Class	30	30	
2189	Ladypool Primary School	60	60	
2119	Lahey Lane Junior and Infant School	60	60	
2127	Lozells Junior and Infant School and Nursery	60	60	
2129	Lyndon Green Infant School	90	90	
2420	Maney Hill Primary School	60	60	School Organisation approval achieved for expansion from 30 to 60 from 2016.
2004	Mapledene Primary School	45	45	
2132	Marlborough Infant School	90	90	
2133	Marsh Hill Primary School	60	60	
2406	Minworth Junior & Infant School	30	30	
2142	Nelson Junior and Infant School	60	60	
2457	Nelson Mandela School	60	60	
2469	New Hall Primary and Children's Centre	45	45	
3431	New Oscott Primary School	90	90	
2436	Osborne Primary School	60	60	School Organisation approval

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				achieved by the governing body expansion from 30 to 60 from 2017.
2021	Paganel Primary School	60	60	
2149	Paget Primary School	60	60	
2150	Park Hill Primary School	90	90	
2425	Penns Primary School	30	30	
3004	Quinton Church Primary School	30	30	
2157	Raddlebarn Primary School	60	60	
2159	Redhill Junior and Infant School	30	30	
2161	Rednal Hill Infant School	90	90	
2063	Regents Park Community Primary School	90	90	
2169	Severne Junior Infant and Nursery School	60	60	
2008	Shaw Hill Primary School	60	60	
2174	Sladefield Infant School	120	120	
2176	Somerville Primary (NC) School	90	90	
3413	Springfield Primary School	90	90	
2183	St Benedict's Infant School	150	150	
3010	St James Church of England Primary School, Handsworth	60	60	
3025	St Mary's Church of England Primary School	60	60	
3016	St Matthew's CofE Primary School	30	30	
3428	St Peters CofE Primary School	60	60	
3019	St Saviour's CofE Primary School	60	60	
2178	Stanville Primary School	30	30	School has admitted a bulge of 30 pupils taking PAN to 60 for 2016 only.
2179	Starbank School	180	180	
2184	Stechford Primary School	60	60	
2188	Stirchley Primary School	30	30	
2097	Story Wood School & Children's Centre	30	30	
2067	Summerfield Junior & Infant School	60	60	
2190	Sundridge Primary School	30	30	
2246	The Meadows Primary School	90	90	
2018	The Oaks Primary School	60	60	
2192	Thornton Primary School	0	0*	*School Organisation consultation currently taking place to change the age range so that school returns to a Junior school, removing the Reception PAN of 30. Decision expected in January 2017. School has received agreement to a 0 Reception PAN in 2017. The expectation is for current infant pupils to work through so the school is operating as a Junior

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				provision only from 2019, if School Organisation approval is received.
2273	Topcliffe Primary School	30	30	
2442	Turves Green Primary School	60	60	
2108	Ward End Primary School	120	120	
2306	Water Mill Primary School	30	30	
2482	Wattville Primary School	60	60	
2308	Welford Primary School	60	60	
2245	Welsh House Farm Community School and Special Needs Resource Base	30	30	
2019	West Heath Primary School	60	60	
2471	Westminster Primary School	60	60	
2011	Wheeler Lane Primary School	90	90	
2276	Wilkes Green Infant School (NC)	90	90	
2445	Woodcock Hill Primary School	30	30	
2278	Woodgate Primary School	60	60	
2314	Woodthorpe Junior and Infant School	30	30	
2317	World's End Infant and Nursery School	90	90	
2412	Wylde Green Primary School	60	60	
3421	Yardley Primary School	120	120	
2227	Yardley Wood Community Primary School	60	60	
2485	Yenton Primary School	90	90	School Organisation approval achieved at Cabinet for expansion from 60 to 90 from 2016.
2231	Yorkmead Junior and Infant School	60	60	
-	Total	7875	7875	

Year 3 Intake - Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools

Junior Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2016	Beeches Junior School	90	90	
2241	Bellfield Junior School	60	60	
2024	Birches Green Junior School	60	60	
2401	Boldmere Junior School	90	90	
2236	Broadmeadow Junior School	60	60	
2053	Colmore Junior School	120	120	
2092	Hall Green Junior School	120	120	
2128	Lyndon Green Junior School	90	90	
2283	Marlborough Junior School	90	90	
2155	Princethorpe Junior School	60	60	
2160	Rednal Hill Junior School	90	90	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2192	Thornton Primary School	150	150	Thornton Primary School currently has a smaller Infant than Junior capacity (30 / 150) therefore pupils already on roll in the School's Year 2 will automatically be transferred into Year 3. The remaining vacancies in Year 3 will be offered to applicants in accordance with the School's admissions criteria. School Organisation consultation currently taking place to change the age range so that school returns to a Junior school, removing the Reception PAN of 30. The expectation is for current infant pupils to work through so the school is operating as a Junior provision only from 2019, if School Organisation approval is received.
2293	Wilkes Green Junior School	90	90	
2225	World's End Junior School	90	90	
-	Total	1260	1260	

Year 7 Intake - Community Schools

Secondary & All-through Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4333	Balaam Wood School	97	97	
4115	Bordesley Green Girls' School & Sixth Form	120	120	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4015	Hodge Hill Girls' School	150	150	
4201	Hodge Hill College	240	240	
4223	Holte School	192	192	
4301	John Willmott School	195	195	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4063	Kings Heath Boys	120	120	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4177	Selly Park Technology College for Girls	140	140	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4237	Swanshurst School	300	300	
4244	The International School	120	120	Schools Adjudicator Approval received for in-year variation to reduce PAN to 120 for 2016 also.
4188	Turves Green Boys' School	150	150	
4193	Wheeler Lane Technology College	125*	130	*School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking PAN of 130. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
-	Total	1949	1954	

Reception Intake - Foundation and Voluntary Aided Schools

Infant, Primary & All-through Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
3318	Abbey Catholic Primary School	60	60	
5949	Al-Furqan Primary School	90	90	
4334	Al-Hijrah School	60	60	
3354	Bournville Infant School	90	90	
3319	Christ the King Catholic Primary School	45	45	
2289	Cofton Primary School	60	60	
2464	Coppice Primary School	60	60	
3320	Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3321	English Martyrs' Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3435	Four Oaks Primary School	60	60	
3316	Guardian Angels Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3436	Harper Bell Seventh-Day Adventist School	30	30	
3411	Holly Hill Methodist CofE Infant School	60	60	
2474	Hollyfield Primary School	60	60	
3317	Holy Family Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3327	Holy Souls Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3352	King David Junior and Infant School	30	30	
2462	Little Sutton Primary School	60	60	
3322	Maryvale Catholic Primary School	30	30	
2416	Moor Hall Primary School	30*	30*	*School Organisation consultation currently taking place to expand the school to 60 from 2017. Decision expected in January 2017.
3003	Moseley Church of England Primary School	30	30	
3351	Our Lady and St Rose of Lima Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3328	Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School (NC)	30	30	
3357	Our Lady's Catholic Primary School	30	30	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
3409	Sacred Heart Catholic School	30	30	
3302	Saint Barnabas Church of England Primary School	60	60	
3381	St Alban's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3380	St Ambrose Barlow Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3335	St Anne's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3329	St Augustine's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3372	St Bernadette's Catholic Primary School	90	90	
3375	St Bernard's Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3331	St Catherine of Siena Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3337	St Chad's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3406	St Clare's Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3386	St Cuthbert's RC Junior and Infant (NC) School	30	30	
3363	St Dunstan's Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3347	St Edmund's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3355	St Edward's Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3342	St Francis Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3367	St Gerard's RC Junior and Infant School	30	30	
3410	St John and Monica Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3360	St John Fisher Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3339	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School (B7)	30	30	
3377	St Jude's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3371	St Laurence Church Infant School	90	90	
3361	St Margaret Mary RC Junior and Infant School	45	45	School Organisation approval achieved at Cabinet for expansion from 30 to 45 from 2017.
3383	St Mark's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3382	St Martin de Porres Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3350	St Mary and St John Junior & Infant School	60	60	
3344	St Mary's Catholic Primary School	60	60	
3346	St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3385	St Peter's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3362	St Peter and St Paul RC Junior and Infant School	30	30	
3365	St Teresa's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3349	St Thomas More Catholic Primary	60	60	School Organisation approval achieved at Cabinet for expansion from 45 to 60 from 2017.
3310	St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3359	St Wilfrid's Catholic Junior & Infant School	60	60	
3323	The Oratory Roman Catholic Primary	30	30	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
3325	The Rosary Catholic Primary School	60	60	
5203	Walmley Infant School	90	90	
2478	Whitehouse Common Primary School	60	60	
-	Total	2880	2880	

Reception Intake - Academies & Free Schools

Infant, Primary & All-through Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2020	Acocks Green Primary School	60	60	
3433	Albert Bradbeer Academy	60	60	
2144	Alston Primary School	90	90	
2041	Ark Rose Primary Academy	30	30	
2056	Ark Tindal Primary Academy	60	60	
2443	Aston Tower Community Primary School	60	60	
3412	Audley Primary School	120	120	
2072	Billesley Primary School	90	90	
4017	Bournville School and Sixth Form Centre	60	60	Regional Schools Commissioner Approval received for school to become all-through school from 2016.
2295	Brookvale Primary School	30	30	
2152	Brownmead Junior & Infant School	30*	30*	*School Organisation consultation to take place to expand the school to 60 from 2017. Decision expected during 2017.
2047	Chilwell Croft Academy	60	60	
2140	Chivenor Primary School	60	60	
2134	City Road Primary School	60	60	
2082	Conway Primary School	60	60	
2299	Cottesbrooke Infant and Nursery School	90	90	
2065	Dorrington Academy	90	90	
2036	Erdington Hall Primary	60	60	
2310	Fairway Primary School	30	30	
2109	Four Dwellings Primary Academy	60	60	
2448	Gossey Lane Academy School	30	30	
2450	Great Barr Primary	60	60	
2451	Green Meadow Primary	60	60	
2085	Greenholm Primary	90	90	
2086	Greet Primary School	120	120	
2138	Grestone Academy	90	90	
2121	Hawkesley Church Primary Academy	30	30	
2309	Heathfield Primary School	60	60	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2455	Heathlands Primary Academy	60	60	
2165	Highfield Junior and Infant School	120	120	
2434	Hillstone Primary School	60	60	
3429	Hill West Primary School	60	60	
3402	Holy Cross Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3303	Holy Trinity CE Primary Academy (Handsworth)	30	30	
2111	Jervoise School	30	30	
4020	King Solomon International Business School	60	60	
2073	Kings Rise Academy	45*	45*	*School Organisation consultation to take place to expand the school to 60 from 2017. Decision expected during 2017.
2096	Lea Forest Primary Academy	60	60	
2453	Leigh Primary School	60	60	
5204	Manor Park Primary School	60	60	
2075	Mansfield Green E-ACT Academy	60	60	
2463	Mere Green Primary School	60	60	
2100	Merritts Brook E-ACT Academy	30	30	
2070	Montgomery Primary Academy	90	90	
2078	Moor Green Primary School	60	60	
2038	Nansen Primary School	120	120	
2048	Nechells Primary E-ACT Academy	30	30	
2032	Nishkam Primary School Birmingham	60	60	
2315	Nonsuch Primary School	30	30	
2263	Northfield Manor Primary Academy	60	60	
2102	Oasis Academy Blakenhale Infants	90	90	
2117	Oasis Academy Boulton	30	30	
2141	Oasis Academy Foundry	30	30	
2110	Oasis Academy Hobmoor	60	60	
2103	Oasis Academy Short Heath	60	60	
2105	Oasis Academy Woodview	60	60	
3374	Our Lady of Fatima Catholic Primary School	30	30	
2458	Parkfield Community School	90	90	
2452	Pegasus Primary School	30	30	
2057	Percy Shurmer Academy	60	60	
TBC	<i>Perry Beeches The Primary School I</i>	-	60	<i>Primary free school proposed to open, date unknown. Pending formal Funding Agreement. Co- ordinating own Admissions in first year.</i>
4019	Perry Beeches V The All Through Family School	100	100	
TBC	<i>Perry Beeches VI The Free School</i>	-	100	<i>All-through free school proposed to</i>

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				<i>open, date unknown. Pending formal Funding Agreement. Co-ordinating own Admissions in first year.</i>
2003	Prince Albert Primary School	90	90	
2156	Princethorpe Infant School	60	60	
2460	Robin Hood Academy	90	90	
2481	Rookery School	60	60	
2037	Slade Primary School	60	60	
3330	St Brigid's Catholic Primary School	60	60	
2059	St Clement's Church of England Academy	30	30	
2154	St Columba's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
5205	St Francis Church of England Aided Primary School and Nursery	30	30	
2104	St George's Church of England Academy, Newtown	60	60	
2120	St George's Church of England Primary School	30	30	
3358	St James Catholic Primary School	30	30	
2071	St John's and St Peter's CofE Academy	30	30	
3306	St John's CofE Primary School	60	60	
2158	St Joseph's Catholic Primary (B30)	30	30	
3401	St Joseph's RC Primary School	60	60	
3015	St Mary's C of E Primary and Nursery Academy, Handsworth	60	60	
2061	St Michael's CofE Primary Academy, Handsworth	30	30	
3311	St Michael's Church of England Aided Primary School	60	60	
3403	St Nicholas Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3366	St Paul's Catholic Primary School	30	30	
3314	St Thomas CofE Academy	30	30	
2098	Tame Valley Academy	30	30	
5201	The Deanery Church of England Primary School	60	60	
2064	The Oaklands Primary School	60	60	
2167	The Olive School, Birmingham	90	90	
2249	The Orchards Primary Academy	30	30	
2447	The Oval School	90	90	
2058	The Shirestone Academy	30	30	
2195	Timberley Primary School	90	90	
2126	Tiverton Academy	30	30	
2449	Twickenham Primary School	60	60	
2068	Warren Farm Primary School	45	45	
4084	Washwood Heath Academy	30	30	School Organisation approval achieved from Regional Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				Commissioner to become an all-through school offering primary places from 2017.
4009	Waverley School	90	90	
2136	Woodhouse Primary Academy	60	60	
2480	Wychall primary School	60	60	
2146	Wyndcliffe Primary School	90	90	
2122	Yarnfield Primary School	90	90	
2180	Yew Tree Community Junior and Infant School (NC)	60	60	
-	Total	5860	6020	

Year 3 Intake - Foundation and Voluntary Aided Schools

Junior Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
3353	Bournville Junior School	96	96	
3307	St Laurence Church Junior School	90	90	
5202	Walmley Junior School	90	90	
-	Total	276	276	

Year 3 Intake – Academies

Junior Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
2182	ARK Chamberlain Primary Academy	150	150	
2226	Cedars Academy	90	90	
2107	Oasis Academy Blakenhale Junior	90	90	
2080	Reaside Academy	60	60	
2145	Town Junior School	60	60	
-	Total	450	450	

Year 7 Intake - Foundation and Voluntary Aided Schools

Secondary Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4804	Archbishop Ilsley Catholic	210	210	
5413	Bishop Challoner Catholic College	180	180	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4801	Cardinal Wiseman Catholic Technology College	120	120	Schools Adjudicator Approval received for in-year variation to PAN to 120 for 2016 and 2017.
5416	Colmers School and Sixth Form College	210	210	
5403	Great Barr School	350	350	Schools Adjudicator Approval received for in-year variation to reduce PAN to 350 for 2016 and 2017.
5402	Handsworth Grammar School	150	150	
4664	Holy Trinity Catholic Media Arts College	126	126	
5415	King's Norton Boys' School	128	150	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4245	Moseley School	250	250	
4173	Queensbridge School	170	170	
5401	Small Heath School	240	240	
4663	St Edmund Campion Catholic School & Sixth Form Centre	186	186	
4625	St John Wall Catholic School	120	120	
4606	St Paul's School for Girls	165	165	
4187	Turves Green Girls' School	150	150	
-	Total	2745	2777	

Year 7 Intake - Academies & Free Schools

Secondary & All-through Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4013	Ark Boulton Academy	180	180	
4001	Ark Kings Academy	120	120	
6908	Ark St Alban's Academy	120	120	
4220	Aston Manor Academy	150	150	
4108	Bartley Green School	185	185	
4660	Bishop Vesey's Grammar School	160	160	
4661	Bishop Walsh Catholic School	150	150	
4017	Bournville School and Sixth Form Centre	210	210	
4227	Broadway School	210	210	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4022	Cockshut Hill Technology College	270	270	
4129	Dame Elizabeth Cadbury Technology College	125	125	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4021	Eden Boys' School	100	100	
2168	Erdington Academy	180	180	
5410	Fairfax	250	250	
4005	Four Dwellings Academy	150	150	
5412	George Dixon Academy	180	180	
4006	Greenwood Academy	180	180	
5409	Hall Green School	180	180	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4240	Hamstead Hall Academy	180	180	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4207	Handsworth Wood Girls' Academy	160	160	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
6910	Harborne Academy	120	120	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
6905	Heartlands Academy	150	150	
4012	Hillcrest School A Specialist Mathematics and Computing College and Sixth Form Centre	120	120	
4241	Holyhead School	210	210	
5408	King Edward VI Aston School	120	120	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
5407	King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys	120	120	
5406	King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Girls	150	150	
5405	King Edward VI Five Ways School	180	180	
5404	King Edward VI Handsworth School	160	160	
6906	King Edward VI Sheldon Heath Academy	210	210	
4020	King Solomon International Business School	90	90	
5414	Kings Norton Girls' School	160	160	School has submitted an

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4057	Lordswood Boys' School	130	130	
4060	Lordswood Girls' School and Sixth Form Centre	154	154	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
5411	Ninestiles, an Academy	300	300	
4004	Nishkam High School	100	100	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
6909	North Birmingham Academy	180	180	
4323	Rockwood Academy	120	180	School intending to offer 180 places from September 2017. School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4109	Perry Beeches The Academy	180	180	
4002	Perry Beeches II The Free School	100	100	
4011	Perry Beeches III The Free School	100	100	
4016	Perry Beeches IV The Free School	100	100	
4019	Perry Beeches V – The All Through Family Free School	100	100	
TBC	<i>Perry Beeches VI – The Free School</i>	-	100	<i>All-through free school proposed to open, date unknown. Pending formal Funding Agreement. Co-ordinating own Admissions in first year.</i>
4331	Plantsbrook School	240	240	
4018	Saltley Academy	210	210	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
6907	Shenley Academy	180	180	
4616	St Thomas Aquinas Catholic School	210	210	
4206	Stockland Green School	150	150	
4300	Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls	180	180	
4307	The Arthur Terry School	240	240	
5400	The Baverstock Academy	240	240	

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4014	The University of Birmingham Free School	150	150	
4084	Washwood Heath Academy	260	260	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4009	Waverley School	180	180	
4246	Yardleys School	180	180	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
-	Total	9214	9374	

Secondary Schools – Year 9 Intake

14 – 19 Free School

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4010	Waverley Studio College	-	60	The academy trust is proposing to consult on extending the age range from Y10-13 to Y9-13 and to change the PAN from 75 to 60. Full organisation and decision from the Regional Schools Commissioner is expected to this effect in due course.
-	Total	-	60	

Secondary Schools – Year 10 Intake

14 – 19 Academies & Free Schools

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
4003	Aston University Engineering Academy	120	120	School has submitted an Expression of Interest in taking additional places. Discussion underway with LA regarding Basic Need.
4000	Birmingham Ormiston Academy	150	150	
4010	Waverley Studio College	75	-	The academy trust is proposing to consult on extending the age range from Y10-13 to Y9-13 and to change the PAN from 75 to 60. Full organisation and decision from the Regional Schools Commissioner is

DfE	School Name	PAN Sep 2017	PAN Sep 2018	Comments
				expected to this effect in due course.
-	Total	345	270	

PROPOSED SCHEME FOR THE CO-ORDINATED ADMISSIONS TO SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES – SEPTEMBER 2018/2019

Contents

1. Background
2. Admission authority for each type of school
3. Parents right to apply for a school
4. The application process for in-year admission
5. The application process for primary and secondary normal admission rounds
6. Determining the offer of school places
7. Timetable for primary and secondary normal admissions rounds for 2018/2019
8. Late applications
9. Foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools
10. Academies and free schools
11. Selective schools
12. Fair Access Protocol
13. Relevant area

1. Background

- 1.1 This scheme applies to all primary and secondary maintained schools, academies and free schools (excluding special schools) in Birmingham for the academic year 2018 / 2019 and is made under the provisions of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, as amended by the Education Act 2002, and The School Admissions (Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 The School Admissions Service, on behalf of the Local Authority and other admission authorities in Birmingham, will co-ordinate applications made during the normal admissions round (i.e. applications for Reception Year, Year 3 at a Junior School, Year 7 and, in the case of 14-19 Academies, Year 10). Parents/carers resident in Birmingham who are applying for a place for their child in September 2018 will make a single application to the Local Authority (School Admissions Service) for any Birmingham maintained school, academy or free school or any such school or academy in a neighbouring authority.
- 1.3 For the academic year 2018 / 2019 and subsequent years, subject to any review, applications made outside the normal admissions round (i.e. in-year applications) will be made directly to individual schools or academies.
- 1.4 Birmingham City Council is the relevant admission authority for all community and voluntary controlled schools within the city.
- 1.5 For voluntary aided and foundation schools (including Trust schools), academies and free schools, governing bodies of such schools are the admission authority.
- 1.6 Co-ordination schemes do not affect the rights and duties of the governing bodies of voluntary aided and foundation schools (including Trust schools), academies and free schools to set and apply their own admission arrangements and oversubscription criteria, but they must ensure that their own arrangements are compatible with the Local Authority's admission arrangements and co-ordinated scheme.

2. Admission Authority for each type of school in Birmingham

There are a number of different school types in Birmingham:

Type of School	Who is the admission authority?
Academies (inc. Free Schools)	Academy Trust
Community Schools	Local Authority
Foundation Schools	Governing Body
Voluntary Aided Schools	Governing Body
Voluntary Controlled Schools	Local Authority

3. Parents' right to apply for a school

Birmingham City Council, as a Local Authority, must enable parents and carers to say where they would prefer their child to go to school. The law does not give parents a right to “choose” which school their child will attend.

Subject to certain exceptions an admission authority must comply with any preference expressed by a parent/carers as to the school at which their child should be educated.

Exceptions

The law recognises that it may not always be possible to carry out parents' wishes, for a number of reasons:

- because this would “prejudice the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources”, e.g. because a particular school may be full (i.e., it has already admitted pupils up to the Published Admission Number for the child's year group);
- because it is a selective (grammar) school and the child has not reached the required academic standard for entry to a selective school;
- because the child has been permanently excluded from two or more schools and the most recent of the exclusions took place within the last two years;
- because the school's statutory infant class size limit of 30 has been reached.

4. The application process for in-year admissions

- 4.1 In-year applications may arise for a number of reasons, for example, where a family has moved to Birmingham or if a parent/carers wishes to move their child from one school to another at a time outside the normal admissions round.
- 4.2 The local authority, schools and academies will work together to coordinate in-year applications.
- 4.3 The local authority will provide a Local Authority Preference Form for parents to complete when applying for a school place and will provide details of schools with places available.
- 4.4 In the first instance, parents will be requested to make applications directly to the school(s) concerned. Parents/carers can apply for a place for their child at any time and to any school.
- 4.5 The law relevant to admissions states schools and academies must, on receipt of an in-year application, notify the local authority of both the application and its outcome, this will also allow the local authority to keep up to date with figures on the availability of school places in Birmingham.

- 4.6 Parent/carers who live in Birmingham who have not been offered their preferred school will be advised of their right of appeal.
- 4.7 Children who are not offered a place at any of their preferred schools, following consultation with another admission authority if appropriate, will be offered a place at a Birmingham Local Authority maintained school, academy or free school near to the child's home address, that has a vacancy.
- 4.8 The Local Authority will be informed by schools and academies of any child who has not taken up a school place so that appropriate action can be taken.
- 4.9 Children who live in Birmingham whose parents have refused the school place offered may be issued with a formal notice advising of their legal requirement to ensure that their child is in receipt of a suitable education whether in school or otherwise.
- 4.10 Where a child is not receiving suitable education, further action may be taken against a parent under Birmingham Local Authority's School Attendance process.

5. The application process for primary and secondary normal admission rounds

5.1 All rounds

- 5.1.1 Applications made on behalf of children with Statements of Special Educational Needs or an Education Health and Care Plan will be considered by the Special Educational Needs Assessment and Review Service (SENAR), in accordance with parental preference and each child's individual needs, taking account of Birmingham City Council's inclusion policy and any consultation required with school governing bodies.
- 5.1.2 Birmingham Local Authority's School Admissions Service will obtain names of all children who are looked after and will verify details for those applicants who indicate that their child was previously looked after but ceased to be so because they were adopted (or became subject to a residence or special guardianship order) within the appropriate age range, from the Looked After Children Education Service (LACES). Places for these children will be considered in accordance with each school's admission criteria.

5.2 Starting Reception Class

- 5.2.1 If a child attends a nursery class, this does not mean that he or she will automatically get a place in the primary or infant school to which the nursery is linked or attached. Parents with children in a nursery class

must apply for a Reception Class place at the school in the same way as other parents.

- 5.2.2 By law, parents must ensure that their children are receiving suitable full-time education at the beginning of the term after their 5th birthday. However, in Birmingham, children are admitted to Reception Class in the September at the start of the academic year in which they reach five years of age.
- 5.2.3 Parents may, however, defer their child's admission to primary or infant school until later in the school year, but not beyond the beginning of the first academic term after the child's fifth birthday (the time when the child reaches compulsory school age). Alternatively, a parent may make a request for their child to be admitted on a part-time basis during the Reception Class year but not beyond the point that they reach compulsory school age.
- 5.2.4 A child who reaches the age of five during the 2018 / 2019 summer term would reach compulsory school age in September 2019. However, it is not possible to accept a place in the Reception Class for 2018 / 2019 but defer the child's admission until the beginning of the 2019 / 2020 academic year, and if a child did not take up their place in a Reception Class in 2018/19 a separate application would need to be made for the child to enter the school in Year 1.
- 5.2.5 Parents of children who reach the age of five during the summer term of the 2018 / 2019 academic year who are considering deferring their child's admission to primary or infant school until the beginning of the 2019 / 2020 academic year should note that, as the overwhelming majority of children in Birmingham start school at the start of the academic year in which they reach the age of five, it is likely that some or all of the parents' preferred schools will not have vacancies in their child's year group if they apply for a place in Year 1 (these places having been allocated to children who started school the previous year).
- 5.2.6 On very rare occasions, for example due to a child's ill health, premature birth or children born in the summer, parents/carers may believe it to be in their child's best interests to be admitted to Reception Class rather than Year 1, outside their child's normal age group. These requests will be considered by the admission authority of the school(s) and a decision made on the basis of the circumstances of each case and also in the best interests of the child concerned. Parents do not have the right to insist that their child is admitted to a particular age group.
- 5.2.7 Where a parent wishes to request admission out of the normal age group for their child, they should still make an application for their child's normal age group at the usual time. At the same time, the parent should submit their request for their child to be admitted out of their normal age group to the relevant admission authority, together with supporting evidence.

- 5.2.8 The admission authority will then consider the request, taking into account the views of the head teacher at the relevant school. The admission authority must ensure that the parent receives the response to their request before primary national offer day.
- 5.2.9 If the request is agreed, the application for the normal age group may be withdrawn and the parent must make a new application for a place in Reception Class as part of the main admissions round the following year. If the request is refused, the parent must decide whether to accept the offer of a place for the normal age group, or to refuse it and make an in year application for admission to Year 1 for the September following the child's fifth birthday.
- 5.2.10 One admission authority cannot be required to honour a decision made by another admission authority on admission out of the normal age group. Parents, therefore, should consider whether to request admission out of the normal year group at all their preference schools, rather than just their first preference schools.
- 5.2.11 In October 2017, the local authority will contact parents/carers of children who are on roll at a community or private nursery advising them of how to apply for a Reception Class place online and of where to obtain information regarding primary schools. Copies of information advertising the process will be displayed at all Birmingham primary schools, libraries, private and community nurseries.
- 5.2.12 Parents should apply on-line with applications should be completed by 4 December 2017, however Local Authority Preference Forms will also be available from schools and the School Admissions and Pupil Placements Service for parents who do not have access to the internet. Proof of address will be required to be provided to the School Admissions Service. The School Admissions Service will accept applications until 15 January 2018. Applications received after this date will be treated in accordance with the procedure for late applications.
- 5.2.13 Parents will be allowed to express up to three preferences for their child to be admitted to any maintained primary or infant school or academy or free school inside or outside the Birmingham Local Authority area.
- 5.2.14 Applications made online will receive an immediate email confirmation when the application is submitted. Applications made on a paper form and those online applicants who have not provided an email address will receive an acknowledgment letter through the post
- 5.2.15 Data will be exchanged with other admission authorities and other local authorities as detailed in Section 7.
- 5.2.16 The School Admissions Service will send sibling reports to schools and academies for verification.

- 5.2.17 The School Admissions Service will compare ranked parental preferences for each school. All ranked preferences will be given equal consideration against schools' admission criteria. If the child ranks sufficiently highly within the admission criteria for two or more schools and could therefore potentially be offered a place at either school, the school the parent ranked highest will be offered.
- 5.2.18 Children who live in Birmingham that have not been offered one of their parents' three preferences, following consultation with another admission authority if appropriate, will be offered a place at one of their closest Birmingham Local Authority maintained primary or infant schools or academies or free schools with a vacancy.
- 5.2.19 Primary / infant schools will verify the child's date of birth at either the time of acceptance of the offer or at the school's induction day. Offers will be conditional on providing valid proof of date of birth.
- 5.3 Transfer from Infant School to Junior School (Year 2 to Year 3)
- 5.3.1 If a child attends an infant school, it is necessary for the child to transfer to a different school for his/her junior education.
- 5.3.2 In October 2017, parents/carers with a child in Year 2 at an infant school will be contacted advising them how to apply online for a Year 3 place at a junior school or any other primary. Local Authority Preference Forms will also be available from schools and the School Admissions and Pupil Placements Service for parents who do not have access to the internet. The same timetable and process as Reception Class admissions above will be used.
- 5.3.3 Applications made online will receive an immediate email confirmation when the application is submitted. Applications made on a paper form and those online applicants who have not provided an email address will receive an acknowledgment letter through the post.
- 5.3.4 If a child attends a primary school (rather than an infant school) it is not necessary to apply for him / her to transfer at the end of Year 2.
- 5.4 Transfer from Year 6 to Secondary School
- 5.4.1 At the end of the Summer Term 2017, Birmingham Local Authority will invite parents of children who will transfer to secondary education in September 2018 to complete an online application form. The online system will be available from September 2017.
- 5.4.2 All parents will be required to make an application to the Local Authority in which they live. By the second week in July 2017, all maintained primary and junior schools, academies and free schools and, where possible, the majority of independent primary schools in Birmingham, will be forwarded a letter for each Year 5 child living in Birmingham, inviting their parents/carers to make their application for a secondary school place online, however Local Authority Preference

Forms will also be available from schools and the School Admissions and Pupil Placements Service for parents who do not have access to the internet. Information regarding schools and the application process will also be made available for each school and will also be available to view on the Birmingham City Council's website.

- 5.4.3 Parents of children who live in Birmingham but whose children attend a primary school outside Birmingham will be advised to make their application online to the School Admissions Service by 31 October 2017.
- 5.4.4 Applications will be accepted up until 31 October 2017, which will be the absolute deadline for the submission of applications. Applications received after this date will be treated in accordance with the procedures for late applications as detailed in Section 8.
- 5.4.5 Applications to sit any selective or assessment tests are to be made separately, to be returned by dates specified by the admission authority for the school concerned (i.e., the governing body of a foundation or voluntary aided school or Academy Trust for academies and free schools). No other separate application will be required by admission authorities in Birmingham; however, some voluntary schools (particularly those with a religious character) require supplementary information, which needs to be completed to determine which category a child should be placed in. These schools will be listed in the information for parents 'Secondary Education – Opportunities for your child in Birmingham' available in schools and other public buildings and on the School Admissions website.
- 5.4.6 Parents may express up to six preferences for their child to be admitted to any maintained school, Academy or Free School inside or outside Birmingham Local Authority.
- 5.4.7 Applications made online will receive an immediate email confirmation when the application is submitted. Applications made on a paper form and those online applicants who have not provided an email address will receive an acknowledgment letter through the post.
- 5.4.8 Data will be exchanged with other admission authorities and other local authorities as detailed in Section 7.
- 5.4.9 The School Admissions Service will compare ranked parental preferences for each school. All ranked preferences will be given equal consideration against schools' admission criteria. If the child meets the admission criteria for two or more schools and could therefore potentially be offered a place at either school, the school the parent ranked highest will be offered.
- 5.4.10 Children who live in Birmingham who have not been offered one of their parents' six preferences, following consultation with another admission authority if appropriate, will be offered a place at one of their

closest Birmingham Local Authority maintained secondary schools or academies or free schools with a vacancy.

5.5 Year 10 (in the case of 14-19 academies)

- 5.5.1 At the start of the Autumn Term 2017, parents who wish to make an application for their child to transfer to Year 10 at a 14 -19 Academy in September 2018 will be able to make their application online, however Local Authority Preference Forms will also be available from schools and the School Admissions and Pupil Placements Service for parents who do not have access to the internet.
- 5.5.2 Applications to sit any selective or aptitude tests are to be made separately, to be returned by dates specified by the Academy concerned.
- 5.5.3 Parents may express up to three preferences for their child to be admitted to any 14 - 19 Academy inside or outside of the Birmingham Local Authority area.
- 5.5.4 Applications made online will receive an immediate email confirmation when the application is submitted. Applications made on a paper form and those online applicants who have not provided an email address will receive an acknowledgment letter through the post.
- 5.5.5 Data will be exchanged with other admission authorities and other local authorities as detailed in Section 7.
- 5.5.6 The School Admissions Service will compare ranked parental preferences for each Academy. All ranked preferences will be given equal consideration against Academies' admission criteria. If the child meets the admission criteria for two or more 14 - 19 Academies and could therefore potentially be offered a place at either Academy, the Academy the parent ranked highest will be offered.
- 5.5.7 Children who live in Birmingham who have not been offered one of their parents' three preferences will continue to have a place at their current school and they will be added to the Academies' waiting lists and their parents/carers informed of their right of appeal.

6. Determining the offer of school places

- 6.1 In determining applications for school places admission authorities must usually comply with parental preference.

In accordance with Section 86 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, with the exception of designated grammar schools, all maintained schools and Academies that have enough places available must offer a place to every child that has applied for one, without condition or the use of any criteria.

6.2 Children with challenging behaviour and those who have been excluded twice

Admission authorities must not refuse to admit children in the normal admissions round on the basis of their poor behaviour elsewhere. Where a child has been permanently excluded from two or more schools there is no need for an admission authority to comply with parental preference for a period of two years from the last exclusion. The twice excluded rule does not apply to children who were below compulsory school age at the time of the exclusion, children who have been re-instated following a permanent exclusion (or would have been had it been practicable to do so), and children with special educational needs statements/EHC plans.

Timetable for primary and secondary normal admissions rounds for 2018/2019				
	Reception	Junior (Yr 2- 3)	Secondary (Yr 6 –7)	Year 10 (14-19 academies)
Birth range	01/09/13-31/08/14	01/09/10-31/08/11	01/09/06-31/08/07	01/09/03-31/08/04
Final closing date for receipt of applications	15 January 2018	15 January 2018	31 October 2017	31 January 2018
Data exchange with other Local Authorities	30 January 2018	30 January 2018	14 November 2017	7 February 2018
Unranked preferences forwarded to Birmingham Admission Authorities	6 February 2018	6 February 2018	23 November 2017	14 February 2018
Sibling reports sent to schools and academies	6 February 2018	6 February 2018	23 November 2017	14 February 2018
Ranked preferences from Birmingham Admission Authorities and sibling reports from community schools/academies to be returned to Birmingham LA	27 February 2018	27 February 2018	14 December 2017	28 February 2018
Offer exchange with other Local Authorities	6 March 2018 20 March 2018 27 March 2018	6 March 2018 20 March 2018 27 March 2018	8 January 2018 22 January 2018 31 January 2018 7 February 2018	20 March 2018
Offer day – letters posted	16 April 2018	16 April 2018	1 March 2018	6 April 2018
Acceptance of any offer should be made by this date	30 April 2018	30 April 2018	16 March 2018	20 April 2018

Any appeal should be received by this date. (20 school days following notification that application was unsuccessful)	15 May 2018	15 May 2018	29 March 2018	14 May 2018
Appeals received on-time should be considered by this date (40 school days)	17 July 2018	17 July 2018	18 June 2018	16 July 2018

8. Late applications

In exceptional circumstances, Birmingham Local Authority may consider applications received after the final closing date, but before the exchange of data with other admission authorities, at the same time as those which were received by the final closing date. The Local Authority will use its discretion when considering the individual circumstances. For example where;

- There were exceptional reasons which prevented the parent/carer from applying by the closing date.
- A child and the person with parental responsibility have moved home.
- Where the local authority has contacted that parent/carer regarding the information contained within their application, for example, an incomplete application or potentially misleading information requiring further investigation.

All late applications received after the exchange of data with admission authorities, but before the offer of places, will only be considered after those applications which were received on time have been considered. Such applicants may therefore be less likely to be offered a place at one of their preferred schools.

All late applications received after the offer of places will be considered by Birmingham Local Authority.

In the event that a late application is made for a place at an undersubscribed school, a place will be offered.

Applications made on or after the start of the Autumn Term 2018 will need to be submitted to their preferred school on an 'Application for a Change of School' form and will be treated as an in-year application.

9. Foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools

For each voluntary aided and foundation school (including Trust schools), the Governing Body is the admission authority and decides its own published oversubscription admission criteria.

10. Academies and Free Schools

Admission arrangements for academies and free schools are approved by the Secretary of State for the Department for Education as part of an Academy's Funding Agreement, which requires compliance with admissions legislation and relevant Codes.

11. Selective schools

The selection of children for admission to grammar schools in Birmingham is by reference to ability and for this purpose there are tests held in the Autumn Term of the 2017/18 academic year for admission to these selective secondary schools in September 2018.

Arrangements relating to selective testing for admission to Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls, Bishop Vesey's Grammar School and Handsworth Grammar School are made jointly with The Schools of King Edward the Sixth in Birmingham. This will be known as "The Grammar Schools in Birmingham"

The Grammar Schools in Birmingham consists of the following schools:

Bishop Vesey's Grammar School
Handsworth Grammar School
King Edward VI Aston School
King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys
King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Girls
King Edward VI Five Ways School
King Edward VI Handsworth School
Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls

Parents will be required to complete a test registration to sit the selective test for a school that forms part of The Grammar Schools in Birmingham.

Pupils will only be required to sit one test to be considered for a place at a school that forms part of The Grammar Schools in Birmingham. Parents must also name any school(s) in The Grammar Schools in Birmingham on their Local Authority Preference Form to be considered for a place there.

Details and application dates will usually be publicised widely within the city from March each year with a closing date for applications to sit the test in July. The test will be at the beginning of September.

Admission authorities for grammar schools must inform parents of the outcome of selection tests prior to the final closing date for applications each year, so that parents can make an informed decision as to whether they should name a selective school as one of their preferences.

12. Fair Access Protocol

The operation of the Fair Access Protocol is outside the arrangements of co-ordination and is triggered when a parent of an eligible child has not secured a school place under the in-year admission arrangements.

Fair Access Protocols exist to ensure that unplaced children outside the normal admissions round, especially the most vulnerable, are offered a suitable school as quickly as possible and to ensure that all schools in an area admit their fair share of children with challenging behaviour.

In the event of a governing body refusing to admit a pupil with challenging behaviour outside the normal admissions round, even though places are available, a referral will be made to the Local Authority for action under the Fair Access Protocol.

This provision will not apply to a looked after child, a previously looked after child or a child with a statement of special educational needs/EHC plan naming the school in question, as these children must be admitted.

All admission authorities must participate in the Fair Access Protocol in order to ensure that unplaced children are allocated a school place quickly. There is no duty for local authorities or admission authorities to comply with parental preference when allocating places through the Fair Access Protocol.

13. Relevant area

In accordance with The Education (Relevant Areas for Consultation on Admission Arrangements) Regulations 1999, Birmingham Local Authority has determined its relevant area as that contained within the administrative area of the City of Birmingham. It is proposed that this arrangement will continue for 2018/2019.

PROPOSED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FOR SEPTEMBER 2018 / 2019

1. Birmingham Local Authority (community and voluntary controlled schools) over-subscription criteria

- 1.1. Any child with a Statement of Special Educational Needs or Education, Health and Care Plan is required to be admitted to the school that is named in the statement or plan. This gives such children overall priority for admission to the named school. This is not an oversubscription criterion.

The local authority is the admission authority for community and voluntary controlled schools. Children are admitted to schools in accordance with parental preference as far as possible. However, where there are more applications than there are places available, places at community and voluntary controlled schools will be offered based on the following order of priority:

- 1.2. Looked after children or children who were previously looked after children
- 1.3. Children (siblings) with a brother or sister already at the school who will still be in attendance at the time the child enters the school.
- 1.4. In the case of Voluntary Controlled Church of England primary schools: children whose parents have made applications on denominational grounds. This will be confirmed by a letter from the Vicar / Minister of the relevant Church. Details of schools that use denominational criteria can be viewed at section 6.
- 1.5. Children who live nearest the school.

Within each of the categories above, priority is given to those who live nearest to the school.

Admission to a nursery school or nursery class does not give the child priority or an extra right to transfer to the Reception year of the primary or infant school to which the nursery is linked or attached.

2. Chilcote Primary, Hall Green Infant and Hall Green Junior schools

Chilcote Primary, Hall Green Infant and Hall Green Junior schools each have catchment areas. At these schools, the order of priority for admission is as follows:

- 2.1. Looked after or previously looked after children.
- 2.2. Children living within the catchment area of the school who will have a sibling in attendance at the school at the time of admission.
- 2.3. Children living within the catchment area of the school who live nearest the school.
- 2.4. Children living outside the catchment area of the school who will have a sibling in attendance at the school at the time of admission.
- 2.5. Children living outside the catchment area who live nearest the school.

Within each of the categories above, priority is given to those who live nearest to the school.

3. Over-subscription criteria for Year 2 to Year 3 Transfers

- 3.1. Looked after or previously looked after children.
- 3.2. Linked Schools: Children who will be attending the linked Infant School at the time of application and will still be in attendance at the end of Year 2. (A list of linked infant and junior schools is available in the parents information booklet 'Primary Education – Opportunities for your child in Birmingham' and on the School Admissions website).
- 3.3. Children with a sibling already at the Infant / Junior School and who will still be in attendance at the time the sibling enters the school.
- 3.4. Children who live nearest the school.

Within each of the categories above, priority is given to those who live nearest to the school.

4. Over-subscription criteria for Year 2 to Year 3 Transfer - Hall Green Junior

- 4.1. Looked after or previously looked after children.
- 4.2. Children attending Hall Green Infant School
- 4.3. Children who will be attending the School at the time of the application and will still be in attendance at the end of Year 2.
- 4.4. Children living within the catchment area of the school who will have a sibling in attendance at the school at the time of admission.

- 4.5. Children living within the catchment area of the school who live nearest the school.
- 4.6. Children living outside the catchment area of the school who will have a sibling in attendance at the school at the time of admission.
- 4.7. Children living outside the catchment area who live nearest the school.

Within each of the categories above, priority is given to those who live nearest to the school.

5. Year 12 entry requirements for Community Schools

Each school which admits pupils into Year 12 is required to publish in the school prospectus the minimum academic entry criteria for entry in the sixth form. This is the same for both external and internal places. Details of the academic requirements for each course can be obtained by contacting the school.

Children and their parents applying for sixth form places may use the Local Authority Preference Form although if they are already on the roll they are not required to do so in order to transfer into year 12. Internal applicants who meet the minimum academic entrance requirements will be offered a place automatically.

The following oversubscription criteria will be used for external applicants who meet the minimum academic entry criteria when there are more applications than places available:

1. Looked after or previously looked after child (in public care).
2. Proximity of the child's home to school with those living nearer accorded the higher priority.

Applicants refused a place in Year 12 are entitled to appeal to an independent appeal panel.

Year 12 places are not coordinated by the Local Authority and applications should be made directly to the school(s) concerned.

The secondary community schools listed below will admit the following number of children externally into Year 12.

Bordesley Green Girls' School - 10
Holte Visual and Performing Arts College - 20
John Willmott School - 20
Swanshurst School – 20

6. Voluntary controlled Church of England denominational criteria

Christ Church CE Primary School

Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends the local Church of England Parish Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.

No supplementary information form is used at Christ Church CE Primary School.

Quinton Church Primary School

Children whose parents have made a claim on denominational grounds in that they desire a Church of England school education and for whom this is the nearest Church of England school from home.

Applicants are required to send a letter of support from their vicar/minister/elder/preacher as evidence of regularly attending worship at their church.

Applications under this heading will be placed in this order of priority:

- a) Children who worship regularly* at Christ Church, The Quinton or whose parent or carer does.
- b) Children who worship regularly at another Church of England church, or whose parent or carer does.
- b) Children who worship regularly at another Christian church (that is, a church which is affiliated to either the Evangelical Alliance or Churches Together in Britain), or whose parent or carer does.

* For the purposes of this application, 'regularly' is taken to be at least twice a month for a minimum of one year.

A supplementary Information Form is used at Quinton Church Primary School – please see below.

St James CE Primary School

Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends St James Church, Handsworth. Regular is defined as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by Fr. David Isiorho, our parish priest.

A supplementary Information Form is used at St James CE Primary School – please see below.

St Mary CE Primary School (B29)

Children who regularly worship at St Mary's Church, Selly Oak. We define regular as meaning at least twice a month for at least two consecutive years and this will be confirmed by a letter from the minister on headed note paper.

NB: Only 10% of places within each cohort are eligible for faith claims and these shall be ranked according to distance from the school.

A supplementary Information Form is used at St Mary's CE Primary School (B29) – please see below.

St Matthew's CE Primary School

- a) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends the local Church of England Parish Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.
- b) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends any other Church of England Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.
- c) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends any other Christian denomination (defined as a Church who are members of Churches together in England or the Evangelical Alliance). We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.

No supplementary information form is used at St Matthew's CE Primary School.

St Peter's CE Primary School (B17)

- a) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends the local Church of England Parish Church which is St. Peters C of E Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister. The child also needs to attend.
- b) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends any other Church of England Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister. Also the child of anyone who studies at Queens Theological College.
- c) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends any other Christian denomination (defined as a Church who are members of Churches together in England or the Evangelical Alliance). We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister. The child also needs to attend.

A faith claim for this school will not be accepted for this school if another Church of England school is closer to the applicants address or they do not have a Birmingham postal code.

A supplementary Information Form is used at St Peter's CE Primary – please see below, this should only be completed if applying on denominational/ faith criterion.

St Saviour's CE Primary School

- a) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends the local Church of England Parish Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.

- b) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends any other Church of England Church. We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.
- c) Anybody whose parent/guardian regularly attends any other Christian denomination (defined as a Church who are members of Churches together in England or the Evangelical Alliance). We define regular as meaning once a month for a twelve month period and this will be confirmed by a letter from the local minister.

No supplementary information form is used at St Saviour's CE Primary School.

7. Waiting lists

Parents whose children have not been offered a place at one or more of their preferred schools will be informed of their right of appeal and will be added to their preferred schools' waiting lists. Parents will be advised that inclusion on a school's waiting list does not mean a place will eventually become available there.

Waiting lists will not be fixed following the offer of places; they are subject to change. Any new applicants to whom it is not possible to offer a place will be added to each school's waiting list in accordance with the relevant oversubscription criteria. This means that a child's waiting list position during the year could go up or down.

There will be a period of two weeks after the published offer date whereby any available places will not be reallocated. If places become available after this date they will be offered according to the schools oversubscription criteria.

School Admissions Service, on behalf of the Local Authority, will maintain waiting lists for community and voluntary controlled schools for the first term of the academic year.

At the start of the Spring Term each year, School Admissions will pass community and voluntary controlled school waiting lists to the schools themselves. Schools may wish to write to parents/carers to establish if they wish for their child to remain on a waiting list. Waiting lists do not close.

Waiting lists for voluntary aided and foundation schools, Academies and free schools in Birmingham will be maintained by the schools and Academies on behalf of their Governing Bodies. The Local Authority may require sight of the waiting lists at these schools, in order to determine that the co-ordinated scheme is operating effectively.

8. Appeals

Where parents are not satisfied with the school offered, arrangements exist for appeals to be heard by an Appeals Panel, which is independent of the admission authority for the school.

Parents can only appeal for schools for which they have expressed a preference.

In the case of infant class size appeals, because infant classes have a legal limit of 30, Appeals Panels are limited in the matters they can take into account when considering Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 appeals in which the admission of more pupils would cause this limit to be exceeded. In this type of appeal, an Appeal Panel can only uphold an appeal if it is satisfied that:

- the admission of additional children would not breach the infant class size limit; or
- the child would have been offered a place if the arrangements had been correctly and impartially applied; or
- the child would have been offered a place if the arrangements had not been contrary to the School Admissions Code and legislation; or
- the decision to refuse admission was not one which a reasonable admission authority would have made in the circumstances of the case.

Appeals in respect of community, voluntary controlled schools and those academies who have delegated responsibility for the administration of appeals to Birmingham Local Authority, should be sent to Birmingham's School Admissions Service. Appeals in respect of voluntary aided and foundation schools, the King Edward VI schools, Ninestiles, Holyhead School should be sent to the Governing Body of the school(s) concerned. A comprehensive list of which schools administer their own appeals is available in the parents' information and the School Admissions website.

9. Definitions

Looked After and previously looked after children

Children who are looked after or immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, residence or special guardianship order. This includes any child / young person who is subject to a Full Care Order, an interim Care Order, accommodated under Section 22(1) of the Children Act 1989, is remanded or detained into Local Authority accommodation under Criminal Law or who has been placed for adoption. Birmingham Local Authority's School Admissions and Pupil Placements Service will obtain names of all children who are looked after or will verify details for those applicants who indicate that their child was previously looked after, within the appropriate age range, from the Looked After Children Education Service (LACES). Places for these children will be considered in accordance with each school's admission criteria.

Siblings

Siblings (brothers or sisters) are considered to be those children who live at the same address and either:

- i. have one or both natural parents in common;

- or ii. are related by a parent's marriage;
- or iii. are adopted or fostered by a common parent.

Unrelated children living at the same address, whose parents are living as partners, are also considered to be siblings.

Children not adopted or fostered or related by a parents' marriage or with one natural parent in common, who are brought together as a family by a same sex civil partnership and who are living at the same address, are also considered to be siblings.

Children who attend either a linked infant or junior school and will still be in attendance at the time of admission are considered as sibling claims.

Separate boys' and girls' schools are not considered to be linked for the purposes of sibling claims.

Distance measurements to schools

Distances are calculated on the basis of a straight-line measurement between the applicant's home address and a point decided by the school (usually the front gates). The Local Authority uses a computerised system, which measures all distances in metres. Ordnance Survey supplies the co-ordinates that are used to plot an applicant's home address and the address of the school.

Tie-Breaker

In a very small number of cases where a school is oversubscribed, it may not be possible to decide between the applications of those pupils who are the final qualifiers for a place, when applying the published admission criteria.

For example, this may occur when children in the same year group live at the same address, or if the distance between the home and school is exactly the same, for example, blocks of flats. If there is no other way of separating the application according to the admissions criteria and to admit both or all of the children would cause the Published Admission Number for the child's year group to be exceeded, the Local Authority will use a computerised system to randomly select the child to be offered the final place.

Home Address

A pupil's home address is considered to be a residential property that is the child's only or main residence and is either;


- Owned by the child's parent(s), or the person with parental responsibility for the child;
- Leased to or rented by the child's parent(s), or the person with parental responsibility under lease or written rental agreement of not less than twelve months duration.

Evidence of ownership or rental agreement may be required, plus proof of permanent residence at the property concerned.

Parents who are unable to provide proof of permanent residence should contact a member of the School Admissions Service to discuss providing other acceptable proof of address.

Where parents have shared responsibility for a child, and the child lives with both parents for part of the week then the main residence will be determined as the address where the child lives the majority of the week. Parents may be requested to supply documentary evidence to satisfy the authority that the child lives at the address put forward by the parents.

If a school is offered on the basis of an address that is subsequently found to be different from a child's normal and permanent home address, then that place is liable to be withdrawn.



QUINTON CHURCH PRIMARY SCHOOL

Executive Headteacher Mrs Cosgrove

HAGLEY ROAD WEST

QUINTON

BIRMINGHAM

B32 1AJ

tel 0121 675 4422

fax 0121 675 2828

email enquiry@quinton.bham.sch.uk

September 2017 Admissions – Additional Application

PLEASE COMPLETE & RETURN TO SCHOOL

Child's Name: _____ Gender: M/F

Date of Birth: _____

Home Address: _____

Telephone

Number: _____


Please indicate, **by ticking** which of the categories you are claiming, to support your application.

1. evidence to be supplied please
2. please state name of sibling
3. evidence of attendance will be sought directly from Church.
supporting letter to be enclosed with this form.

Signed _____ Parent/Carer

Date _____

Places will be allocated as per the Primary Admissions booklet issued by the Local Authority.



QUINTON CHURCH PRIMARY SCHOOL

Executive Headteacher Mrs Cosgrove

HAGLEY ROAD WEST

QUINTON

BIRMINGHAM

B32 1AJ

tel 0121 675 4422

fax 0121 675 2828

email enquiry@quinton.bham.sch.uk

Admissions Over-subscribed Criteria

We ask all parents to complete the Additional Application

Where there are more applications than there are places available, places at our school will be allocated based on the following order of priority:

1. Looked after children (in public care)
This includes any child who is subject to a Full Care Order, an Interim Care Order, accommodated under Section 20 of the Children Act 1989, is remanded or detained into Local Authority accommodation under Criminal Law or who has been placed for adoption.
2. Children (siblings) with an older brother or sister already at the school who will still be in attendance at the time the sibling is admitted to the school.

Sibling refers to brother or sister, half brother or sister, adopted brother or sister, step brother or sister, or the child of the parent/carer's partner, and in every case, the child should be living in the same family unit at the same address.
3. Children whose parents have made a claim on denominational grounds in that they desire a Church of England school education and for whom this is the nearest Church of England school from home.

Applicants are required to send a letter of support from their vicar/minister/elder/preacher, as evidence of regularly* attending worship at their church.

Applications under this heading will be placed in this order of priority:

- a) Children who worship regularly* at Christ Church, The Quinton, or whose parent/carer does.
- b) Children who worship regularly* at another Church of England church, or whose parent/carer does.
- c) Children who worship regularly* at another Christian church (that is, a church which is affiliated to either the Evangelical Alliance or Churches Together in Britain), or whose parent/carer does.

***For the purposes of this application, 'regularly' is taken to be at least twice a month for a minimum of one year.**

4. Children who live nearest the school.
5. Within each of these categories, priority is given to those who live nearest the school, by straight-line measurement to a fixed point in the school.



St Mary's Church of England Primary School

Denominational Form in support of a preference for a place at St Mary's Primary School.

Christian Application

Section A is to be completed by the parent/carer. **Section B** must be completed by a priest/minister. For multiple applications, a separate form should be completed for each child.

Section A

Pupil Surname

Christian Name(s)

Date of Birth

Parent/carer's name(s)

Address

Post Code

Phone Number

E-mail

Parent/Carer's signature(s)

Section B

1. I confirm that the parent(s) and child has attended St Mary's Church on a regular basis during the previous two years (i.e. at least once a month)

Signature of Minister

Date

Name and address of Minister

Please make sure **both** section A & B are completed. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED FORM TO St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Lodge Hill Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 6NU.

St Peter's C.E. Primary School

Denominational Form in support of a preference for a place at St. Peter's C.E. Primary School

St Peter's Church Application

Section A is to be completed by the parent/carer. Section B must be completed by the priest/minister at St. Peter's Church. For multiple applications, a separate form should be completed for each child.

SECTION A

Pupil Surname _____ Date of Birth _____

Pupil Forename(s) _____

Parent/carer's name(s) _____

Parent/carer's signature (s) _____

Address _____

_____ Post Code _____

Telephone No: _____ Mobile No: _____

SECTION B

I confirm that this child was baptised on _____ (date/month/year)

At _____ Church

In the parish of _____

I confirm that this child has attended Church/other faith institution on a regular basis during the previous 12 months (i.e. at least twice a month).

I confirm that this child and his/her family are actively involved at this Church/Other Faith institution.

Signature of Minister _____ Date _____

Name of Minister _____

This form needs an official Church stamp or sent with an accompanying letter on Church headed paper to St. Peter's C.E. Primary School, Old Church Road, Harborne, Birmingham B17 OBE

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	Acting Strategic Director of Place
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017
SUBJECT:	Housing Rent, Service Charges and other Charges 2017/18
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002984/2017
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Cllr Ian Ward - Deputy Leader of the Council Cllr Peter Griffiths – Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Victoria Quinn – Housing and Homes
Wards affected:	All

1. Purpose of Report:
<p>1.1 The report seeks approval for the council housing rent and service charges and garage rents that will be implemented from 3 April 2017.</p> <p>1.2 The report also seeks approval to revised charges for Temporary Accommodation, to be implemented from the same date.</p> <p>1.3 The proposals are subject to the approval of the Budget for 2017/18 by Council on 28 February 2017 and are consistent with the HRA Business Plan 2017+ and the proposed HRA Budget for 2017/18.</p>

2. Decision(s) Recommended:
<p>Cabinet is requested to:</p> <p>2.1 Approve the changes to rents, service charges and garage rents to be implemented from 3 April 2017 (as set out in paragraphs 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.12 and 5.14).</p> <p>2.2 Approve the changes to charges for temporary accommodation to be implemented from 3 April 2017 (as set out in paragraphs 5.16 to 5.18)</p>

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Robert James Service Director – Housing 0121 464 7699 Robert.james@birmingham.gov.uk
Telephone No: E-mail address:	Guy Olivant Head of City Finance - Housing Place Directorate 0121 303 4752 Guy.olivant@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation
<p>3.1 <u>Internal:</u> The Director of Finance has been fully consulted and is supportive of the recommendations. Officers from City Finance and Legal Services have been involved in the drafting of this report.</p> <p>3.2 <u>External:</u> City Housing Liaison Board considered the rent proposals contained within this report at their meeting on 19 January 2017.</p>
4. Compliance Issues:
<p>4.1 <u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u> This decision is consistent with the housing priorities set out in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2017+ and the HRA Business Plan 2017+.</p> <p>4.2 <u>Financial Implications</u> The revised charges will be implemented through existing approved resources for staffing and IT.</p> <p>The net reduction in income as a result of the proposed revised charges amounts to £2.4million and is included in the proposed HRA Budget for 2016/17.</p> <p>4.3 <u>Legal Implications</u> The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 sets out the obligations for annual reviews of rent and service charges and to ensure that there is a balanced budget for the ringfenced HRA. This is supplemented by the national rent restructuring policy and the HRA Self-Financing Determination.</p> <p>4.4 <u>Public Sector Equality Duty</u> A copy of the initial screening is attached at Appendix 1 of this report. There are no specific issues identified, as the changes will be implemented for all tenants of the Council and all service users. It is estimated that 75% of council tenants will be insulated from the full impact of the revised charges from 3 April 2017 as they are eligible for support towards their housing costs through housing benefit or universal credit. Those tenants who require assistance will continue to be offered additional financial planning advice through the Central Housing Rents Team and Debt Advice Services in order to reassess and maximise benefit entitlement, and to help tenants to budget effectively.</p>

5. Relevant Background/Chronology of Key Events:

National Rent and Service Charge Policy – Council Housing

- 5.1 A summary of the national rent setting framework that applied prior to April 2016 is set out in Appendix 2.
- 5.2 On 8 July 2015 the Chancellor of the Exchequer set out a substantial revision to the National Rent Policy to be implemented from April 2016, with these changes subsequently confirmed as a part of the Autumn Statement in November 2015. This new Policy included two substantial changes, as set out below.
- 5.3 Firstly, rents are required to reduce by 1% per annum for four years commencing from April 2016, replacing the previous regime of annual increases of CPI + 1%. Over the four years to 2019/20 and after the impact of lettings to new tenants at formula rents, this will result in average tenants' rents being approximately 13% lower than would have been the case under the previous policy. The resources available to each local authority's HRA will be reduced on an ongoing basis as a result of this change, with the cost to Birmingham estimated to increase to £42m per annum by 2019/20.
- 5.4 Secondly, local authorities and housing associations were to be required to charge market rents to tenants where household income exceeds £31,000. Following substantial feedback from the social housing sector, it was announced in November 2016 that this element of the revised policy would not be implemented, and the discretion to charge higher rents as set out in the previous policy would be retained.
- 5.5 There are no changes to the existing national guidelines in respect of service charges to tenants. The principle continues to be the recovery of the cost of services provided, including an appropriate proportion of overhead costs. This policy will continue to be applied by the Council.

Birmingham City Council Rent and Service Charge Proposals for 2017/18

- 5.6 It is proposed that social rents for existing tenants are reduced by 1% in line with the new policy, with effect from 3 April 2017. The average weekly rent to be implemented as a result of this revision will be £87.94 (representing the weekly rent payable over a 48 week cycle, with 4 weeks rent payment holidays, 2 weeks in each of December 2017 and March 2018). This weekly rent over 48 weeks is equivalent to an annualised average rent over 52 weeks of £81.19. It is further proposed that social rents for new tenants are set at formula rents as set out in the Government publication "Guidance on Rents for Social Housing" as published in May 2014. Appendix 3 sets out proposed typical rent levels on a 52 week basis for the main property types and sizes.
- 5.7 It is proposed that rents charged for properties let at affordable rents continue to be calculated by reference to formula rents as set out above, with an uplift on a 52 week basis of £2.67 per week (representing a reduction of 1% from 2016/17), with the overall rent charged representing approximately 70% of market rents in Birmingham.

- 5.8 The table below shows the key elements of expenditure funded from the weekly rent, including a comparison between the budget for 2016/17 and the proposed budget for 2017/18.

	2016/17 £pw	2017/18 £pw	Change £pw	%
Repairs	19.31	18.86	(0.45)	-2.3%
Local Housing Costs	18.80	20.20	1.40	+7.4%
Voids & Arrears	2.29	2.08	(0.21)	-9.2%
Debt Financing Costs	15.76	15.62	(0.14)	-0.9%
Debt Repayment	0.34	7.37	7.03	
Contributions for Capital Investment	22.83	16.04	(6.79)	-29.7%
Other	2.45	1.02	(1.43)	-58.4%
Average Weekly Rent (52 wk basis)	81.78	81.19	(0.59)	-0.7%

It should be noted that the budget comparison shows an overall reduction of less than 1% in average rents. This is as a result of the average rent change comprising two elements as set out in paragraph 5.13:

- Rents for existing tenants are proposed to be reduced by 1% (as set out in paragraph 5.10)
- Rents for new tenants (including for BMHT properties) are proposed to be set at formula rents (as described in paragraph 5.7). These rents continue to be higher than those charged for existing tenants due to the removal of rent convergence increases since April 2015.

- 5.9 It is proposed that service charges are increased to reflect changes in costs of service delivery as a result of pay and price inflation. The service charges are separately calculated for each District for Caretaking and Cleaning charges, with other charges calculated on a Citywide basis and in all cases will be levied over a 48 week cycle alongside the weekly rent, with the major average charges on a 52 week basis as follows:

Service Charge	April 2016 Average Charge	April 2017 Average Charge	Change from 2016/17
Door Entry / Night-time Security	£9.05	£9.14	+1%
Traditional Concierge / Night-time Security (Bloomsbury EMB only)	£19.43	£19.62	+1%
Cleaning	£2.58	£2.64	+2.5%
Multi-Storey Communal Areas	£6.35	£6.41	+1%
Caretaking	£8.89	£8.98	+1%
Careline	£1.87	£1.89	+1%

- 5.10 The charges for Cleaning are proposed to increase by 2.5% to reflect increases in the cost of delivery of this Service. This service is delivered through external contracts, with an expected increase in contract costs of 2.5%, reflecting general inflationary pressures and the impact of increases in the Living Wage. Other services are substantially delivered through internal resources, allowing charges to be limited to a 1% increase as set out above.

- 5.11 The charges for the Careline service have historically been complex, with various service users being charged different amounts, despite there being no variation in the service provided. Following the transfer of the Telecare service (previously provided by Tunstall) to Careline, the opportunity has been taken to rationalise the charging structure, with all tenants to be charged the same amount from April 2017, as set out above.
- 5.12 The sheltered housing service is undergoing a substantial service redesign (considered by Cabinet in January 2017), resulting in a change to the charging structure for this service. For 2016/17, weekly charges to tenants were levied at two separate levels (on a 52 week basis):
- sheltered housing – high rise - £4.59 per week
 - sheltered housing – low rise - £6.71 per week
- Under the revised service, these charges will be replaced for 2017/18, as follows:
- CAT 1 / High Rise - £6.90 per week
 - CAT 2 / Extra Care - £9.35 per week
- 5.13 The rent and service charge increase proposals will ensure that the debt allocation to Birmingham City Council through the implementation of Self-Financing from 1 April 2012 remains affordable, whilst ensuring that services to tenants can be maintained at an appropriate level.
- 5.14 It is proposed to increase garage rents from 3 April 2017 to £7.04 per week (currently £6.45 per week) over a 52 week cycle, equivalent to an increase of 9.1%. This represents the sixth year of a 10-year programme to improve the Council's garage provision, including a rationalisation of holdings, improvements to retained garages and a realignment of garage rents to become closer to market levels and garage rents levied by other local authorities.

Charges for Temporary Accommodation

- 5.15 Temporary Accommodation provided in discharge of the Council's statutory duty falls into three distinct categories, being accommodation leased from private sector landlords, dispersed properties and hostels. The proposed changes to charges are set out in paragraphs 5.16 to 5.18.
- 5.16 It is proposed to increase hostel accommodation charges by 3% per week from 3 April 2017. 1 room accommodation will now be £216.87, 2 rooms £257.41, 3 rooms £298.11 and 4 rooms will be £338.72, compared to £210.55, £249.91, £289.43 and £328.85 respectively in 2016/17.
- 5.17 The charges for accommodation leased from private sector landlords (inclusive of a contribution for management and administration costs) will continue to be in line with the contractual agreements. These properties are leased to the Council on a call-off basis and allow the council to discharge its statutory obligations for homeless people.

- 5.18 It is proposed to increase dispersed temporary accommodation charges by 3%, inclusive of the management fee element. The proposed charges for rent are detailed below according to property type.

Property type	Property Size	Total Rent For 2017/18	2016/17	Increase %
Flat	1 bedroom	183.61	178.26	3.0%
	2 bedroom	216.60	210.29	3.0%
	3 bedroom	243.92	236.82	3.0%
House	2 bedroom	196.10	190.39	3.0%
	3 bedroom	224.80	218.25	3.0%
	4 bedroom	254.95	247.52	3.0%
Maisonette	2 bedroom	190.06	184.52	3.0%
	3 bedroom	213.96	207.73	3.0%

6. Evaluation of Alternative Option(s):

- 6.1 As a part of the annual Budget setting process, the Council is required to consider the appropriate level of increase to be implemented for rents and service charges to ensure that expenditure plans are affordable.
- 6.2 The proposed rent reduction for 2017/18 is consistent with national rent setting policy. HRA rents will continue to be around 70% of market rents in Birmingham, and also compare favourably with those charged by Registered Providers.
- 6.3 Implementing a higher rent increase than proposed may be unlawful and would be likely to have an adverse impact on the ability of HRA tenants to pay their rent, and have a consequential adverse impact on levels of arrears. Taken together with the impact on tenants' financial wellbeing, this option is not considered appropriate.
- 6.4 Implementing a lower rent increase than proposed would create additional financial pressures on the HRA, and result in a reduction in levels of service provided to tenants. This represents a substantial risk to the effective management of council housing, and is not recommended.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):

- 7.1 The annual changes to the rent and service charges are a key decision and require the approval of Cabinet. The changes are consistent with the approved HRA Business Plan.
- 7.2 The rent and service charge income is a key component of the ring fenced HRA Budget that is scheduled for consideration of the overall Budget for 2017/18. The reduced income that will be generated in the HRA in 2017/18 and future years from the proposed changes, when taken alongside other compensating budget savings proposals, will ensure that the HRA Self-Financing Settlement continues to be affordable.

Signatures**Date**

Cllr Ian Ward
Deputy Leader of the Council

.....

.....

Cllr Peter Griffiths
Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes

.....

.....

Jacqui Kennedy:
Acting Strategic Director for Place

.....

.....

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:

Report to Cabinet Member for Housing (16 January 2012) – HRA Municipal Garage Strategy
CLG Publication – HRA Self-Financing Determination (February 2012)
CLG Publication – A Guide to Social Rent Reforms in the Local Authority Sector (February 2002)
CLG Publication – Guidance on Rents for Social Housing (May 2014)

Council Business Plan and Budget 2017+ (including HRA Business Plan 2017+)

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):

1. Appendix 1A – Public Sector Equality Statement
2. Appendix 1B – Equalities Assessment
3. Appendix 2 – Former National Rent Policy
4. Appendix 3 – Exemplifications of typical rents by property type and size

Equality Act 2010

The Executive must have due regard to the public sector equality duty when considering Council reports for decision.

The public sector equality duty is as follows:

1	<p>The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
2	<p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
3	<p>The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.</p>
4	<p>Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.
5	<p>The relevant protected characteristics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) marriage & civil partnership (b) age (c) disability (d) gender reassignment (e) pregnancy and maternity (f) race (g) religion or belief (h) sex (i) sexual orientation

Former National Rent Policy

Former National Rent Policy – Effective from April 2002

- 1 In 2001, the national government proposed a new policy framework for rents and service charges for social housing providers. Following a period of consultation, the new framework was implemented from April 2002 and this national policy has subsequently effectively determined local authority annual rent and service charge changes.
- 2 The major principle established was that rent levels (formula rents) would be determined with respect to a formula based on affordability (70%) and capital values (30%) with due regard to the size of the property (i.e. number of bedrooms). Service Charges were also required to be calculated by reference to the costs of service delivery.
- 3 The national objective of the new policy was that rent levels for social housing providers (registered social landlords and local authorities) would converge by 2012/13 so that rent levels for similar properties in similar areas would be similar.
- 4 In practice, rent convergence of actual rents charged by different landlords was not achieved nationally by 2012/13 as originally envisaged due to the 5% limit on average rent increases introduced for 2006/07 and 2007/08 and 3.1% limits in both 2009/10 and 2010/11. The HRA Self-Financing Settlement confirmed that convergence was then expected to be substantially achieved by 2015/16.

Revised National Rent Policy – Effective from April 2015

- 5 A revised framework for social rents was confirmed in May 2014, setting out revised guidance to be followed by local authorities for a 10 year period from April 2015, to give certainty within the social rented sector. Whilst not mandatory, there was a firm expectation from central government that the guidance will be followed, and this is necessary to ensure that there are no consequential adverse impacts in relation to housing benefit regulations (if rents are increased above the government guidance then there is a loss of housing benefit reimbursement to the Council equivalent to 77% of the additional rent charged to tenants). This revised framework affected rent setting in three ways, as set out below.
- 6 Firstly, the annual rent increase was changed from RPI + 0.5% to CPI + 1% (for 2015/16 – the first year of operation of this revised framework - the increase was calculated by reference to inflation in September 2014, and both of these calculations would result in an increase of 2.2%). This amendment was consistent with the increasing adoption of CPI as the inflation measure for welfare benefits.
- 7 Secondly, “across the board” rent convergence increases were removed, with rents instead only increased to formula rents when a property is relet. This represented a substantial reduction in future rent levels for the Council, as the previous rent policy required convergence increases in both 2015/16 and 2016/17 to achieve formula rent levels. It is estimated that this resulted in an annual cost to the HRA of up to £10million per annum, and that it would be likely to take in excess of 20 years for all rents to be increased to formula rents on relet.
- 8 Thirdly, the revised policy allowed local authorities the flexibility, but not the obligation, to charge market rents for properties with a household income in excess of £60,000. Whilst this would result in higher rents being charged for those properties affected, this element of the revised guidance in Birmingham was not implemented as it was considered that the costs of administering such a system would outweigh the additional income that might be collected.

Exemplification of Typical Rent by Property Type and Size

Property type	Property Size	Existing Tenants				New Tenants
		2016/17	2017/18	Decrease		Formula Rent 2017/18
		£ per week	£ per week	£ per week	%	£ per week
Flat	1 bedroom	68.42	67.74	0.68	1.0%	69.02
	2 bedroom	73.99	73.25	0.74	1.0%	74.93
	3 bedroom	84.49	83.65	0.84	1.0%	86.65
House	2 bedroom	84.46	83.62	0.84	1.0%	86.10
	3 bedroom	94.21	93.27	0.94	1.0%	97.80
	4 bedroom	102.38	101.36	1.02	1.0%	104.13
Bungalow	1 bedroom	76.05	75.29	0.86	1.0%	77.08
	2 bedroom	86.41	85.55	0.86	1.0%	88.78
Maisonette	2 bedroom	78.88	78.09	0.79	1.0%	80.72
	3 bedroom	85.31	84.46	0.85	1.0%	95.40

Note: the above table sets out the proposed rent charges (excluding service charges) on a 52 week basis, for the main categories of property held within the HRA (representing in excess of 98% of the homes held within the HRA).

Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Housing Rent, Service Charges And Other Charges 2017/18
Directorate	Place
Service Area	Landlord Services
Type	Reviewed Policy
EA Summary	Impact on service users of changes to Housing Rent, Service Charges and other Charges 2017/18 financial year. Including revised Temporary Accommodation Charges.
Reference Number	EA001774
Task Group Manager	mark.simpson@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Date Approved	2017-01-17 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	guy.olivant@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	placeequalitycontrol@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a Reviewed Policy.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Policy and expected outcomes?

Aims: These proposals for 2017/18 do not propose to alter the ring-fenced HRAs core activity which is to provide and support the delivery of Council housing as part of an overall balanced budget. These proposals for 2017/18 also do not propose to alter the core activity of the Housing Options Service.

Objectives: Fully consistent with the housing priorities set out in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2017+ and the HRA Business Plan 2017+ to provide affordable and sustainable housing for residents, and to provide a Housing Options Service.

Outcomes: The rent and service charge income is the key component of the HRA Budget and the revised income that will be generated for both 2017/18 and future years from these proposals, when taken alongside other budget proposals, will ensure that the HRA Self-Financing Settlement continues to be affordable.

The proposals are consistent with the revised National Rent Policy that was confirmed in July 2015 for implementation from April 2016.

Temporary Accommodation rent income is a key component of the Housing Options Service Budget and the revised income that will be generated for both 2017/18 and future years from these proposals, when taken alongside other budget proposals, will ensure that the Housing Options Service continues to be affordable.

Benefits: Proposals will ensure that services to Council tenants can continue to be maintained at an appropriate level and also may provide potential regeneration opportunities.

Proposals will ensure that the Housing Options Service can continue to be maintained at an appropriate level.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Children A Great City To Grow Up In	No
Health - A Great City To Grow Old In	No
Housing - A Great City To Live In	Yes
Jobs And Skills - A Great City To Succeed In	No

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	No
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	No

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Not Relevant	No
Disability	Not Relevant	No
Gender	Not Relevant	No
Gender Reassignment	Not Relevant	No
Marriage Civil Partnership	Not Relevant	No
Pregnancy And Maternity	Not Relevant	No
Race	Not Relevant	No
Religion or Belief	Not Relevant	No
Sexual Orientation	Not Relevant	No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

The Housing Rent Charges for 2017/18 will be applied, without exception, to all tenants of the Council. The other charges reviewed as a part of this report will be applied for all service users in receipt of the underlying services. Additionally, the Service Charges are subject to regular reviews to ensure they remain appropriate and that they offer value for money for all users of these services.

There will be no negative effect on people in respect of disability, gender, including gender identity, race, age, religion and belief and sexual orientation as a result of these proposals.

A Full Equality Assessment is not required.

It is estimated that 75% of council tenants will be insulated from the full impact of the revised charges from 3 April 2017 as they are eligible for support towards their housing costs through housing benefit or universal credit. Those tenants who require assistance will continue to be offered additional financial planning advice through the Central Housing Rents Team and Debt Advice Services in order to reassess and maximise benefit entitlement, and to help tenants to budget effectively.

The income that will be generated in the HRA in 2017/18 and future years from the proposed changes, when taken alongside other budget proposals, will ensure that the HRA Self-Financing Settlement continues to be affordable, whilst ensuring that services to tenants can be maintained at an appropriate level.

Consultation

Internal:

The Deputy Leader has been consulted on the proposed charges for 2017/18 and supports this report proceeding to executive decision. The Director of Finance has also been fully consulted and is supportive of the recommendations. Officers from City Finance and Legal Services have been involved in the drafting of this report.

External:

City Housing Liaison Board considered the rent proposals contained within this report at their meeting on 19 January 2017.

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact arising from these proposals.

The Housing Rent Charges for 2017/18 will be applied, without exception, to all tenants of the Council. The other charges reviewed as a part of this report will be applied for all service users in receipt of the underlying services. Additionally, the Service Charges are subject to regular reviews to ensure they remain appropriate and that they offer value for money for all users of these services.

There will be no negative effect on people in respect of disability, gender, including gender identity, race, age, religion and belief and sexual orientation as a result of these proposals.

4 Review Date

03/01/18

5 Action Plan

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET	
Report of:	Acting Strategic Director of Place	
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017	
SUBJECT:	BIRMINGHAM COUNCIL HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2017/18 to 2019/20	
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002901/2017	
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved	<input type="checkbox"/>
	O&S Chairman approved	<input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Councillor Peter Griffiths – Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes Councillor Majid Mahmood – Cabinet Member for Value for Money and Efficiency	
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Councillor Victoria Quinn – Housing and Homes Councillor Mohammed Aikhlaq– Corporate Resources and Governance	
Wards affected:	All	

1. Purpose of report:	
1.1	To seek approval for the Full Business Case for the scope of work to be included in the Council Housing Improvement Programme 2017/18 to 2019/20 of £168.626 million and Other Programmes (including Adaptations) of £14.797 million within a total Public Sector Housing Capital budget of £358.969 million, including clearance and redevelopment costs.
1.2	To inform Cabinet that this programme will deliver improvements to around 20,000 existing council properties and will include the provision of new kitchens and bathrooms, upgraded central heating systems, door, window, roof replacements and structural works to traditional/non-traditional construction type properties including electrical and thermal efficiency works, replacement double glazed PVCU windows, replacement heating system, roof replacement works and external/internal improvements, these works to be delivered through existing contracts for Housing Repairs, Gas Servicing, Capital Works and Major Adaptations.
1.3	To inform Cabinet that a sum of £0.800 million per annum has been identified in Appendix 2 for continued environmental works in neighbourhoods. It is to be noted that a sum of monies be allocated based on housing stock in that locality and that officers within Housing Services consult with Local Elected Members and the Housing Liaison Board to prioritise investment projects. A process for agreeing the approval of these projects will be developed and approved by the Cabinet Committee Local Leadership.
1.4	The proposals are subject to the approval of the Budget for 2017/18 by Council on 28 February 2017 and are consistent with the HRA Business Plan 2017+ and the proposed HRA Budget for 2017/18.

2.	Decision(s) recommended:
	That Cabinet:
2.1	Approves the Full Business Case (Appendix 1) for the scope of works to be included in the Council Housing Improvement Programme 2017/18 to 2019/20 at an estimated capital cost of £168.626 million, together with Other Programmes (including Adaptations) at an estimated cost of £14.797 million over the same period.
2.2	Authorises the Service Director, Housing Transformation and Head of Capital Investment to allocate the Housing Investment works and place orders with the recently procured service providers in accordance with the scope of those contracts.
2.3	Notes the allocation of £175.546 million for clearance and new build activity included within the Public Sector Housing Capital budget of £358.969 million, with specific scheme details to be the subject of further reports as appropriate sites are identified.
2.4	Authorises the City Solicitor to negotiate, execute, seal and complete all necessary documents to give effect to the above recommendations.

Lead Contact Officer(s):	
	Robert James – Service Director –Housing 0121 464 7699 Robert.james@birmingham.gov.uk
Telephone No:	Martin Tolley – Head of Capital Investment 0121 303 3974
E-mail address:	martin.tolley@birmingham.gov.uk

3.	Consultation				
3.1	<p><u>Internal</u></p> <p>The proposals for the Housing Investment Programme for 2017/18 to 2019/20 are consistent with the budget report presented to Cabinet. The following members have been consulted and support the proposals going forward for Executive decision.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Councillor Ian Ward</td><td>Deputy Leader of Birmingham City Council</td></tr> <tr> <td>Councillor Victoria Quinn</td><td>Chair of Housing and Homes Overview & Scrutiny Committee</td></tr> </table>	Councillor Ian Ward	Deputy Leader of Birmingham City Council	Councillor Victoria Quinn	Chair of Housing and Homes Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Councillor Ian Ward	Deputy Leader of Birmingham City Council				
Councillor Victoria Quinn	Chair of Housing and Homes Overview & Scrutiny Committee				
3.2	There will be continued local member influence through local Environmental Works Investment Projects.				
3.3	Officers in Legal Services, City Finance and Corporate Procurement have been involved in the preparation of this report.				

3.4 External

The City Housing Liaison Board has been consulted and endorse the programme as outlined in this report.

4 **Compliance Issues**

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?

Improving the Council owned housing stock directly contributes to the strategic outcomes of the Sustainable Community Strategy, the proposed Council Business Plan and Budget 2017+. In particular there is a specific target under the theme of securing a high quality of life for residents. Stock improvements will also impact upon the other strategic outcomes, most notably on the aspiration for healthier communities and carbon reduction.

The Council will upgrade its stocks thermal performance by energy efficient measures that may include whole property retrofit in line with the City's wider sustainability strategy set by Birmingham's Green Commission through the Carbon Roadmap. These works will include the replacement of existing older inefficient heating systems, external insulation, hard to treat cavity wall and loft insulation and any other innovative energy efficiency works. This will further contribute to targets within the Commission's Carbon Roadmap to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 60% by 2027 and alleviate fuel poverty. The Council's approach will be to identify additional funding routes such as Energy Company Obligation (ECO), Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) and any other funding routes that may become available in the future.

4.2 Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility

Although the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 only applies to the procurement of services, or the provision of services together with the purchase or hire of goods or the carrying out of works, it is the Council's policy to ensure that social value is included as a requirement for works contracts. The additional economic, social and environmental benefits sought through this programme of works will be considered and secured through application of the Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility. The existing contractors are certified signatories to the Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility and will provide additional Social Value actions, including the provision of apprenticeships, that are relevant and proportionate to the nature and value of the contracts they are awarded. Any sub-contractors or new suppliers awarded contracts for works above £1m will also be required to sign up to the Charter and submit Action Plans prior to the award of contracts.

4.3 Financial Implications (Will decisions be carried out within existing finance and Resources?)

The total capital funding for these schemes is contained within the proposed Housing Public Sector Capital Budget 2017+ and summarised in Appendix 1. The programme will be funded in line with the anticipated resources set out in the Council's Business Plan and Budget 2017+, which is scheduled for consideration at the Council Meeting on 28 February 2017.

This capital expenditure will ensure that the properties remain available for letting, hence protecting the net rental income to the Housing Revenue Accounts (HRA) in line with the Council's proposed Business Plan and Budget 2017+.

In the event that capital resource availability for these purposes is changed, the programme will be amended to reflect such changes through the existing quarterly review process with detailed approval to be sought through Cabinet and Strategic Director reports, as appropriate.

4.4 Legal Implications

The proposed allocation of work is consistent with the effective management of the Council's housing stock under Part II Housing Act 1985. The existing contracts for Responsive Repairs and Maintenance Services, Gas Servicing and Capital Improvement Work Programmes (including Major Adaptations to Council Housing Stock) in the North, South, West-Central and East areas of Birmingham. (Contract Ref F0239).

4.5 Public Sector Equality Duty

In making its decision Cabinet is required to have due regard to the public sector equality duty, the outcome of the screening is attached as **Appendix 4A**. In relation to the programme, due regard has been paid to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and an Equality Assessment has been carried out which has shown that the programme will not have any adverse effects due to the resulting extended lifecycles of the housing stock and improvements to the thermal comfort and the quality of life for the Council's tenants.

The requirements of Standing Order No. 9 in respect of the Council's Equal Opportunity Policy will be incorporated in the contracts for projects carried out within the programme.

5. **Relevant background/chronology of key events:**

The Council's Stock

- 5.1 The City Council currently owns and manages a portfolio of 62,616 residential properties (as at November 2016). This includes a high proportion of non- traditionally built homes and the average age of our properties is approaching 70 years
- 5.2 To safe-guard the condition/asset value of our stock achieved through previous capital investment programmes, all future investment programmes will be targeted on the principle of expired component lifecycles. This is achieved by holding detailed stock condition information within the asset management database (Apex). In an effort to ensure that the initial programme identified by Apex is targeted and appropriate, all properties proposed to be included will be pre surveyed. If the lifecycle of the component can be extended the property will not be included in the programme and will be re-inspected in future years. In essence, the housing stock will self-select for inclusion in the programme based upon the expired lifecycle rule. All programmes are shared across the Place and Economy Directorates to ensure the appropriateness of the investment.

HRA Business Plan Budget 2017+ and Asset Management Principles

- 5.3 The HRA Business Plan Budget 2017+ is included in the overall draft Council Business Plan and Budget which sets out the long term service and financial strategy. The key asset management principles are set out below:

Continued maintenance to protect the investment already undertaken as to avoid impairment/disrepair charges and to allow retention of affordable future debt levels. This will include the lifecycle replacement of major property components (e.g. windows, heating, kitchens, bathrooms, roofs, electrical and structural works) and an estimated average of £50-55m will need to be spent annually on this programme. The outcome of this expenditure is detailed in **Appendix 2**. This fits with the theme of providing a healthy happy city.

- To deliver bespoke structural investment packages including, external wall insulation, roofing, windows, heating change and lighting to a number of tower blocks across the city.
- To provide an ongoing programme of adaptations to Council dwellings to promote independent living.
- Clearance of obsolete and unviable dwellings together with a new build programme to provide replacement affordable housing.

Under the HRA Self Financing regime, expenditure must be allied to these principles.

Delivery of the Investment Programme for 2017/18 to 2019/20

- 5.4 The Investment Programme will be delivered through the existing contracts for Responsive Repairs & Maintenance Services, Gas Servicing, Capital Improvement Work Programmes including Major Adaptations and Lifts to Council Housing Stock in the North, South, West-Central and East areas of Birmingham.
- 5.5 A yearly sum of £0.800 million has been identified in Appendix 2 for capital environmental works to HRA assets in neighbourhoods. It is proposed that this sum be allocated based on housing stock in that locality and that officers within Housing Services consult with local elected members and the Housing Liaison Board to prioritise investment projects. A process for agreeing the approval of these projects will be developed and approved by the Cabinet Committee Local Leadership.

Performance of 2016/17 Investment Programme

- 5.6 The 2016/17 investment programme budget allocation is estimated to be a 100% budget spend. Further details are set out in Appendix 1.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

- 6.1 The option of not investing in the improvement of our housing stock is discounted as it would result in an increasing number of properties becoming unlettable and increasing levels of disrepair litigation.

- 6.2 The allocation of resources between different components within the programme is derived from detailed stock condition information. Whilst it would be possible to allocate resources differently between priorities within the proposed programme, the current arrangement represents the best fit in terms of value for money and protecting the Council's assets.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):

- 7.1 To progress the Council Housing Investment Programme 2017/18 to 2019/20 of £183.423 million within a total Public Sector Housing Capital budget of £358.969 million.

Signatures

Date

Cabinet Members

.....

Cllr Peter Griffiths
Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes

.....

.....

Cllr Majid Mahmood
Cabinet Member for Value for Money and Efficiency

.....

Chief Officer

.....

Jacqui Kennedy, Acting Strategic Director
of Place

.....

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:

Council's Business Plan and Budget 2017+.

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):

1. Appendix 1 Full Business Case
2. Appendix 2 Public Sector Housing Capital Investment 2017/18 to 2019/20
3. Appendix 3 Risk Assessment
4. Appendix 4A Equality Assessment, 4B Public Sector Equality Duty Statement

Report Version		Dated	
-----------------------	--	--------------	--

Full Business Case (FBC)			
1. General Information			
Directorate	Place	Portfolio/Committee	Housing and Homes
Project Title	Birmingham Council Housing Investment Plan 2017/18 to 2019/20	Project Code	Various
Project Description	<p>The investment set out in this report represents the detailed proposals for improvements in the condition of Council housing in 2017/18 to 2019/20 as a part of the ongoing programme of capital investment as outlined in the HRA Business Plan and Budget 2017+.</p> <p>The annual programme for 2017/18 to 2019/20 forms a part of a continued programme of investment in Council housing in Birmingham, which has been under way for many years and that is expected to continue for as long as the Council retains ownership of Council housing. The HRA Business Plan sets out an overall financial plan for ongoing housing investment over a 30-year period, showing the continuation of this programme throughout that period, with the investment fully funded throughout the Business Plan period.</p> <p>With 62,616 homes currently held within the HRA (as at 08 November 2016), many of which are over 70 years old, it is inevitable that there is an extremely high demand for capital works to the properties, to such an extent that it would not be possible to address all needs in any single year, either from an affordability or a delivery perspective. For each annual investment programme, it is therefore important that the properties to benefit from investment are prioritised to ensure maximum benefit across the City.</p> <p>The City's estates are prioritised according to investment need driven by expired lifecycle elements derived from detailed stock condition information held for each property. Investment is then directed to the appropriate areas within each District. Individual elements for renewal are identified from a combination of urgent need to ensure properties are at a lettable standard and overall investment need as identified from the stock condition data, taking account of any plans for regeneration of estates or other investment being undertaken.</p> <p>Financial and non-financial delivery of the overall investment programme is reported to the Housing Transformation Board (chaired by the Service Director of Housing Transformation) as an integral part of the established reporting process.</p> <p>As the annual programme is delivered, and resource availability changes (whether through identification of additional funding opportunities or changes in levels of generation of capital receipts etc.), changes to the approved programme and associated outputs will be reported through the existing capital budget reporting structure, including quarterly reports to Cabinet.</p> <p>As a part of this programme, it is anticipated that around 20,000 properties will receive improvements during 2017/18 to 2019/20. The key elements to be improved include kitchens, bathrooms, central heating systems, doors, windows, roofs and fire protection works as set out in the Benefits Quantification section below. Actual performance against these targets will be reported annually.</p> <p>For the 2016/17 programme, the following programmes show an indicative level completion. Key outputs as compared to the approved Full Business</p>		

	Case for 2016/17 are summarised in the following table.					
		FBC Target	Actual completions December 2016	Estimated Completions 31 March 2017		
	Kitchens	367	131	265		
	Bathrooms	273	90	265		
	Central Heating/Boilers	1,135	1,277	1,277		
	Windows	526	564	1,236		
	Doors	1,432	608	1,502		
	Roofs	321	351	490		
	Fire Protection	986	1,221	1,269		
	Soffits and Facia Replacement & External Painting (Estate Makeover)	37	75	92		
Links to Corporate and Service Outcomes	<p>Improving the Council owned housing stock directly contributes to the strategic outcomes of the Sustainable Community Strategy, the Council Business Plan and Budget 2017+. Stock improvements will also impact upon the other strategic outcomes, most notably on the aspiration for healthier communities. The report is also consistent with the policy priorities for Housing as set out in the Housing Business Plan and Budget Plan Budget 2017+.</p> <p>The replacement of existing older heating systems with new condensing boilers, installation of external insulation, cavity wall and loft insulation will contribute to targets within the Council's Climate Change Strategy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and fuel poverty.</p>					
Project Definition Document Approved by	N/A	Date of Approval	N/A			
Benefits Quantification- Impact on Outcomes	Measure		Impact (units)			
	<p>The housing improvement programme is delivered to improve/replace as individual elements reach the end of their useful lives, and is focused on ensuring that our stock is fit for purpose and maintains its asset value for future years with investment targeted to further reflect tenant aspirations as to which aspects of property improvements are most valued.</p> <p>Key elements of properties to be renewed / improved are set out in the table below:</p> <p>(Please note the total number for kitchen and bathrooms does not include Major Works Voids)</p>					
	2017/18 Measures	North	South	East	Central west	Total
	Kitchens	197	195	165	133	690
	Bathrooms	197	195	165	133	690
	Central Heating/Boilers	185	390	280	280	1,135
	Windows	185	316	254	90	845
	Doors	183	462	326	180	1,151
	Roofs	122	46	125	27	320
	Fire Protection	55	563	116	252	986
Soffits and Facia Replacement & External Painting (Estate Makeover)	25	25	25	25	100	

	2018/19 Measures	North	South	East	Central west	Total
	Kitchens	207	205	177	144	733
	Bathrooms	207	205	177	144	733
	Central Heating/Boilers	216	455	327	327	1,325
	Windows	184	315	253	89	841
	Doors	183	462	326	180	1,151
	Roofs	146	62	130	58	396
	Fire Protection	88	903	186	404	1,581
	Soffits and Facia Replacement & External Painting (Estate Makeover)	25	25	25	25	100
	2019/20 Measures	North	South	East	Central west	Total
	Kitchens	231	229	201	168	829
	Bathrooms	231	229	201	168	829
	Central Heating/Boilers	247	520	373	373	1,513
	Windows	181	312	250	86	829
	Doors	181	461	325	179	1,146
	Roofs	163	79	147	76	465
	Fire Protection	231	229	201	168	829
	Soffits and Facia Replacement & External Painting (Estate Makeover)	25	25	25	25	100
	<p>To deliver bespoke structural investment packages including, external wall insulation, roofing, windows, heating change and lighting to high-rise and low-rise properties across the city, this will benefit circa 1,612 properties over the 3 years.</p> <p>To deliver an electrical inspect and test programme to circa 7,600 properties and installation of 124 door entry systems plus 35 common rooms in sheltered housing schemes.</p>					
Project Deliverables	The investment set out in this report will ensure the continued replacement/improvement of expired elements ensuring a lettable standard with improvements focussed on those aspects most valued by our tenants and identified through our asset management software as being in need of renewal.					
Scope	Capital works to Council housing, including structural works, kitchen and bathroom renewals and modernisation of heating systems. Adaptations to Council housing to enable independent living.					
Scope exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Clearance & Acquisitions Activity • New Build • Revenue / Responsive Repairs • Complementary works to non-HRA assets • Procurement of contractors 					
Dependencies on other projects or activities	Capacity of repairs contractors to undertake work Planning permission – particularly for structural works Consultation with / agreement from key stakeholders including tenants, freeholders, Ward Members					

Achievability	<p>The detailed proposals covered by this report represent the continuation of an ongoing investment programme to maintain the physical condition of Birmingham's Council Housing.</p> <p>There is significant in-house expertise in managing and delivering a successful programme of this nature and size; although it should be noted that slippage/acceleration of certain elements of the programme can occur.</p> <p>The existing contractors have successfully tendered to deliver programmes of this size and it is therefore considered to be reasonable to expect that the programme as set out in this report can be delivered within the existing framework.</p> <p>There is a well-developed tenant engagement structure in place for delivering capital improvement programmes, as have been delivered for a number of years. It is anticipated that this will continue to be effective for 2017/18 to 2019/20 through ongoing consultation.</p>		
Project Manager	<p>Martin Tolley – Head of Capital Investment 0121 303 3974 Martin.tolley@birmingham.gov.uk</p>		
Budget Holder	<p>Martin Tolley – details as above</p>		
Sponsor	<p>Robert James – Service Director 0121 464 9819 robert.james@birmingham.gov.uk</p>		
Project Accountant	<p>Nick Ward – Finance Manager 0121 464 4282 Nick.ward@birmingham.gov.uk</p>		
Project Board Members	<p>As above, plus members of the Place Directorate Senior Management Team.</p>		
Head of City Finance (HoCF)	Guy Olivant	Date of HoCF Approval:	16.01.17

PUBLIC SECTOR HOUSING CAPITAL INVESTMENT 2017/20

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total 2017/18- 2019/20
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Council Housing Investment				
Central Heating	3,000	3,500	4,000	10,500
Windows	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
Soffits & Fascias / External Painting ,Estate Makeover	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
Front Doors Secure by Design	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
Electrical programmes	8,200	5,700	4,200	18,100
Structural Works – High-rise and Low-rise and Advanced design fees.	18,500	18,597	19,229	56,326
Kitchens	5,200	5,450	5,950	16,600
Bathrooms	5,200	5,450	5,950	16,600
Roofing	2,000	2,500	3,000	7,500
DDA and Door Entry	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
Communal Decorations	1,500	1,000	1,000	3,500
Fire Protection Chutes and Soil Stacks	2,500	4,000	3,500	10,000
Lift Refurbishments	1,500	1,500	1,500	4,500
Concierge / Caretaker Rooms	400	300	300	1,000
District Environmental Works	800	800	800	2,400
Legionella	500	500	500	1,500
Structural Investigations	700	700	700	2,100
Housing Improvement Programme	56,000	55,997	56,629	168,626
New Build Programme	65,489	39,735	36,312	141,536
Clearance and Acquisitions Programme	11,452	14,855	7,703	34,010
Redevelopment	76,941	54,590	44,015	175,546
Desktop Refresh	250	250	250	750
Internal Fees	482	492	501	1,475
Adaptations – Council Tenants	3,351	3,418	3,487	10,256
Garage Investment	772	772	772	2,316
Other programmes	4,855	4,932	5,010	14,797
Total Capital Expenditure	137,796	115,519	105,654	358,969
Revenue Contributions	(54,014)	(61,591)	(66,048)	(181,653)
Sales to InReach	(19,000)	(19,000)	(19,000)	(57,000)
RTB Receipts	(11,570)	(11,946)	(12,339)	(35,855)
BMHT Receipts	(12,356)	(11,010)	(6,026)	(29,392)
Slippage from 2016/17	(16,484)	-	-	(16,484)
Other Resources	(24,372)	(11,972)	(2,241)	(38,585)
Total Capital Financing	(137,796)	(115,519)	(105,654)	(358,969)
Net (Surplus) / Deficit	0	0	0	0

Note:

The revenue implications of the proposed programme are accounted for in the HRA Business Plan and Budget 2017+ as part of the HRA dwellings repair costs which will be delivered on a fixed price per property basis through the existing contractual arrangements.

Risk register key

IMPACT	PROBABILITY	SCORE
1 – Insignificant	1 – Unlikely	1-4
2 – Minor	2 – Possible	5-8
3 – Moderate	3 – Likely	9-12
4 – Major	4 – Almost Certain	13-16

Description of Risk	Responsibility owner	Impact	Probability	Score	Mitigation Measures	impact	Probability	Score
Contractor Capacity	Senior Service Manager	4	2	8	Early discussion with contractors about programme of works.	2	2	4
Planning Approval Delays	Contract Team Manager	4	1	4	Early engagement with Planners. This only applies to structural works.	2	1	2
Delays Due to Site Conditions	Contractors	4	2	8	Outdoor work is planned during summer periods to avoid snow, heavy rain and inclement weather	2	1	2

Costs of Programme Delivery exceed available Resources	Senior Service Manager	3	3	9	Existing contracts include fixed prices for most elements of the planned investment programme. Programme performance will be monitored through the year and works accelerated or slipped to future years to fit resource availability.	3	1	3
Programme of Works not Delivered Within Timescale	Senior Service Manager	4	2	8	Monthly contractor performance meeting and financial reviews. Service Improvement notice and performance Related Payment processes within the contract.	2	1	2
No Access to Properties/Refusals of Work	Contract Team Manager	3	4	12	Extensive consultation with tenants and robust procedures in place to deal with legal requirements (e.g. gas / electrical testing)	3	2	6
Possible Disrepair Litigation	Contract Team Manager	4	4	16	Specific programmes to prevent successful challenge (reducing court & legal costs to allow focus of investment on improvements to properties) – key elements include soil stacks, heating & windows replacement programmes.	4	1	4

Customer satisfaction/ex expectations undeliverable	Contract Team Manager	4	4	16	Successful delivery of programme in previous years has been reflected in consistently high levels of customer satisfaction. In forthcoming years a new programme of customer involvement for those that have had Capital Investment Works will be centred on reality checks, Customer Service User Panels and collation of Partners' satisfaction data.	4	1	4
Unforeseen additional works arise in course of undertaking improvements	Contract Team Manager	3	3	9	Re-profile delivery programme as required. Also capacity is built within the programme running order and all foreseen risks are checked at programme issue.	2	2	4

Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Capital Investment Programme 2017-2020
Directorate	Place
Service Area	Asset Management
Type	New/Proposed Function
EA Summary	This Document describes the function of the capital Investment Programme including how it relates to the Cabinet Report.
Reference Number	EA001820
Task Group Manager	paul.mcgrath@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	
Date Approved	2017-01-19 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	michelle.bache@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	placeequalitycontrol@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a New/Proposed Function.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Function and expected outcomes?

The Housing Capital Investment Plan is part of Birmingham City Councils (BCC) budget approval process for maintaining and improving the condition of the City Councils stock, i.e. residential properties.

A 3 year Cabinet report has been completed by the Asset Management and Maintenance Divisions' Capital investment Team and submitted to Cabinet. In previous years this has been a 1 year report.

The Cabinet report seeks approval for the scope of work to be included in BCC Housing Investment Programme which includes clearance and redevelopment costs.

We also seek authority from the Service Director for Housing Transformation and the Head of Capital Investment to allocate the Investment Programme between the repairs and maintenance partners and other specialist providers.

Repairs and maintenance partners have demonstrated through recent procurement that they comply fully with the City Council's aims and objectives. To assist to deliver a thriving local community we carry out improvements and repairs to customers' homes making the local environment a pleasant place to live.

This investment process helps to deliver a strong economy through using local companies through Find It In Birmingham. We consult with residents about their priorities to ensure that the local community is a healthy and happy place to live.

The report also contains an outline proposal as to how the budget will be allocated to the different type of works to be carried out. Once approved, the identified programme of work, e.g. stock improvement to windows, doors, kitchens, bathrooms, roofs etc., along with the allocated budget will form the framework for delivery known as the Capital Investment Programme.

The Capital Investment Programme is essentially driven by stock data that targets expired building elements (e.g. windows, doors, kitchens, bathrooms, roofs etc.) that have reached the end of their design life cycle.

The Capital Investment Programme determines where and how the actual scheme of works should be delivered. The focus is on how to improve the actual property and does not take into account who the occupant is or what their circumstances may be.

Customers experience an improvement in the quality of their lives directly proportionate to the improvement to their property.

The work that is required for each property is prioritised according to expired element life cycles. The Capital Investment Programme work that is required falls into three headings:

Expired Lifecycles will include.

Roofs flat & pitched, Kitchen & Bathrooms, structural works to all

stock, rewires, Complete the work to the common areas in the sheltered schemes, Central

Heating Systems & boilers, Secure By Design Doors, Window replacement.
Essential Capital Investment works and statutory obligations include:
D.D.A, Fire Protection Work, Lift Refurbishment, Door Entry systems, Environmental work, Legionella, Communal area electrical testing, Refuse Chutes / Soil Stacks, insulation and energy upgrades Smoke detectors and internal decoration of communal areas in tower blocks.

Additional Programme works include:
Adaptations to customers properties

The proposed environmental works will be consulted upon with Housing management, customers, and development and joint venture officers.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Children A Great City To Grow Up In	No
Health - A Great City To Grow Old In	Yes
Housing - A Great City To Live In	Yes
Jobs And Skills - A Great City To Succeed In	Yes

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Not Relevant	No
Disability	Not Relevant	No
Gender	Not Relevant	No
Gender Reassignment	Not Relevant	No
Marriage Civil Partnership	Not Relevant	No
Pregnancy And Maternity	Not Relevant	No
Race	Not Relevant	No
Religion or Belief	Not Relevant	No
Sexual Orientation	Not Relevant	No

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

It is not anticipated that any aspects of this proposal will directly or indirectly contribute to inequality on the grounds of age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity or human rights.

However, there may be times when we are unable to meet our Customers additional non-standard requirements, due to the nature of the dwelling or the design or construction:

Our aim is to meet specific needs where possible and also accommodate individual requirements across all of our programmes.

We usually offer Customers the choice on whether they require electrical cables to be chased in or hidden behind trunking. If a property is constructed from concrete then we have no choice but to use trunking. Therefore technically we cannot offer the customer a choice as it is not feasible.

If the layout of the customers property allows, we will install radiators where the customer requires them. Where this is not possible the customer is provided with alternative options to meet the layout of their property.

When providing a Secured by Design door the customer chooses from a pre determined range of styles and colours. The standard specification meets most needs; however, sometimes we work outside of these constraints to meet any additional needs. Please note low level threshold is standard to comply with current building regulations.

During preparation for Kitchen and Bathroom programme delivery or where works are intrusive our team of Contract Works Officers will work closely with our customers to determine their individual needs.

During programme delivery contractor appointed, Tenant Liaison Officers will assess customers needs and support any individual arrangements needed to allow the works to be completed.

To aid communication:

We give visually impaired customers the option of having a Braille thermostat control to assist them in operating the central heating. Large font and Braille scheme signage upgrades are used and language line as a translation service is available for all customers.

All BCC officers, contractors and operatives have been briefed to record, on our computer database, any specific requirements identified which can also help improve the service delivered.

Additional support:

Additional support is provided to customers where required for example; offering to remove carpets and furnishings and assistance with packing to enable improvements to customers homes to be delivered.

Where residents have specific health needs, which have been assessed, we will provide any Aids and Adaptations. This may include:

Hand rails

Walk in showers

Stair and vertical lifts

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

The Capital Investment report informs Cabinet of improvements to be delivered to Council properties based on priorities identified in this equality assessment.

Equality assessment has considered the impact of the programme on protected characteristics. Through this process we have determined that no persons are adversely affected because investment is based on property condition and not the customer.

Consideration has been given to take account of disabled persons disabilities, even where that involves treating disabled persons more favourably than other persons;
Improvements are carried out based on the property expired life cycle. Once a property has been identified and included in our programme, detailed assessment of a customer's needs is undertaken. This means that some customer groups may receive additional support based on their appropriate needs.

The consultation process is through City HLB who represent all Council tenants.
Cabinet members have been provided with the relevant information on this proposal, prior to decision making.

The relevant Cabinet Members have been consulted:

Councillor Peter Griffiths - Cabinet member for housing and homes
Councillor Majid Mahmood - Cabinet Member for value of money and efficiency.
And overview and scrutiny chair persons:
Councillor Victoria Quinn - Housing and Homes.
Councillor Mohammed Aikhlaq - Cooperate resource and governance
Consideration has been given on how to mitigate the impact;

There has been no adverse impact identified on any group determined with the protected characteristic.

4 Review Date

19/01/17

5 Action Plan

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

Equality Act 2010

The Executive must have due regard to the public sector equality duty when considering Council reports for decision.

The public sector equality duty is as follows:

1	<p>The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
2	<p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
3	<p>The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.</p>
4	<p>Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.
5	<p>The relevant protected characteristics are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Marriage & civil partnership (b) Age (c) Disability (d) Gender reassignment (e) Pregnancy and maternity (f) Race (g) Religion or belief (h) Sex (i) Sexual orientation

Report to:	CABINET	
Report of:	Acting Strategic Director of Place	
Date of Decision:	14 FEBRUARY 2017	
SUBJECT:	COMMUNITY LIBRARY SERVICE TIERED DELIVERY MODEL	
Key Decision: Yes	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 002921/2017	
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>	
Relevant Cabinet Member(s) or Relevant Executive Member	COUNCILLOR IAN WARD, DEPUTY LEADER	
Relevant O&S Chairman:	COUNCILLOR ZAFAR IQBAL, ECONOMY, SKILLS AND TRANSPORT	
Wards affected:	ALL	

1. Purpose of report:
<p>1.1 Following a decision at Cabinet on 18th October 2016 to consult on a tiered library model, this report summarises the consultation response and sets out the changes to the model that have arisen as a result.</p> <p>1.2 Appendix 1 contains the detail of the amended future model for community libraries. This Cabinet report seeks approval for the tiered model and authorises its implementation.</p>

2. Decision(s) recommended:
<p>That Cabinet :-</p> <p>2.1 Agree the Tiered Library model, as detailed in Appendix 1, noting the main changes to the model (section 6.1 and 6.2, Appendix 1) following the consultation exercise.</p> <p>2.2 Authorise the implementation of the Tiered Library model from 1 April 2017, as set out in Appendix 1, sections 6.2 and 6.3 (tables 2 and 3) noting that volunteers and partners will play a key role in both Tier 3 and Tier 2/3 libraries.</p> <p>2.3 Agree that the management of the Library of Birmingham and Birmingham's Community Libraries are brought back together and that the Acting Strategic Director of Place be delegated to enact this and the designation of a City Chief Librarian by 1 June 2017. (See Appendix 1 section 0.4)</p> <p>2.4 Note that, subject to the confirmation of funding from Sutton Coldfield Town Council, this report maintains a library service at Sutton Coldfield; should it subsequently not be possible to develop a partnership solution, then a report will be forthcoming recommending its closure by 31 August 2017.</p>

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Chris Jordan Assistant Director Neighbourhoods and Communities
Telephone No:	0212 303 6143
E-mail address:	Chris.jordan@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

- 3.1 Following the cabinet report in October there has been a comprehensive public consultation exercise undertaken on the proposals for a Tiered Community Library Service. This has run from 25th October 2016 to 27th January 2017 and has involved
- 4 public meetings
 - 33 facilitated sessions at community libraries
 - 13 ward or district committee meetings
 - 24 other meetings

The full list is set out in Appendix 2.

This has resulted in 1947 responses submitted via the Be Heard database as well as 72 responses (see appendix 3c) submitted via other forms, letter, e-mail, 9 petitions and the 1675 responses to the children's survey.

Alongside the public consultation there has also been a formal consultation ongoing with staff and trade unions. Trade Unions and staff have formally submitted their proposals for amending the model and these have been considered and where appropriate changes reflected in the revised model. The formal consultation with Trade Unions will close after Cabinet have agreed the model.

3.2 Internal

- 3.2.1 Consultation commenced with staff and Trade Unions on the 10th October 2016. Following a period of consultation Trade Unions were asked to submit their final detailed response to the model by 13th January 2017, this is attached in Appendix 3.
- 3.2.2 A meeting took place with the Overview & Scrutiny Chairman for Economy, Skills and Transport on the 2nd February to provide an overview.
- 3.2.3 During the consultation process, the views of local members have been sought through a range of meetings. The proposals have been discussed at 13 ward/district meetings and in addition local members have also been present at many of the 37 public meetings/facilitated sessions.
- 3.2.4 The Head of Library Services and the Assistant Director, Culture and Visitor Economy have been consulted on the report.

3.3 External

- 3.3.1 Individuals and groups were able to submit their views on the proposals via the BeHeard system and via the questionnaire. The consultation had a strong response with 1947 questionnaires completed. Appendix 3 sets out the detail of the public consultation.
- 3.3.2 Furthermore 1675 children responded to a specific questionnaire which sought to gain information on travelling to libraries, times of use as well as what the library was used for.

3.3.3 In order to ensure the impacts of the proposed model were explored further and better understood there was also a series of 6 focus groups. These concentrated on Sutton, Aston, Disability and a further three on wider impacts of the proposed changes.

There have clearly been a number of responses on individual aspects of the model and indeed the proposals for specific libraries. In addition to this we have had a small number of responses from organisations making comment on the overall model. These include Friends of the Library of Birmingham, Unison, the Library Lobby, etc and these submissions are also attached in Appendix 3.

In the run up to the commencement of our local consultation. Other bodies such as the National Library Task Force have recognised that nationally authorities are having to make difficult decisions in light of their limited budgets but, if short-term savings really are required, it needs to be clear how the proposals developed sit alongside - and in the context of - the overall strategic direction of travel and a future-facing vision. They should not prejudice longer-term ambitions.

3.2.4 The responses to the consultation (detailed in Appendix 3) have helped shape the final model for consideration by cabinet. The main amendments made to the model as a result of the consultation analysis are set out in Appendix 1 sections 6.1 and 6.2.

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?

4.1.1 The recommendation enables delivery against the savings proposals that were part of the 2015/16 budget decision and consulted on at a high level at that time.

4.1.2 Libraries have a key role to offer in supporting three of the council's policy priorities of children, jobs & skills and health and this is reinforced in the proposed model by a new service focus on the Society of Chief Librarians' five Universal Offers of Reading, Learning, Health, Digital and Information.

4.2 Financial Commentary

4.2.1 Background and Context

- The report that was presented to Cabinet on 18 October 2016 outlined the financial implications relating to the proposed Future Operating Model (FOM) that was published for consultation.
- In summary, the proposals were fundable within the provisional cash limits for the service to 2019/20 (after taking into account planned savings and adjustments for approved pay and pension pressures). In addition, the financial projections also included the corporate funding of the prudential borrowing costs for the investment of £0.8m for new technology to improve self-service.

4.2.2. Provisional Service Cash Limits 2017/18 to 2019/20 (Appendix 4)

- The provisional cash limits for the service have been updated to take into account the City Council's Medium Term Financial Plans – in summary, this now includes provision for pay and pensions, corporate funding for the prudential borrowing and the re-phasing of the savings of £0.388m that were planned for 2017/18 into 2018/19 on an ongoing basis.
- The revised cash limits for the service are now £4.450m for 2017/18 and reducing to £4.062m for 2018/19 onwards (this reflects the saving of £0.388m that has been deferred for 2017/18). The cash limits for 2018/19 onwards may be adjusted as part of the annual budget process of the Council to take into account pay and pension costs and potential new savings for example – the new Future Operating Model of the City Council.

4.2.3. Summary of Financial Implications following the Completion of the Consultation and the Revised Proposed Model

- The additional estimated costs of the new potential proposed FOM (for a full year from 1 April 2017) are estimated at £0.14m per annum on an ongoing basis for the next 3 years from 2017/18 to 2019/20 and the major components of these costs are set out below:
 - additional employee costs of £0.18m (this reflects 12 more staff at a cost of £0.3m and savings of £0.1m on agency costs and including Sutton Library)
 - premises and operational costs of £0.19m (including Sutton Library)
 - additional pension strain costs of £0.13m (payable per annum for the next 3 years)
 - additional income of £0.36m (including a proposed contribution of £0.15m from Sutton Town Council for the operation of the Library for 5 months pending the completion of a long term business case, anticipated income of £0.18m from commercial rents, £0.09m from community services and reduced income of £0.05m following the cancellation of the proposed reservations charge)
- The financial analysis indicates that the new model can be operated within the provisional cash limit of £4.450m in 2017/18 (including the set aside of a one-off provision for transitional costs of £0.29m in 2017/18 to manage any short term risks).
- There is a marginal annual shortfall of £0.09m from 2018/19 to 2019/20 (due primarily to the additional pension strain costs that will be payable over 3 years to 2019/20) - this is not expected to continue beyond 2019/20 as the pensions strain liabilities will have been discharged). Mitigations to cover this shortfall will be identified within the Place Directorate approved budget.

4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The Council has a statutory duty pursuant to the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 to provide a “comprehensive and efficient Library service” to all those seeking to make use of it. This duty is discharged through a combination of services across the city including for example the Library of Birmingham and 37 Community Libraries. Cabinet must be satisfied that the proposals set out in this report are compliant with the statutory duty.
- 4.3.2 The model being consulted on retains City Council involvement in 37 libraries (The Library of Birmingham and 36 libraries proposed as Tiers 1-3) of the 38 libraries in the city. This figure includes Sutton Coldfield Library on the basis of it being retained if a sustainable solution can be delivered by 31 August 2017. The new model additionally establishes a grant pot of £20,000 to support aspects of further library provision (in addition to the Mobile Library and Library Services at home). At present there are live discussions with 4 organisations around Tier 4 provision.
- 4.3.3 Equality considerations and duties have been paramount to the consultation process and should be central to the decision making process and the proposals relating to the library service, members will need to give careful consideration to the information set out in paragraph 4.4 and Appendix 5 of this report when making their decision.
- 4.3.4 Analysis of the consultation process has been used to advise and ensure that the resultant model put forward to Cabinet to make a decision delivers a comprehensive and efficient library service with the equality duties and considerations at its heart.

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

- 4.4.1 The initial Equality Assessment is attached as Appendix 5, along with additional supporting documentation in Appendix 6 including a Needs Assessment, map, and individual Library & Catchment Area Profiles. The Needs Assessment has been updated to reflect feedback that deprivation should be given an enhanced weighting, the model now uses a 50% increased weighting for this criteria.
- 4.4.2 The main potential impacts resulting from the originally proposed model related to
- closure of Aston and Sutton Coldfield libraries and
 - reduced hours of operation across the service
- The amended model retains a library service at Aston and also maintains a service in Sutton Coldfield prior to further consideration during the next 5 months. The current impacts have been largely mitigated. The closure of Kents Moat is mitigated by an increase in provision at Glebe Farm.
- There has been no evidence that the service wide reduction in opening hours of 155 hours (14%) has a disproportionate effect on any group with a protected characteristic. The model was generated from 11 criteria which included a weighted figure for deprivation.
- 4.4.3 A full equality assessment has been carried out using information gathered from the consultation exercise.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

- 5.1 From 2004 to 2015 Community Libraries were managed through District Committees. The library service in Birmingham is now managed within the Place Directorate and needs to design a service that is fit for the 21st Century which is financially sustainable and is underpinned by transformational change to deliver on a modern set of outcomes.
- 5.2 The first phase of change is necessary as a result of the budget limitations within the Community Library Service. As a result in October 2016 Cabinet agreed to an extensive consultation taking place on the proposal for a Tiered Library Service. The proposals which were consulted on for a 12 week period set out to maximise accessibility to library services across the city and in doing so sought to maintain a significant library provision and where appropriate it would work with partners to deliver this.
- 5.3 The consultation response has been significant with 1947 responses submitted via the questionnaire on Be Heard. In addition to this there have also been 74 sessions around the city whereby those involved in developing the model have heard directly from residents their views. The Council has been in listening mode and has given serious consideration as what changes could be made to the model whilst still operating to its required budget levels. The full detail of the consultation responses is set out in Appendix 3, however a summary of the key consultation responses and the city council's response to these is set out in Appendix 1 section 6 and table 2 and highlighted below

This model has secured;

- 36 of the 37 community libraries in the city and in doing so re-establishes two sites that have been temporarily closed
- a significantly increased expenditure on books etc than has been the case in previous years. An expenditure budget of £380,000 has been allocated whereas in recent years around £140,000 has been spent.
- A £50,000 increase for repairs and maintenance.
- investment in self-service technology at our sites

And the model has responded to the consultation with the following key amendments

- Giving an additional weighting to the criteria for deprivation used in the Needs Assessment. Although this altered rankings it did not significantly impact tiering.
- In addition the amended model suspends the decision on the future of Sutton Coldfield Library by up to 5 months. In this time the City Council will work in conjunction with Sutton Coldfield Town Council, the Library Lobby and other partners to see if a sustainable partnership solution can be established within the available resources of all parties.
- The model being considered for Sutton Coldfield Library is based on achieving additional income through property rental if this is achieved in addition to providing a Tier 1 budget for Sutton Coldfield. Library Services at Aston and Glebe Farm would be enhanced and the charge for reservations not progressed. Therefore the amended model suspends the decision on the introduction of reservation charges by up to 5 months, as this is provisional on the Sutton Coldfield business case.

- Withdrawing the proposal to enhance Birchfield to a Tier 1 site (maintaining it at Tier 2) and utilising the resource released by this alongside anticipated extra rental income from Sutton to run Aston Library as a Tier 3 site
- Working in partnership with the local community to ensure the sustainability of continuing to deliver library services from the current site at Stirchley as well as seeking to work more closely with the adjacent Stirchley Baths
- Enhancing the opening hours at Glebe Farm library from the 15 originally proposed to 21 by withdrawing the proposal to replace Kents Moat with a Tier 3 service. As with Stirchley Library this will require community or organisational support.
- The expectation that at least four community sites will offer additional access to some library services under the proposed Tier 4 offer

The consultation exercise and the ambition of working with local communities and partner organisations has therefore been positive and produced some beneficial results.

- 5.4 The City Council currently has 38 main libraries in the city alongside a range of further library services such as the prison library service, mobile library service and library services at home. The 38 main libraries consist of the Library of Birmingham, and then 20 community libraries (open 5 days/ week) and 17 community libraries (open 4 days/week). There is one further community library being run through a partnership with Castle Vale Tenants and Residents Alliance. Of the 38 libraries, two are temporarily closed.
- 5.5 The starting point for the model (Appendix 1, Section 5) was to carry out an assessment using an objective mechanism to prioritise the 37 community libraries (Appendix 1, Section 4). This was undertaken by officers using 11 criteria drawn from library reviews that have taken place in other authorities. In the original proposal all the criteria had an equal weighting, however following consultation this has been amended to provide a higher weighing for deprivation, it now has 50% more weighting than the other 10 criteria.
- 5.6 The authority commenced the consultation exercise with an ambition to maximise the coverage and accessibility of library services across the city. This remains its core principle supported by a number of other concepts behind the model including:
- The library service provision should be prioritised using proven methods used by other library authorities
 - Retaining a local library service with reduced hours is preferable to a closure
 - Libraries should focus on delivering the main outcomes associated with the universal offers:
 - Reading
 - Learning
 - Health
 - Digital
 - Information

With the main libraries offering a wider range of services either delivered through the City Council or by partners.

- Where it is necessary to close a library, additional opening hours and/or services should be offered from a neighbouring library or libraries.
- Where community groups are able to take on the operation of a library, they will be provided with 15 hours a week of operational support from Birmingham City Council library staffing.
- Customers should be encouraged to undertake routine and less complex tasks such as borrowing and returning items themselves with Cabinet already having supported the investment of £824,000 to improve self-service/kiosks in our libraries.
- Library Services do not have to be delivered from the current library buildings, if better property solutions exist and more integrated service provision delivered this will be considered.
- Community involvement will be welcomed in all libraries and all options for working in partnership will be actively considered. A Community Library Partnership has been established for those organisations wanting to support delivery of this approach. The response so far has been heartening with a dozen organisations involved in the last meeting.
- A small pump priming grant totalling £20,000 will be made available for service proposals contributing to the universal offer outcomes.
- Securing investment to modernise the library offer remains a priority.

5.7 The above principles were supported through the consultation exercise and have resulted in the development of a Tiered model of library service delivery.

- Tier 1: Main Library – these would be open for 35 hours, more likely to be delivered from the current library building and have other services delivered from the site such as the benefit verification service. All will have investment in installing self-service equipment. The proposal is for 18 sites to be in this category, with a successful business case for Sutton increasing this to 19.
- Tier 2: Community Library – these would be open for 21 hours, likely to be delivered from the current library building although options may exist to increase hours of operation by working with partners. The proposal is for 10 sites in this category.
- Tier 2/3: These 2 sites would be open for 21 hours but will need the involvement of communities or other organisations to be sustainable.
- Tier 3: Supported Community Library – these would be run by a community organisation, from either their own premises or via a transferred facility. The City Council's library service will work in partnership to support the organisation through 15 hours of operational support, through the provision of books and investment in self service equipment. The proposal is for 6 sites to be in this category.

- Tier 4: Community Initiated Library Services – the proposal under Tier 4 is to ensure that any local schemes put forward that increase access to one of the universal offers (Digital, Learning, Information, Reading and Health) are considered for support i.e. this could be organisations wanting to loan books or providing free internet access etc. There is no proposed number for the local offer this will be dependent on the ideas that come forward and the number that can be supported through the £20,000 small grant budget available or indeed locally members may wish to support through the Local Innovation Fund. Caste Vale Library already delivers under a Tier 4 type approach and Tyburn Ward has initiated a second Tier 4 provision through use of the Local Innovation Fund.

As a result of the consultation process the rigidity of definition of the four tiers and the clarity of distinction between them and indeed areas of overlap have grown. This is detailed further in Appendix 1, but in essence adopts a more flexible approach to ensure we deliver what works best in a specific set of circumstances.

- Library closures: The proposal is that one of the 37 Community Libraries in the city (Kents Moat) should close and that financial sustainability of another site (Sutton Coldfield) will be considered over the next 5 months as partners work together to see if a sustainable solution can be found. If it can't then two libraries will close. Under the revised model it is proposed that Kents Moat Library closes and the previously proposed budget transfer to Glebe Farm Library to increase its opening hours. Sutton Coldfield Library will remain open for up to 5 months whilst a sustainable partnership solution is sought. If a business case is not workable then a report will be forthcoming recommending closure on 31 August 2017.

- 5.8 Sites were originally placed into Tiers 1-3 based on the initial scoring matrix using 11 criteria drawn from reviews that have taken place in other authorities. These have been amended following consultation to reflect feedback regarding the need to weight the criteria measuring deprivation – this has now been increased by 50% see Appendix 1, Section 4.

A map showing the proposed geographical spread is set out in Appendix 1, Section 6

- 5.9 The detail of the proposed model is set out in Appendix 1 however by tiering the service provision and by looking to maximise the opportunities for working with others, whether that be additional service provision, co-location or working alongside local interested organisations, the tiered model offers to protect a wider range of provision than could otherwise have been the case.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

- 6.1 The main alternative options coming forward through the consultation responses were to
- i) Hand over the six Tier 3 sites to the community/other organisations without any support from the city council in order to use that resource in the other 29 libraries
 - ii) Temporarily fund Sutton Library through the capital resources.

Neither of these options were deemed viable alternatives.

	The main alternative options considered at the time of formulation of the October 2016 consultation report were to (a) implement open plus technology/have libraries that can operate in unstaffed mode, (b) to close a number of 'lower priority' libraries across the city, or (c) to deliver the service via a staff led mutual. The initial option appraisal that was completed, suggested that the latter was not a financially viable model in the short term.
6.2	The introduction of a tiered model does not require or preclude the option of a staff led mutual.
7. Reasons for Decision(s):	
7.1	Changes are needed to the community library service in order to address the £1.95m cumulative saving allocated to the service. The model achieves this by working with other organisations in a partnership setting and in doing so maximises the spread of and access to library services across the city. A second phase of transformational change to library services in Birmingham remains necessary and work has been initiated with the Birmingham Innovation Hub to drive this.

Signatures	<u>Date</u>
Cabinet Member	
..... Cllr Ian Ward, Deputy Leader
Chief Officer	
..... Jacqui Kennedy, Acting Strategic Director of Place

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:	
List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):	
1.	Amended Tiered Delivery Model for Libraries in Birmingham
1a	Needs Analysis – Key Performance Indicators
2.	List of consultation sessions
3.	Consultation Analysis
3a	Focus Group Analysis
3b	Children's Survey Analysis
3c	Additional Consultation Comments
3d	Notes of Public Consultation Meetings
3e	Friends of Library of Birmingham Response
3f	Unison Response
3g	Library Lobby Proposal for Sutton Coldfield
4.	Medium Term Financial Plan 2016/17-2019/20
5.	Equality Assessment
5a	Equality Assessment Appendix
6.	Needs Assessment
6a	Map indicating 2 Mile Radius
6b.	Individual Library & Catchment Area Profiles

AMENDED TIERED DELIVERY MODEL FOR LIBRARIES IN BIRMINGHAM

Summary

0.1 The library service in Birmingham needs to design a service that is fit for the 21st Century which is financially sustainable and is underpinned by transformational change to deliver on a modern set of outcomes. To deliver the type of change required will take time and the city council, as part of this change process, has embarked on a comprehensive consultation exercise regarding both its proposals for a Tiered library service as well as the specific implications for this model at each of the councils 37 community library sites.

The response to the model through the consultation exercise has been significant and this is both welcomed and appreciated. The volume, passion, challenge and support contained within the responses have helped to shape the specifics of the model, the detailed proposals at each site and the dialogue that has taken place over the last three months has also created a significant number of opportunities for groups, organisations and the library service to work in partnership to deliver something greater than would have been the case if the council had sought to act alone.

Although this report seeks to conclude the overall model for library services in Birmingham it is inevitable and indeed necessary that the City Council will need to continue to work with and listen to partners at a national level and with organisations and individuals from local communities if it is to maximise the potential of the model and indeed shape the vision for local library services over the next 20 years.

Not every challenge has been resolved, the budget envelope remains a constraint to achieving this. However a flexible approach to the consultation responses alongside an openness to partnership working have resulted not only in some core aspects of the model being secured but also several key modifications to the model being proposed. This model has secured;

- The model retains at least 35 (and potentially 36) of the 37 community libraries in the city and in doing so re-establishes two sites that have been temporarily closed
- The model secures a significantly increased expenditure on books etc than has been the case in previous years. An expenditure budget of £380,000 has been allocated whereas in recent years around £140,000 has been spent.
- The money the council has set aside to repair and maintain its libraries has been increased by £50,000.
- We are investing in technology at our sites which will enable customers to borrow and return books themselves.

And the model has responded to the consultation by making the following key amendments to the original proposals

- Giving an additional weighting to the criteria for deprivation used in the Needs Assessment
- In addition the amended model suspends the decision on the future of Sutton Coldfield Library by up to 5 months. In this time the City Council will work in conjunction with Sutton Coldfield Town Council, the Library Lobby and other partners to see if a sustainable partnership solution can be established within the available resources of all parties.
- The model being considered for Sutton Coldfield Library is based on achieving additional income through property rental if this is achieved in addition to providing a Tier 1 budget for Sutton Coldfield, Library Services at Aston and Glebe Farm would be enhanced and the charge for reservations not progressed. Therefore the amended model suspends the decision on the introduction of reservation charges by up to 5 months.

- Withdrawing the proposal to enhance Birchfield to a Tier 1 site (maintaining it at Tier 2) and utilising the resource released by this alongside anticipated extra rental income from Sutton to run Aston Library as a Tier 3 site
 - Working in partnership with the local community to ensure the sustainability of continuing to deliver library services from the current site at Stirchley as well as seeking to work more closely with the adjacent Stirchley Baths
 - Enhancing the opening hours at Glebe Farm library from the 15 originally proposed to 21 by withdrawing the proposal to replace Kents Moat with a Tier 3 service. As with Stirchley Library this will require community or organisational support
 - The expectation that at least four community sites will offer additional access to some library services under the proposed Tier 4 offer
- 0.2 The consultation has resulted in an amended model for the future operation of community libraries, but this has not negated the need for change from April 2017 which remains necessary as a result of the budget limitations within the City Council. However the need for longer term change and a jointly owned vision for the future of the service are also needed. The revised model, set out in this report, maintains significant library provision and seeks to maximise accessibility and partnership working. In doing so the proposals establish a stable position from which a second phase of service transformation can be progressed. This remains a high priority for the service and the Innovation Hub will be assisting the service in setting out its 20 year vision.
- 0.3 The City Council currently has 38 main libraries in the city alongside a range of further library services such as the prison library service, mobile library service and library services at home. The 38 main libraries consist of the library of Birmingham, and then 20 community libraries (open 5 days/ week) and 17 community libraries (open 4 days/week). In addition to the 38 there is one further library service being run through a partnership with a community organisation at Castle Vale. Of these 38 libraries two of the buildings are closed but in these locations, West Heath and Bloomsbury, an interim level of service is being provided through either the mobile library service or through static provision.
- 0.4 The Library of Birmingham and the Strategic Library Service had substantial savings (£3.1m) to make in 2015/16 and made operational changes last year to put these savings into place. The 37 Community Libraries have a cumulative saving of £1.946m and as a result need to deliver a revised service within a net budget of £4.062m. This report focusses on the first phase of change needed in our Library Service which is driven by the need to deliver the £1.946m saving. It is recognised that a second phase of transformational change is also necessary and the library service is being supported in this work by the Improvement Hub. This will include recombining the two service areas and a designation of a City Chief Librarian.
- 0.5 The starting point for the model has been to carry out an assessment (detailed in section 4 of this report) and to prioritise the 37 community libraries. Following the consultation exercise the 11 criteria used were modified so that one of them, deprivation, was given a 50% increase in weighting whilst the others remained of equal weighting. Applying the criteria resulted in each library being allocated a ranking from 1 to 37 depending on where they scored on the criteria. A similar approach has been used in other local authorities where budget reductions were required.
- 0.6 It has remained the ambition of the authority to maximise the coverage across the city of library services and the model has therefore been developed based around a number of principles. The majority of these principles were tested through the consultation process and the response is set out after each item. The responses to each principle are positive, however the grouping of libraries into the 4 tiers was not supported with 28.5% in agreement but 47.4% disagreeing.

- The library service provision should be prioritised using proven methods used by other library authorities including the need to consider any impacts on equality.
- Libraries should focus on delivering the main outcomes associated with the Society of Chief Librarians' Universal Offers:
 - Reading
 - Learning
 - Health
 - Digital
 - Information
 (69.5% agree, 5.8% disagree)

With the main libraries offering a wider range of services, with these additional service elements either being delivered through the city council or by partners

- Retaining a local library service with reduced hours is preferable to a closure (87.4% agree, 6.3% disagree)
- Where it is necessary to close a library additional opening hours and/or services should be offered from a neighbouring library or libraries. (80.9% agree, 7.4% disagree)
- Where community groups are able to take on the operation of a library, they will be provided with 15 hours a week of operational support from Birmingham City Council library staffing. (73.7% agree, 8.9% disagree)
- Customers should be encouraged to undertake less complicated tasks such as borrowing and returning items themselves – and £824k of investment has been set aside to improve self-service/kiosks in our libraries. (51.5% agree, 27.0% disagree)
- Library Services do not have to be delivered from the current library buildings, if better property solutions exist and more integrated service provision delivered this will be considered. (37.8% agree, 36.2% disagree)
- Community involvement will be welcomed in all libraries and all options for working in partnership will be actively considered. To support this approach a Community Library Partnership has been established for those organisations wanting to support delivery. Small grants will be made available for service proposals contributing to the universal offer outcomes. (49.3% agree, 16.2% disagree that small one-off grants should be available)
- Securing investment to modernise the library offer remains a priority and will be needed within the second phase of transformational change

0.7 The above principles were tested through the consultation process and these principles have resulted in the development of a Tiered model of library service delivery.

- Tier 1: Main Library – these would be open for 35 hours, more likely to be delivered from the current library building and have other services delivered from the site such as the benefit verification service. All will have investment in installing self-service equipment. The proposal is for 18 sites to be in this category. This is one less than the proposals that were originally consulted on as in the original proposal Birchfield was enhanced from a Tier 2 to a Tier 1 as a result of Aston closing. In the revised proposals Aston will remain as a Tier 3 library and therefore Birchfield reverts to its original/non enhanced ranking in Tier 2. However the figure will increase to 19 if the provision at Sutton Coldfield remains.

- Tier 2: Community Library – these would be open for 21 hours, likely to be delivered from the current library building although options may exist to increase hours of operation by working with partners. The proposal is for 10 sites in this category.
 - Tier2/3: Supported Community Library 21 hours – this is a new category of provision which has resulted from the amended weighting given to deprivation and the dialogue with partners. Two libraries now fall in between the scores of a Tier 3 or Tier 2 and as a result their hours will be enhanced to 21 on the basis of engaging community or organisational support in making this option sustainable.
 - Tier 3: Supported Community Library 15 hours– these would be run by a community organisation, from either their own premises or via a leased or transferred facility. The City Council’s library service will work in partnership to support the organisation through a 15 hour worker and through the provision of books and investment in self-service equipment. The proposal is for 5 sites to be in this category.
 - Tier 4: Community Initiated Library Services – the proposal under Tier 4 is to ensure that any local schemes put forward that increase access to one of the universal offers (Digital, Learning, Information, Reading and Health) are considered for support through a one-off pump priming grant. I.e. this could be organisations wanting to loan books or providing free internet access etc. There was no proposed quantity of Tier 4 sites in the original consultation and this will still be dependent on the ideas that come forward and the number that can be supported through the £20,000 small grant budget available. However Castle Vale Library already falls into this category and Tyburn Ward Councillors have supported, through their Local Innovation Fund a ‘Tyburn Pop Up Service’ to include aspects of library provision. There has also been interest from two further organisations and it is therefore likely that 4 sites will fall into this category.
 - Library closures: The revised proposal is that one of the 37 Community Libraries in the city should close (Kents Moat). In addition a decision as to whether or not to close Sutton Coldfield Library will be taken in the next 5 months depending upon whether or not the work subsequently undertaken with partners in Sutton Coldfield can deliver a financially sustainable model. Aston will now remain open as a Tier 3.
- 0.8 Sites have been placed into Tiers 1-3 based on the amended scoring matrix detailed in section 4 of this report. This used 11 criteria drawn from reviews that have taken place in other authorities, with now an enhanced weighting for deprivation. The final tiering was modified to take account of any additional factors at certain sites such as disproportionate costs, proximity etc. A map showing the proposed geographical spread is set out in section 6.
- 0.9 The detail of the proposed model is set out later in this report however by tiering the service provision and by looking to maximise the opportunities for working with others, whether that be additional service provision, co-location or working alongside local interested groups of residents, the tiered model offers to protect a wider range of provision than could otherwise have been the case.
- 0.10 The city council recognises the high level of responses to the consultation that have helped to shape this final report and is of the view that there remains huge potential in working with partners and individuals to explore and develop ideas that will no doubt continue to come forward from individuals, organisations and communities who want to actively engage in the provision of library services in their specific local area. In conclusion to this opening section, it is worth drawing out, that the response from partners in wanting to work with the library service locally has been exceptional and the service is determined to keep this approach to partnerships open and

accessible to all who want to work alongside and in conjunction with libraries. All interested parties can continue to contact the service via communitylibraries@birmingham.gov.uk.

1. Section 1: The Current Library Service in Birmingham

- 1.1 Birmingham City Council has a statutory duty to provide a 'comprehensive and efficient library service' to all those seeking to make use of it, through its responsibility as a statutory Library Authority determined by the 1964 public libraries and museums act.
- 1.2 The library service carries out a statutory role as repository for the City of Birmingham Diocesan Archives and the City of Birmingham's Record Office. The service also ensures the relevance and entitlement for people confined to their home through age, disability, etc or those unable to access services in the usual way.
- 1.3 This duty is discharged through a combination of services including those at the Library of Birmingham, prison, mobile library, the library service at home, and thirty-seven community libraries across the city.
- 1.4 Current service provision across the city consists of:

Library of Birmingham services include lending and reference services, specialist services for children and young people, music library, business library, the city archive and special collections. The Library acts as a gateway to wider services such as business support, job search, health and also supports tourism. The Library provides study space, access to the internet as well as a range of cultural, social and educational activities for residents. The Library of Birmingham is the most visited free attraction outside London with 1.7 million visits p.a.


37 Community Libraries services include both lending and reference services. These libraries attract over 2 million visits p.a. across the sites. In 2015/16 1.59 million books were issued through our Community Libraries. These Libraries, like the Library of Birmingham also provide study space and access to the internet as well as a range of cultural, social and educational activities for residents. The events and cultural activities attracted more than 172,000 attendances throughout the year. Children's activities are delivered at all sites and during the summer of 2015, 7691 children participated in the summer reading challenge.

The Mobile Library serves residents in neighbourhoods, children and families, schools and nurseries, people geographically isolated from existing community library provision, and people with limited transport or limited mobility. The Mobile library service is delivered via a van which moves around the city offering 'stops' for people to obtain and return books as per the timetable on page 8.

Library Services At Home reaches vulnerable residents confined to home through age, disability, long-term illness, frailty or mobility. It provides essential reading and information resources and acts as a gateway to the wider range of Library and City Council services and referrals to other agencies. The Library Service at Home, a van based service which visits vulnerable individuals in their own homes, is currently closed to new entrants.

The Prison Library Service, serves prisoners and their families offering education through access to distance learning, qualifications, literacy and ESOL programmes, recreational reading for prisoners and their families.

- 1.5 A map of current provision is set out overleaf.



Mobile Library Timetable

	WEEKLY - Stops & Visit Times		
Mon	10.00 - 12.00	WEST HEATH : Houlday Road (The Fordreugh end) Temporary from 1st August 2016	
Tues	10.00 - 12.00	BANNERS DATE : Copples View Road	
	2.00 - 2.45	BORDESLEY GREEN : Pretoria Road	
	3.00 - 4.15	SALTLEY : St. Saviours Road	
Thurs	10.00 - 10.30	EDGBASTON : Clark Street	
	10.45 - 12.20	WINSON GREEN : Cavendish Road	
	1.45 - 2.10	EDGBASTON : Bernard Road	
	2.20 - 2.40	EDGBASTON : Gillett Road	
	2.40 - 3.00	EDGBASTON : Selwyn Road	
	3.15 - 4.15	WINSON GREEN : Cuthbert Road	
Fri	10.00 - 12.00	WITTON : Wyrley Road	
	2.00 - 2.30	FALCON LODGE : Churchill Road (Ogley Drive end)	
	2.30 - 4.15	FALCON LODGE : Churchill Road (in lay-by opposite shops)	
FORTNIGHTLY Stops & Visit Times			
Weds	1.00 - 1.30	PINEAPPLE : Wade Lane	
	2.00 - 2.30	HALL GREEN : Robinson Lane	
	3.00 - 4.00	HALL GREEN : Plancher Road	
	8 June 2016	17 August 2016	28 October 2016
	22 June 2016	21 August 2016	8 Nov 2016
	6 July 2016	14 Sept 2016	23 Nov 2016
	20 July 2016	28 Sept 2016	7 Dec 2016
	3 August 2016	12 October 2016	21 Dec 2016

	4 WEEKLY Stops & Visit Times	
Sat	11.00 - 12.30	MANCHESTER : Junction Road
	11.45 - 12.15	MANCHESTER 40010 : Breckingdale
	3.00 - 3.40	MOSSLEY : Forest Road
	3.50 - 4.10	EDGBASTON : BARNES HEATH ROAD
	Saturday 10th June 2016	Saturday 20th October 2016
	Saturday 10th July 2016	Saturday 20th November 2016
	Saturday 10th August 2016	Saturday 2nd December 2016
	Saturday 10th September 2016	Saturday 20th January 2017
Sat	11.00 - 11.30	FYCH : Collyerstone Avenue
	11.30 - 11.45	MODGE HILL : Teesdale Avenue
	11.40 - 12.20	FYCH : Regent/Dobson Road
	2.00 - 3.00	MODGE HILL : Hedger Hill Road
	3.10 - 4.00	MODGE HILL : Heathcote Avenue
	Saturday 4th June 2016	Saturday 24th Sept 2016
	Saturday 2nd July 2016	Saturday 22nd October 2016
	Saturday 9th July 2016	Saturday 14th Nov 2016
	Saturday 27th August 2016	Saturday 17th Dec 2016
	If you are not sure of any of the dates or stops, please ask a member of staff or call us on 454 0171 or 0176 582 3344	

2. Section 2 : National context

- 2.1 The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 is the key statutory document setting out the requirements for the provision of library services and under it Birmingham City Council has a statutory duty to provide a “comprehensive and efficient library service”.
- 2.2 Birmingham City Council is required to ensure that facilities are available for the borrowing of or reference to books, other printed materials, recorded music and films of sufficient number, range and quality to meet the requirements of adults and children. The City Council must also encourage adults and children to make full use of library services, and lend books and other printed materials free of charge to those who live, work or study in the area.
- 2.3 The national debate around what constitutes a “comprehensive and efficient library service” continues especially in the light of the scale of budgetary reductions faced by local authorities.

- 2.4 In 2012 The Parliamentary Select Committee report on Library Closures considered the financial constraints within which local authorities are currently operating and concluded: "It may not be possible or even desirable to retain every existing library building but wholesale closures are unlikely to facilitate an appropriate level of service. The key to ensuring that an adequate – and preferably good – library service is available to the whole population appears to be the retention of a distributed service, in accessible locations, but with the flexibility over whether the service is provided in dedicated library buildings, in other locations, via mobile libraries, or in any other way that best fits local need".
- 2.5 Locality produced a briefing for Arts Council England and the Local Government Association in January 2013 presenting some key research findings about new models of delivering library services with greater community involvement. The report includes some useful case studies showcasing different models in operation across England.
- 2.6 As identified nationally expectations of libraries have and will continue to change. On 18th December 2014 the DCMS Independent Library Report for England was published. The report highlighted the "sustained and severe financial situation" and the "rapid pace of current change" which is impacting on libraries across England.
- 2.6.1 The review asked the following questions:
- What are the core principles of a public library service into the future?
 - Is the current delivery of the public library service the most comprehensive and efficient?
 - What is the role of community libraries in the delivery of a library offer?
- 2.6.2 Sieghart's report outlines his vision for the modern library. His view of libraries included not only offering books and digital, but a place for old people to meet; a place for children to enjoy nursery time and stories; a place for adult education and literacy; for students; and for the unemployed to register for benefits and apply for jobs. "Libraries are one of the last safe, non-judgemental places we have", said Sieghart, "and we need to protect them".
- 2.6.3 In summary, Sieghart's vision for modern libraries is :
1. Establish a professional library body to focus on solutions and best practice.
 2. Set up a national taskforce to make changes and work with local authorities.
 3. Commit to Wi-Fi across the UK.
 4. Provide digital training for librarians.
 5. Move to one Content Management System to celebrate best practise.
 6. Gain Trust and Foundation involvement and support.
 7. Involve community stakeholders in library governance.
 8. Ensure library cards work in all libraries.
 9. Enable library loans across the UK.
 10. Establish a national marketing strategy.
 11. Consider the ability to buy books from libraries.
 12. Work alongside library campaigners.
- 2.7 The Libraries Taskforce was developed following the report and it subsequently set out examples of national good practice in "libraries shaping the future good practice toolkit " (April 2016).

2.7.1 The Libraries Deliver: Ambition for Public Libraries in England 2016-2021 was finally published on the 1st December 2016. The report has been published to support Central and Local government understand the changing role that libraries play in communities. Also how libraries achieve positive outcomes across different policy areas.

The Taskforce's Ambition is for everyone to :

- “choose to use libraries, because they see clear benefits and positive outcomes from doing so.
- understand what library services offer, and how they can make the most of what's available to them
- be introduced to new ideas and opportunities, then given confidence and quick and easy access to tools, skills and information they need to improve their quality of life
- receive trusted guidance through the evolving information landscape and build the skills needed to thrive in a changing world”.

The report focusses on 7 outcomes that libraries support. These also complement the SCL Universal offers and they are :

- cultural and creative enrichment
- increased reading and literacy
- improved digital access and literacy
- helping everyone achieve their full potential
- healthier and happier lives
- greater prosperity
- stronger, more realistic communities

Alongside the publication of the report in collaboration with DCMS the £4 million Libraries: Opportunities for everyone innovation fund has been launched. The funding is aimed to support communities in disadvantaged areas. Section 8.11 details the city council's submission. Furthermore the Taskforce will also support councils to consider the use of different delivery models to deliver or co-deliver their library service and where there is a need they will also support the development of public service mutuals. The taskforce will also be delivering a number of master classes to support the profession.

The publication of the “Libraries shaping the future toolkit” which provided details of enhancing income streams within community libraries. In addition to this and working with the Office for Civil Society and Innovation (OCSI), further funding streams for community libraries will be developed.

Finally the Taskforce has committed to producing an action plan and six monthly progress reports.

2.7.2 Prior to issuing the above document the National Library Taskforce has stated “We understand and accept that authorities are having to make difficult decisions in light of their limited budgets but, if short-term savings really are required, it needs to be clear how the proposals developed sit alongside - and in the context of - the overall strategic direction of travel and a future-facing vision. They should not prejudice longer-term ambitions.”

- 2.7.3 This National policy context has been developing over time and has been influential in shaping the model we consulted on and that now set out in sections 5 and 6 of this report. Meeting the statutory requirements and delivering change in the context of the emerging national policy is of paramount importance. The model avoids wholesale closures and is focussed on retaining a distributed accessible service. We have looked at other models and learned from best practice and from what our users, local communities and partners are telling us.

3. Section 3 : Birmingham Context

- 3.1 Over the last 5 years parts of the service have already undergone significant change.
- 3.2 Strategic Library Services and the Library of Birmingham have recently been restructured and since 2014-15 have delivered savings amounting to £3.1m. Opening hours at the Library of Birmingham were initially reduced from 73 to 40 per week and 119 fte posts have been lost. Consequentially there was a reduction in public access to archives and collections and a reduction in events and exhibitions. However with the Brasshouse Language Centre (Adult Education) being relocated on to the first floor of the Library of Birmingham it has been possible to launch the “LoB Express” service thereby increasing access to the lending library, study space and computers, enabling the ground floor of the building to be re-opened from 9am to 9pm on weekdays extending access to library resources by 26 hours a week.
- 3.3 The Strategic Library Services continue to be responsible for city stock policy and bibliographic services providing access across the city to databases, book stock and music, citywide library IT contracts and the reservation service.
- 3.4 The Library of Birmingham and the 37 community libraries now come under the single management of the Place Directorate within the City Council. Further work will take place in 2017 under the transformation agenda to create greater synergies between all the library services offered by the Council and as a result the line management of community libraries and the Library of Birmingham will be combined with the formal nomination of a post as Chief Librarian.
- 3.5 Birmingham has 37 Community Libraries, of which one at West Heath is temporarily closed (with a mobile library stop introduced) and Bloomsbury operating temporarily from a static bus. The 37 libraries have been run by 112.48 full time equivalent staff. A saving of £1.946m has been set for the service.
- 3.6 The library service in Birmingham needs to design a service fit for the 21st Century which is financially sustainable and is underpinned by transformational change to deliver on a modern set of outcomes. To deliver the type of change required will take time and the city council will need to work with and listen to partners at a national level and with organisations and individuals from local communities. The next stage of change will therefore involve a range of expert input which is being co-ordinated and driven by the Innovation Hub.
- 3.7 In the meantime this paper brings forward plans to as to how the community libraries can operate within its future budget level of £4.062m.

4. **Section 4 : Prioritisation Via a Needs Assessment and the Establishment of Principles for the Model**

- 4.1 This section sets out the amended methodology used to prioritise the community library service and then details the principles which have been applied to build a sustainable approach to the provision of library services in the city.
- 4.2 **Prioritisation using proven methodology:** The starting point for the model has been to carry out an assessment and prioritise the 37 community libraries. The prioritisation excludes the Library of Birmingham and also Castle Vale as this is no longer directly run by the City Council.
- 4.3 The report on library closures published in November 2012 by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport recommended that local authorities look to the Charteris Report for guidance in approaching an assessment of local needs. The Report was published in 2009 following the Department for Culture Media and Sport inquiry into Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council's plan to close 11 libraries.
- 4.4 For Birmingham to maintain high quality and sustainable community library services within the available budget, the considerations of the Charteris Report have been applied as part of the review of community library provision across the city. A method of assessing need/viability was developed to look at how well libraries are positioned to meet the needs of local communities. The assessment was undertaken using data from 11 indicators which represented considerations suggested in the Charteris Report and this was a similar approach to work done by other local authorities when assessing need. Libraries were then ranked from 1 to 37 (excluding Castle Vale but including West Heath and Bloomsbury) on each of these indicators which then led to a combined score to demonstrate their viability for service provision going forward.
- 4.5 The 11 criteria listed below were used to rank the 37 community libraries.
1. Population of library catchment area
 2. Total children and young people aged 0-19 in the library catchment area
 3. Total adults aged 65+ in the library catchment area
 4. Number of libraries within 2 miles of a library
 5. Total books and other items issued
 6. Average Index of Multiple Deprivation score
 7. Total visits
 8. Cost per visit
 9. PC Usage
 10. Total attendance at activities and events
 11. Building performance (sites scored better if had recent investment or were new build)
- 4.6 The needs analysis captures data from a variety of sources to reflect the criteria around need/viability (see Appendix 1a of this report and Appendix 6). Data from 2015/16 was used – apart from when a library was closed during this year, in which case the last full year's data set available was used.
- 4.7 All the criteria initially had an equal weighting, but feedback through the consultation process suggested that an elevated weighting should be attached to deprivation. As a result the weighting for deprivation has been increased from equal to 1.5 times the other 10 criteria.

- 4.8 Demographic data includes resident population, proportion of children and young people aged 0-19 living in the catchment area of the library.
- 4.9 The Index of multiple deprivation includes income deprivation; employment deprivation; health deprivation and disability; education deprivation; crime deprivation; barriers to housing and services deprivation; and living environment deprivation.
- 4.10 Access to other libraries includes the number of other libraries within a 2 miles radius of the library. Walking distance according to Google Maps.
- 4.11 Library performance data captures visits, active users, items issued, participation in events and learning activity.
- 4.12 Library financial data is a cost per visit. The calculation is based on the out turn budget figure for each site in 2015/16 divided by the number of visits. Where anomalies have been identified (as they were through the consultation in Sutton) amended figures have been used.
- 4.13 Building Quality rank is dependent on level of investment received in the last 10 years and the level of investment needed in the next 10 years.
- 4.14 A high ranking suggests there is a lower level of need/viability for a library based on a particular indicator. Where a catchment area has a high level of deprivation a library will have a low score because there is more need for its services. Libraries that have good performance in terms of visits, issues, IT usage, membership, attendance at events and activities will have low scores because there is evidence of viability and need through the uptake of services. Buildings that are costly to operate or require investment through refurbishment will have higher scores for this indicator.
- 4.15 As libraries often draw their catchment from across ward and city boundaries, the catchment areas were created by including any *Lower Super Output Areas* (LSOAs) where a defined percentage of the resident population (3%) used the library service in a 12 month period. They have an average of roughly 1,700 residents and 650 households. Measures of proximity (to give a reasonably compact shape) and social homogeneity (to encourage areas of similar social background) are also included. The catchment area data reflects usage of the library service.
- 4.16 The individual library and catchment area profiles (see Appendix 6b) give detailed demographic data on age and gender. Data on economic activity, educational attainment, and health was also included as well as identifying those LSOAs ranked as the most deprived in the (national) Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). All major bus/train routes serving the library catchment areas were identified.
- 4.17 All rankings have been combined to give an overall score, which indicates how well libraries are aligned to meeting the needs of the local community and library users, and the longer term viability of the building.
- 4.18 The detailed breakdown in scoring for each library is set out below and this plus other information has been used to develop a model that is financially sustainable.

Need Analysis: Libraries ranked on key indicators

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Community Library	Population of library catchment area	No. of children and young people 0-19 in library catchment area	No. of people aged 65+ in library catchment area	Number of libraries within 2 miles of library	Total items issued	PC usage (in hours)	Total library visitors	Cost per visit	Average IMD score for the library catchment area (amended to be 1.5x)	Participation in events and educational sessions	Building Performance	Combined score	Ranking (revised)
EDGBASTON													
Bartley Green	29	29	26	9	32	36	35	34	33	16	28	307	34
Harborne *	11	18	7	19	3	8	11	7	48	11	10	153	11
Quinton	14	14	10	9	7	19	18	12	37.5	19	20	179.5	17
ERDINGTON													
Castle Vale **													
Erdington	2	4	5	1	10	10	12	21	24	8	28	125	9
HALL GREEN													
Balsall Heath	15	9	24	9	12	7	7	11	3	6	20	123	8
Hall Green	7	5	6	19	4	29	6	8	43.5	3	20	150.5	10
Kings Heath	5	6	4	19	2	11	2	3	42	10	1	105	3
Sparkhill	4	3	16	19	5	9	4	1	21	7	28	117	5
HODGE HILL													
Shard End	26	23	23	19	27	15	19	2	13.5	5	1	173.5	16
Ward End	1	1	8	1	8	12	15	13	16.5	12	10	97.5	2
LADYWOOD													
Aston	21	15	28	19	29	22	27	22	4.5	29	1	217.5	20
Birchfield	20	16	29	19	22	14	24	33	18	26	1	222	21
Bloomsbury	33	31	36	9	37	37	37	36	1.5	32	38	327.5	35
Small Heath	3	2	15	9	9	6	3	10	6	25	9	97	1
Spring Hill	34	34	34	19	31	13	23	29	10.5	27	10	264.5	26
NORTHFIELD													
Frankley	35	35	33	1	35	33	25	18	15	9	20	259	25
Kings Norton***	18	20	14	1	15	28	17	5	36	18	1	173	15
Northfield	9	10	3	1	6	3	10	16	40.5	13	10	121.5	7
Weoley Castle	16	17	11	19	18	18	13	15	31.5	23	10	191.5	18
West Heath*****	30	32	27	0	24	17	28	20	39	34	38	289	33
PERRY BARR													
Handsworth	13	11	20	19	21	2	16	23	12	21	9	167	14
Kingstanding	24	21	19	9	23	25	21	25	25.5	37	10	239.5	23
Perry Common	28	27	30	9	25	16	22	26	22.5	15	20	240.5	24

Tower Hill	25	25	22	1	26	23	32	24	45	36	20	279	29
------------	----	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	----

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Community Library	Population of library catchment area	No. of children and young people 0-19 in library catchment area	No. of people aged 65+ in library catchment area	Number of libraries within 2 miles of library	Total items issued	PC usage (in hours)	Total library visitors	Cost per visit	Average IMD score for the library catchment area	Participation in events and educational sessions	Building Performance	Combined score	Ranking
SELLY OAK													
Druids Heath*****	32	33	31	9	30	24	26	27	19.5	35	1	267.5	27=
Selly Oak	36	37	35	19	33	31	34	37	49.5	31	35	377.5	37
Stirchley	22	24	21	19	19	27	30	30	46.5	20	28	286.5	31=
Yardley Wood	17	19	18	19	16	26	9	17	28.5	4	20	193.5	19
SUTTON COLDFIELD													
Boldmere	19	22	9	9	20	35	31	32	52.5	28	10	267.5	27=
Mere Green	8	13	2	1	1	21	14	9	55.5	22	10	156.5	12
Sutton Coldfield	6	8	1	9	11	3	5	31	51	17	20	162	13
Walmley	23	26	17	1	17	32	20	4	54	33	10	237	22
YARDLEY													
Acocks Green	10	7	12	19	14	5	8	6	27	1	1	110	4
Glebe Farm	31	30	32	19	34	33	29	19	7.5	24	28	286.5	31=
Kents Moat	37	36	37	19	36	30	36	35	9	30	35	340	36
Sheldon	27	28	25	19	28	20	33	28	34.5	14	28	284.5	30
South Yardley	12	12	13	19	13	1	1	14	30	2	1	118	6

Ranking Description	
1	Rank 1 = high number means more people within the local community so higher need
2	Rank 1 = high number means a higher proportion of C & YP in the area so higher need
3	Rank 1 = high number means a higher proportion of older people in the area so higher need
4	Rank 1 = low number means fewer alternative libraries in the vicinity so higher need
5	Rank 1 = high number of items borrowed from the library
6	Rank 1 = high number of hours PC usage means higher need
7	Rank 1 = high number of library visitors means higher viability
8	Rank 1 = low cost means higher viability
9	Rank 1 = highest level of deprivation
10	Rank 1 = high volume of participation in sessions means higher need
11	Rank 1 = low score means that building has had high level of refurbishment/new build so higher viability as less work required
12	Low ranking number = increased viability/need. High ranking number = lower level of need viability

Harborne closed for 5 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 weeks as per model.*

*Castle Vale** no longer run by BCC therefore data not included*

*Kings Norton*** closed for 14 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week model*

*Druids Heath **** closed for 2 week during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week model*

*West Heath***** data from 2012/13 the last full year that West Heath was open*

- 4.19 The ambition of the authority has been to maximise the coverage of library services across the city. The prioritisation exercise helps to shape a model and enables a considered approach to populating it however in developing the model there have also been some key principles established.
- 4.20 **Outcomes:** Birmingham Community Libraries needs to transform the delivery of the Community Library network to become more efficient and able to deliver on the council's priorities whilst also delivering on the main outcomes associated with the Society of Chief Librarians' Five Universal Offers. All libraries will offer services linked to Reading, Learning, Health, Digital and Information. The main libraries (Tier 1) will offer a wider range of services either delivered through the city council or by partners.
- **Reading:** to encourage reading for pleasure, creating learning and reading opportunities for all ages. To improve the wellbeing of children, young people and families by providing activities and free resources to encourage reading for pleasure and learning in order to raise educational achievement and personal development.
 - **Learning:** to encourage learning opportunities for families' especially intergenerational learning using digital technology. Libraries are about creating, making and connecting communities (coding clubs, oral history, cooking and knitting). Supporting the local economy through resources and courses for independent, formal and informal learners; providing opportunities for support around jobs and skills.
 - **Health:** enables libraries to be trusted non-clinical spaces, where health and well-being partners can engage with local people. Community libraries have stock to support health using quality assured lists. Support for mental health through book stock (Reading Well) and providing health and well-being activity promoting resilience, learning and engagement. To improve the wellbeing of older people through resources and activities that meet social, information and educational needs.
 - **Digital:** Community libraries provide free Wi-Fi access to the internet in all sites as well as professionally trained library staff. There are on-line library services and a 24/7 virtual library presence.
 - **Information:** supports information in life critical areas (careers, health, money, benefits) and brings together government and non– government material which is carefully vetted information delivering a level of quality assurance to the user.
- 4.21 **Retaining libraries:** The authority continues to prefer to retain a library service, even though this may mean reduced hours of operation, as opposed to wholesale closures. It recognises that this is not possible in all cases due to budgetary constraints, operational effectiveness, and premises related issues.

- 4.22 **Compensating closures with additional access nearby:** Where it proves necessary to implement library closures a clear reasoning is set out as to why this course of action is required. In these cases the authority will prioritise increasing opening hours and the service offer from a neighbouring library.
- 4.23 **Community Groups and Organisations wanting to work in partnership will be supported:** Where groups are able to take on the operation of a library, they will be provided with 15 hours a week of operational support from Birmingham City Council library staffing. Books and IT will also be provided. Tier 3 libraries need to find new ways to work in partnership.
- 4.24 **Staff time spent on the issue and return of books can be reduced through self-service:** All 13 Library Authorities in the West Midlands have a comprehensive system of self issue machines. Birmingham has lagged behind others. Although experience in Birmingham has shown 81% of issues/renewals/returns can be achieved through self-service kiosks only four sites achieve a figure more than 11%. Customers should be encouraged to undertake less complicated tasks such as borrowing and returning items themselves – and £824k of investment has been set aside to improve self-service/kiosks in our libraries
- 4.25 **All delivery locations should be considered:** Library Services do not have to be delivered from the current library buildings, if better property solutions exist and more integrated service provision can be delivered then this should be considered. The authority has signed up to the concepts of ‘open for learning’ and ‘one public estate’ and will explore all opportunities that emerge to co-locate and integrate services where there is benefit to service users.
- 4.26 **Community involvement will be welcomed in all libraries and all options for working in partnership will be actively considered:** To support this approach a Community Library Partnership has been established for those organisations wanting to support delivery. Small one-off grants will be made available for service proposals (Tier 4) which contribute to the universal offer outcomes.
- 4.27 **Prioritising investment in the service:** Resource constraints have resulted in a reactive approach to funding issues as they arise in the service. The business model has not been able to resolve this but has allocated an initial additional £50,000 to the repairs & maintenance budget. This will not be sufficient in itself to deliver the transformational change needed in the service, and other innovative ways to achieve this will have to be explored as part of a second phase of change. Investment of £250,000 was secured through the Wolfson Foundation which has dramatically improved the children’s library section in five libraries in the city, community and local organisations are also offering to deliver physical improvements as part of their offer to work with the council in partnership. It has also been possible, through the City Council’s recently launched Local Innovation Fund for groups to generate further innovative solutions through their wards to support and invest in the library service beyond the ideas set out in this report.

5. **Section 5: Our Ambition for a Sustainable Library Service Through the new Tiered Library Model**

- 5.1 Our vision is for a city wide integrated Library Service that works with our communities to achieve maximum accessibility to library services through a variety of means. Community libraries will focus on the outcomes of Reading, Learning, Health, Digital and Information as set out in the Society of Chief Librarians’ Universal Offers.

- 5.2 We are proposing to reshape the delivery of Birmingham Library Services into Tiers. The main Library offer will be delivered through the Library of Birmingham and Tier 1 and Tier 2 libraries which will be managed and delivered by Birmingham City Council.
- 5.3 All of these libraries will continue to be supported through the Community Library pages of the Library of Birmingham website and provide an online service.
- 5.4 All libraries will have library stock and access to city wide stock through the reservation service.

5.5 **Tiers**

5.5.1 **Tier 1 libraries**

Under the proposals there will be 18 Tier 1 libraries in the City, this increases to 19 with the inclusion of Sutton Coldfield. These libraries will be enhanced to provide the widest range of services. They will be open for 35 hours per week and the consultation process and ongoing dialogue will assist in defining the specific times of operation. All these libraries will operate in a staffed mode for 35 hours but a pilot is being initiated in one location to test whether there is scope to further enhance opening hours beyond the 35 hour offer, using open-plus technology to offer additional 'unstaffed' hours of opening. Tier 1 sites may have partner agencies based within them; they will have the greatest capacity for sharing spaces with partners. The Libraries will be supported by having a professionally qualified Librarian leading the team.

A Tier 1 Library will feature:

A Children's Library delivering a range of children's activities, including trained staff in storytelling techniques and creative storytelling.

Regular under five activities.

A community space with the potential to share space with partners.

Internet access and Wi-Fi

Library stock which customers can borrow and return to any library

Access to city wide stock through the reservation system

Trained and knowledgeable staff

A wide range of events and regular activities

Support with using computers

Delivery of SCL Universal offers

Self-service terminals to reserve, issue and return stock.

Volunteers to support the delivery of the service.

5.5.2 **Tier 2 libraries**

Under the proposals there will be 10 Tier 2 libraries and they will need to cater for the diverse neighbourhoods within Birmingham by creating a tailor made offer to local communities. The Libraries will be supported by having a professional qualified Librarian leading the team. They will be open for 21 hours per week and the consultation process will assist in defining the specific times of operation

They will be open for 21 hours per week, and offer:

Regular under-fives activities.
 A community space with the potential to share space with partners.
 Internet access and Wi-Fi
 Library stock which customers can borrow and return to any library
 Access to city wide stock through the reservation system
 Trained and knowledgeable staff
 Delivery of SCL Universal offers
 A wide range of events and regular activities
 There will be an improvement in the number of these libraries that have self-service terminals to reserve, issue and return stock .
 Volunteers to support the delivery of the service.

5.5.3 Tier 2/3 Libraries

These hybrid libraries have come about as a result of the consultation feedback. Alterations to the weighting given to deprivation have resulted in two libraries scoring equally and being either at the top end of Tier 3 or the bottom end of Tier 2. Instead of sticking rigidly to the original model it is proposed that a hybrid solution is used.

Tier 2/3 libraries will be open for the same time as Tier 2 libraries but will require community or partner involvement in order to be sustainable. The Council will be looking to work in partnership with local communities or other organisations in the city to support the provision of library services in these locations. This will include volunteers undertaking library duties in order to achieve enhanced opening hours.

The delivery model may be through the council and supported by the partner or through the partner and supported by the council. The expectation will be that whichever way the relationship works – the library service will be accessible for 21 hours each week.

The specifics for the two libraries falling into this category are set out in section 6.

5.5.4 Tier 3 Libraries

These Libraries will be professionally supported by Birmingham City Council but led by local communities and volunteers. The Council will be looking to work in partnership with local communities or other organisations in the city to provide library services in these locations. This will include volunteers undertaking library duties in order to achieve enhanced opening hours.

As part of the partnership the council will offer 15 hours of professional staff support per week. The City Council will provide access to the Library Management system, through a self-service terminal, training and support through a parent Tier 1 Library. Consideration will also be given to Community Asset Transferring the building from which the library currently operates. This option gives community organisations the opportunity to lead, manage and deliver their Library Service. Tier 3 libraries will provide the opportunity for community organisations to maintain or introduce services to meet local demand.

Will provide a focus for the local community

Other services as led by community needs

Volunteer support to deliver the offer

Social space

Self-service access to borrow, return and reserve stock from the city's libraries

The City Council has worked with a range of organisation in Birmingham that have shown an interest in working in partnership to deliver Tier 3 library services (see section 6 and 7).

5.5.5 Tier 4 Libraries

This will be a very localised and specific response, to support new activity around library service provision. Birmingham City Council will seek to support local communities by way of a one off grant to deliver library provision from a new community venue. This may be a community wanting to deliver something that supports the existing delivered service or one or more of the five universal offers.

- 5.5.5 It has also been possible, through the City Council's recently launched Local Innovation Fund for groups to generate further innovative solutions through their wards to support the library service offer beyond the ideas set out in this report.

5.6 Library closures –

- 5.6.1 The revised proposal is that one of the 37 Community Libraries in the city should close (Kents Moat). In addition a decision as to whether or not to close Sutton Coldfield Library will be taken in the next 5 months depending upon whether or not the subsequent work undertaken with partners in Sutton Coldfield can deliver a financially sustainable model.

6. Section 6: Changes to the Tiered Library offer following consultation

- 6.1 The original proposals based on the original prioritisation exercise were consulted on over a 12 week period. This process gathered views from at least 74 meetings/sessions and saw the submission of 1947 questionnaire responses on the Be Heard database and 1675 further responses to the children's survey.

During the public meetings a clear message came across that the council should consider a greater weighting to one of the criteria (deprivation) used in the ranking/needs assessment. As a result the weighting for this criteria has been increased to 1.5 times that of the other 10 criteria and the model re-run. This has resulted in libraries receiving different overall scores and a change in the individual rankings. The change however has not resulted in substantial change between the libraries and the allocation to a particular Tier, although it has resulted in a hybrid offer between Tier 2 and Tier 3.

- 6.2 The table below sets out the ranking and the Tier into which each library has been allocated.

In addition to the above consideration which is applicable to the entire model, the consultation process also obtained a significant number of responses regarding the original proposals for specific libraries. These views (by site) and the response to them is set out below

- 6.2.1 The table also summarises the potential for working in partnership with others. The City Council is keen to maximise the potential from all the partnership and joint working ideas that have come forward through this consultation exercise and hopes that over time more partnerships will develop at these and other sites in the city.

A. Sutton Coldfield Library

The original proposal for Sutton Coldfield Library was to close it.

There have been five petitions submitted during the consultation period regarding Sutton Coldfield Library.

1242 people stating that instead of closing Royal Sutton Coldfield's Town Library to retain library provision in the town centre as part of a multi-use community hub or other facility.

2781 people opposing any proposal to close Sutton Coldfield Library and calling on the City council to make a commitment to fund a future library resource in Sutton.

868 people calling on the City Council to reverse their decision to close Sutton Coldfield library and impose severe cutbacks to other library services in the city. It also called on Sutton Coldfield Town Council to oppose the cuts to library services.

63 people calling on the City Council to stop the cuts to library services in Sutton Coldfield

957 people calling on the Labour Council to stop the cuts to local library services and ensure that a library service remains in Sutton Coldfield town centre.

In a question to City Council on 10th January 2017 The Friends of the Library of Birmingham summarised four main issues that the public had raised with the model, one of them being around Sutton Coldfield. They stated that *"The main public responses to the proposed new model for community libraries were strong opposition to.....and failure to allow sufficient time for the town of Sutton Coldfield to prepare a proposal for an alternative to closure of its library."*

At the Sutton Coldfield Focus Group (Appendix 3a) concern was also expressed about the capacity of Mere Green to handle the additional customer demand, car parking and public transport being poor.

The library lobby submitted a response to the proposal to close Sutton Coldfield library (attached in Appendix 3g) commenting on the model, the criteria used, the costs of running Sutton Library and the premises. It also put forward a proposal as to how a Tier 1 library could be retained within the Red Rose Centre

Sutton Coldfield Town Council adopted two motions:

8/11/16 "This Council unequivocally condemns BCC's proposals for the future of the library services across Birmingham which have disproportionately reduced the quantity and quality of services allocated to Sutton Coldfield and their refusal to be flexible and accommodate change of date to enable full input from Royal Sutton Coldfield Town Council at the consultation meeting. We call on BCC to revise the proposals to restore a fairer allocation of library resources for Sutton Coldfield. We believe this should entail retaining a modernised form of library service with Sutton Coldfield, which could also involve a civic hub, bringing together other services for example the register office, tourist information, café, merchandising sales and museum services linked to the historic library collection. Sutton Coldfield Town Council resolves to take a leading role and demand full consultation from BCC and will collaborate with BCC, community groups and local businesses to seek to bring about this better proposal."

24/1/17 "This Council has previously expressed support for the retention of a modernized library service within Sutton Coldfield town centre. Neither a location nor funding have yet been secured. In a recent conversation between Birmingham City Council and Cllr Ewan Mackey it was stated that £360,000 was required to keep Sutton Town Centre Library open. This Council therefore resolves to consider the allocation of up to £150,000 from the unallocated portion of its 2016/17 budget, to use if necessary to support the continued provision of a library service in the town centre after 1 April 2017 and for Councillors Pears, Mackey and S Ward to meet with the Deputy Leader of Birmingham City Council & relevant officers in the soonest mutually convenient time to enable a long-term solution to be finalised."

As a result of the consultation feedback and the second Town Council motion the position now being set out is that a period of up to 5 months will be utilised to make a decision as to whether or not to close Sutton Coldfield Library. The decision will be dependent upon whether or not the subsequent work undertaken with partners in Sutton Coldfield can deliver a financially sustainable model.

Sutton Coldfield Library was refurbished in 2012/13 this enabled the Library service to reconfigure on to the first floor. The second floor was occupied by the Registrar's office, Neighbourhood office and Sutton Coldfield District office all of which have now vacated the building.

Since the refurbishment of the Library there have been on-going issues with the building including a number of leaks and other maintenance issues. The Library has historic running costs of £575,000 which is more than 5 times the average running cost proposed for Tier 1 libraries in the future at £107,000 per annum. Although ranked 13th in the model these disproportionate running costs and the ability to extend hours at Mere Green, resulted in the proposed closure.

Historically the City Council has been tied to a long term lease for this library which has limited its ability to reduce delivery costs however it has recently been released from this due to the Council itself embarking on the purchase of the Red Rose Centre. This purchase has enabled the possibility of partners coming together in the area to consider whether or not a library service can be retained within the Town Centre within the resources available to partners.

Sutton Coldfield Town Council has set aside a one off budget of up to £150,000 which, if agreement is reached to utilise this, would secure the operational costs of running the library for up to 5 months by which point an ongoing financial solution would need to have been identified.

B. **Aston & Birchfield Libraries**

These libraries are the two that are closest together in the city. Birchfield Library is only 0.7 miles away from Aston and a 15-20 minute walk and it has recently had a substantial investment creating a new children's library, community room and kitchen facilities. Therefore Birchfield Library is able to offer a range of Library activities in a fit for purpose space. Aston Library occupies a relatively expensive space within a building, that has an uncertain future as it is not owned by the city council – although in a positive development since the consultation was launched the building is no longer up for sale.

It was originally proposed to close Aston Library.

In a question to City Council on 10th January 2017 The Friends of the Library of Birmingham summarised four main issues that the public had raised with the model, one of them being around Aston Library. They stated that *"The main public responses to the proposed new model for community libraries were strong opposition to the closure of the library service in Aston."*

At the Aston Focus Group (Appendix 3a) concern was also expressed about the capacity of Birchfield to be able to cope with the increased demand and in particular the availability of PCs as well as concerns over the safe travel of children from Aston to Birchfield.

During the consultation a proposition was put forward to share the resources available in the model between the two library sites at Aston and Birchfield.

A petition with 841 signatories stated 'We the undersigned oppose the closure of Aston Library. We do not accept that Birchfield Library will provide an adequate service for the two communities which currently use the two separate libraries. Removing Aston Library will mean that many people, including disabled people, the elderly and schoolchildren, will lose regular and easy access to this essential facility. We therefore ask the City Council to withdraw the proposal to close Aston Library and instead to continue to provide adequate library services at both Aston and Birchfield, if necessary by providing a Tier 2 library service in each location rather than a Tier 1 service in Birchfield and nothing in Aston.'

The option of utilising the resources allocated to Birchfield and Aston libraries in different ways has been considered, however the resource is not sufficient to run both libraries as a Tier 2. It has been possible to achieve a financially sustainable solution by reverting Birchfield to a Tier 2 site (21 hours) and using the resource released to offer Aston as a Tier 3 site. In the medium term this would mean working with a local partner to develop a solution, with the preferred option being a partnership arrangement with the Fire Service within their planned redevelopment of fire station for community/heritage purposes. However in the short term a 10-12 hour service targeted at children/after school can be delivered directly by the city council from the current premises at Aston. This will require the service to relocate within the current Adult Education building to an area available 4-6pm weekdays (and possibly a further 2 hours on a Saturday morning) providing a targeted service for children, homework, IT and family learning sessions with Adult Education

The current Aston Library would therefore close and relocate as a Tier 3 site when the community/heritage development of the fire station takes place or if this is not possible an alternative Tier 3 provision would be identified.

As a result of the above Birchfield will become a Tier 2 library operating for 21 hours per week.

C. **Glebe Farm and Kents Moat Libraries**

The public consultation responses showed considerable support for Glebe Farm library – this was coupled with the concerns around levels of deprivation in the area, a lack of community organisations to take on the running of a Tier 3 library, the number of bus journeys to the next nearest library and a lack of community facilities for local people in the area.

Two petitions were received regarding the original proposals for Glebe Farm Library

177 people wanting to ensure that the Library is not closed and is kept within the community's possession for the whole community to use.

504 people opposing any proposal to asset transfer Glebe Farm Library out of the City Council and possible closure.

In a question to City Council on 10th January 2017 The Friends of the Library of Birmingham summarised four main issues that the public had raised with the model, one of them being around Glebe Farm. They stated that *"The main public responses to the proposed new model for community libraries were strong opposition to the.....failure to provide a Tier 2 library service in Glebe Farm."*

The matter was also discussed at Yardley District Committee on 26th January 2017 where the following motion was passed *"As no location has been found for a library at the Poolway, Yardley District Committee believes that the 15 hour support earmarked for there should go to Glebe Farm Library, which should become a Tier 2 library. The community in Stechford needs and deserves its own library, with its future secured"*

Prior to the district committee motion two propositions had already emerged during the consultation;

- Not re-providing Kents Moat library as a Tier 3 and instead redirecting this resource to enhance the offer from Glebe Farm
- A combination of individuals and organisations (Friends of Glebe Farm Library, Welcome Change CIC, Spitfire Advice and Support Services and the Pioneer Group including Compass Support) working together to develop a proposal to work with the council to offer services from Glebe Farm Library. The partnership is targeting opening hours of 30+ if enough volunteers can be activated.

It is felt that both of these propositions can work together. The proposals for the organisations to operate from Glebe Farm library should be supported and the city council should work with these groups (with the additional resource available) to ensure that there is a library service available for 21 hours/week instead of the 15 hours/week originally proposed. This would still operate under the principles of Tier 3 but with enhanced hours.

This proposition would also align with the principles set out earlier in this report which states, *where it is necessary to close a library additional opening hours and/or services should be offered from a neighbouring library or libraries*. In this case Kents Moat would be closing and additional opening hours provided through the neighbouring library of Glebe Farm.

Kents Moat Library is due to be demolished as part of the redevelopment of the Poolway. It is ranked 36th and although it was originally proposed that this should be replaced by a Tier 3 service – the public consultation process has identified that the resources from this site would be better placed supporting additional hours at Glebe Farm (ranked =31st). Kents Moat is therefore proposed to close.

D. **Stirchley and Selly Oak Libraries and Bournville Hub**

During consultation responses have been received regarding the symbiotic relationship between the two city council libraries at Stirchley and Selly Oak. With Selly Oak library moving to a Tier 3 provision, most likely in the Sense building then this will provide a service offer more focused around children, top titles etc and respondents felt that the space afforded within Stirchley Baths would not be large enough for the demand that may move from Selly Oak to Stirchley.

There have also been queries raised about whether or not the resultant vacant site at Stirchley would be attractive for alternative use or would lay dormant.

There is merit in the above arguments but also considerable risk attached to the likely future maintenance costs at Stirchley Library. It is highly likely that a sizeable repair bill will occur in the coming years (indeed the boiler is in need of replacement now) and the scale of investment could be unaffordable within the £150,000 repairs and maintenance budget set aside for the city. If the facility were to be co-located with the Stirchley Baths this scenario of unsustainable repairs would be much reduced.

However the Save Stirchley Library Group/Friends of Stirchley Library Group has submitted a proposal set out its willingness to volunteer and fund raise and it is proposed that the city council work with this group on the basis that the city council believes that a focus for the group should be fundraising for repairs/maintenance if we are to reduce the risk of closure through future repairs issues.

It is also proposed that the city council continue to look at joint working with Stirchley Baths to see what synergies exist and therefore there remains an expectation that elements of the library service can be delivered from the Baths setting – such as children’s activity sessions and top titles.

It should also be recognised that Bournville Hub have expressed an interest in offering aspects of a library service – and although the detail is yet to be defined there is a high likelihood that as a result it will fall within the Tier 4 category.

E. Bloomsbury Library

Bloomsbury Library has been operating a temporary service from a static vehicle on the car park at ‘the POD’. It is proposed that the city council provide an element of financial support (secured from the release of assets in the area) to extend the current building from which ‘the POD’ operates to include a café and library space.

The current temporary service should cease from 1 April 2017 and instead either the mobile library service will stop at the site once a week or an interim arrangement will be put in place from within the POD until the extension is built.

F. West Heath/Oddingley Library

West Heath Library has been closed for several years – in recent months the mobile library service has been stopping in the area once per week.

The consultation response has not captured any significant response against the original proposal and a previous consultation exercise placing Oddingley Hall as the preferred location was consulted on in March 2016. At the time the response led to the conclusion that Oddingley Hall was the best solution.

Although Hampstead House has stated that it may be able to make more space available in its building than was the case back in late 2015/early 2016, there has not been the submission of a business case.

It is proposed that a Tier 3 library is established in Oddingley Hall, utilising up to £150,000-£200,000 of capital previously set aside for the re-provision of West Heath Library. A Community Asset Transfer will be advertised for Oddingley Hall to include the requirement for the facility to include a Tier 3 library.

G. Bartley Green Library

When consultation commenced there was no emerging partnership response to the idea of establishing Bartley Green Library as a Tier 3 service offer. However there is an emerging proposition from a group seeking to form the Bartley Green Community Association.

As this remains in a formative stage it is proposed Bartley Green Library should remain open 1 day per week from 1 April until such time as the partnership response has been fully developed.

H. **Mere Green and Kings Heath Increased opening hours through self-service/open plus**

The open plus proposal at Mere Green should take place. Although there have been concerns raised by the staff and service users – the success or otherwise of such as scheme needs testing. A pilot should commence as soon as is practical with a review of the outcomes after 6 months.

Staffing consultation on the proposal to extend opening hours at Kings Heath through self-service and a security presence (i.e. no library staff on site) has caused concern. Staff have expressed the view that operating on three employees in one of the busiest libraries in the city will be challenging enough and believe that this new model of operation will create additional pressures at this busy library. As the complete picture is not understood the pilot at Kings Heath will be subject to further review and is therefore not proposed for implementation on 1 April 2017. It remains the position that a security based pilot will be tested in the city and it is highly likely that a scenario will come forward through our community library partners that will seek to test this at a different location in the city.

I. **Tower Hill**

A petition with 203 signatories was received regarding Tower Hill Library it called for the library to remain open and for investment so it can continue to serve the community.

The original consultation proposed Tower Hill Library as a Tier 2 provision and this remains the case. It is recognised that many libraries across the city require investment and an additional £50,000 has been placed in to the city wide repairs and maintenance budget accordingly.

Table 2 Future Provision at each library

Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
TIER 1							
Small Heath	1	1	40 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Ward End	1	2	35 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Kings Heath	1	3	35 hrs	35/48 hrs	35 hrs	Pilot a new approach to enhance opening hours beyond 35 to 48 per week through additional access via self-service and security. Also looking to pilot 'workary/co-working' concept for business start-ups in the community room	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners (Mosely Exchange, Equanimity Education etc) particularly on co-working space and education. Removal of proposal to use technology to extend hours from 1 April 2017
Acocks Green	1	4	40 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners including Acocks Green BID	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners including Acocks Green BID

Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
Sparkhill	1	5	35 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	The preferred option is for the Library to remain in the current location in Sparkhill Council House alongside the new Primary School. A secondary option of relocating the library to Sparkhill Adult Education Centre was considered but is not the preferred option for consultation.	Library to remain in the current location in Sparkhill Council House alongside the new Primary School.
South Yardley	1	6	40 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Northfield	1	7	39 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Balsall Heath	1	8	35 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Erdington	1	9	40 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners. The opportunity to co-locate a coffee outlet within the library will be put to the market
Hall Green	1	10	40 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners

Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
Harborne	1	11	35 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners. A review of space within the library will take place to see if there is any potential for commercially letting any of the space within the library. Harborne Business Association have expressed an interest in utilising space.
Mere Green	1	12	35 hrs	35/48 hrs	35/48 hrs	Enhance the Tier 1 offer available through this site due to the proposed closure of Sutton Coldfield Library. Pilot to enhance opening hours beyond 35 to 48 hours or more through additional access via open plus technology.	Pilot to enhance opening hours beyond 35 to 48 hours or more through additional access via open plus technology. Report to be produced reviewing the pilot after 6 months of operation
Handsworth	1	14	31 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Kings Norton	1	15	33 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Shard End	1	16	40 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Quinton	1	17	39 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners

						with partners	
Weoley Castle	1	18	35 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners

Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
Yardley Wood	1	19	34 hrs	35 hrs	35 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
TIER 2							
Birchfield	1	21	29 hrs	35 hrs	21 hrs	Enhanced from Tier 2 (21 hours) to Tier 1 (35 hours) due to proposed closure of Aston Library	Operate as a Tier 2 library. The resulting budget efficiency used to provide a targeted library service at Aston
Walmley	2	22	26 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Joint management of library and community centre. Consideration given to CAT to organisations running both and maintaining equivalent offer. This would be subject to a separate decision.
Kingstanding	2	23	21 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners. Birmingham Careers Advice are piloting their operation from the site on Monday when library currently closed. Witton Lodge Community Association have submitted LIF proposal.

Perry Common	2	24	24 hrs	21 hrs	21/24 hrs	Library to remain in current location. Witton Lodge Community Association is seeking to offer service provision from this site and enhance opening hours beyond the proposed 21 hrs by working in partnership with the city council.	Library to remain in current location. Witton Lodge Community Association is seeking to offer service provision from this site and enhance opening hours beyond the proposed 21 hrs to 24 hrs by working in partnership with the city council.
Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
Frankley	2	25	22.5 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Spring Hill	2	26	24 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Boldmere	2	27=	26 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Druids Heath	2	27=	24 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners
Tower Hill	2	29	24 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library site potentially at risk due to the consideration of redevelopment options of Bescot Court. There may be options to work in partnership at the current site with developer/partner 'Let to Birmingham'. If this is not possible then relocation to a	Library site potentially at risk due to the consideration of redevelopment options of Bescot Court. There may be options to work in partnership at the current site with developer/partner 'Let to Birmingham'. If this is not possible then relocation to a nearby facility may need to be considered. This would be subject to a future decision

						nearby facility may need to be considered.	report
Sheldon	2	30	26 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners	Library to remain in current location, opportunities to work with partners

Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
TIER 2/3 a library offering 21 hours opening with greater involvement of the community							
Stirchley	2/3	31=	26 hrs	21 hrs	21 hrs	Library Service to be relocated into Stirchley Baths	Library Service to remain in current location. To work with Save Stirchley Library/Friends of Stirchley Library seek to focus their fundraising on repairs and maintenance and possible enhanced hours through volunteering. In addition seek to provide some library services from Baths site.
Glebe Farm	2/3	31=	26 hrs	15 hrs support	21/30+ hrs	Offer as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision	Utilising the resource released through the non-re-provision of Kents Moat either BCC increase support by 6 hours (from 15 to 21 hours) or partner commissioned to enhance the offer by 6 hours. The partnership is targeting opening hours of 30+ if enough volunteers can be activated.
TIER 3							
Aston	3	20=	23 hrs	0	10/12 hrs	Initially proposed as a closure	Initially a 10-12 hour targeted library service (after school service targeted a children/IT/homework and possible further 2 hours on a Saturday) will be retained but relocated within the Adult Education building. The medium term plan will be to seek to secure the provision of a Tier 3 library in the planned Fire Service community building.

Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
West Heath	3	33	Closed	15 hrs support	15 hrs support	Offer Oddingley Hall as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision and weekly mobile library stop on The Fordrough	Offer Oddingley Hall as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision and weekly mobile library stop on The Fordrough
Bartley Green	3	34	21 hrs	15 hrs support	15 hrs support	Offer as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision	Offer as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision
Bloomsbury	3	35	24 hrs	15 hrs support	15 hrs support	The Tier 3 library service to be provided at the POD, with the building being Community Asset Transferred.	The Tier 3 library service to be provided at the POD, with the building being Community Asset Transferred.
Selly Oak	3	37	20 hrs	15 hrs support	15 hrs support	The Tier 3 library service to be re-provided at a new build planned by Sense.	The Tier 3 library service to be re-provided at a new build planned by Sense.
TIER 4							
Castle Vale	4	N/A	28 hrs	no change	no change	Library already run by Castle Vale TRA	Library already run by Castle Vale TRA
Tyburn	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	tbc	N/A	Approval given for Tyburn Pop Up Support Service via Local Innovation Fund. Offering Library and Advice Services for housebound and isolated households.
Bournville	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	tbc	N/A	To explore the potential for Bournville Hub to deliver aspects of a library service
Falcon lodge	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	tbc	N/A	To explore the potential for Compass Support to improve digital inclusion within Falcon Lodge and people's access to IT facilities and particular the

							internet through the provision of a Digital Library .
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CLOSURES							
Library	Revised Tier	Revised Rank	Current Hours	Originally Proposed Hours	Proposal Hours following consultation	Original Consultation Option	Proposal following consultation
Sutton Coldfield	Temporary Tier 1	13	40 hrs	0	Temporary Tier 1 hours (35)	close	Retain service for up to 5 months. During this time a decision will be taken as to whether or not to close Sutton Coldfield Library based upon whether or not the work undertaken with partners in Sutton Coldfield can deliver a financially sustainable model.
Kents Moat	close	36	19 hrs	15 hrs support	0	Kents Moat Library is in the Poolway which is to be demolished for redevelopment. There is no site to Community Asset Transfer, therefore seek relocation/partnership with local organisation such as the Pump and offer a new weekly stop for the mobile library service at the Poolway.	Close and use money to secure better offer from Glebe Farm Library
Total			1,134.5	993/1,019	952/979		

6.3 Transition arrangements

In a number of sites (particularly Tier 3) transitional arrangements will need to be implemented before the end state provision set out in table 2 above can be achieved. The table below sets out the interim arrangements.

Table 3 Transitional Arrangements at each library

Library	Proposal Hours following consultation	Proposal following consultation	Transitional Arrangements
Glebe Farm	15 hrs support plus 6 hrs	Utilising the resource released through the non-reprovision of Kents Moat either BCC increase support by 6 hours (from 15 to 21 hours) or partner commissioned to enhance the offer by 6 hours. The partnership is targeting opening hours of 30+ if enough volunteers can be activated.	Using resource from Kents moat offer 21 hour service from 1 April until new partner/tier 3 service can commence
West Heath	15 hrs support	Offer Oddingley Hall as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision and weekly mobile library stop on The Fordrough	Mobile library stop to continue. Immediately progress CAT of Oddingley to seek partner for delivery of tier 3 service.
Bartley Green	15 hrs support	Offer as a Community Asset Transfer with library provision	Reduce service to 1 day (7 hrs)/week from 1 April until new partner/tier 3 service can commence
Bloomsbury	15 hrs support	The Tier 3 library service to be provided at the POD, with the building being Community Asset Transferred.	Close on 1 April Temporary provision of mobile library service or limited service from the POD until new site opens
Selly Oak	15 hrs support	The Tier 3 library service to be re-provided at a new build planned by Sense.	Close on 1 April Temporary provision of mobile library service until new site opens
Aston	10-12 hrs	Initially a 10-12 hour targeted library service (after school service targeted a children/IT/homework) will be retained but relocated within the Adult Education building – consideration will also be given to Saturday morning opening. The medium term plan will be to seek to secure the provision of a Tier 3 library in the planned Fire Service community building.	1 April for 3-6 months Aston to operate 10-12 hours/week in current location (after school/on Saturday). Between July-September new 10-12 hour service to be launched from new space within Adult Ed building
Sutton	Temporary 35 hrs	Final position to be confirmed in up to 5 months time following partnership work on a sustainable model	1 April reduce to temporary Tier 1 opening hours at 35

7. Section 7 – Developing Community Library Partners

- 7.1 Our working with specific community partners is at various stages. However through the development of this model and the more open and positive approach to partnerships that now exists with the City Council – a number of opportunities have emerged

It is very much hoped that more groups and organisations will come forward wanting to work with the library service on the range of delivery models being proposed. More than 170 individuals responded to the Be Heard Questionnaire saying that they were interested in assisting the delivery of library services. Set out below are the organisations (as opposed to individuals) that the library service is currently engaged with and the ideas that are coming forward regarding joint working.

Library	Ranking	Potential Partners	Idea
Kings Heath	3	Wimbletech	delivery of co-working space for business entrepreneurs etc
		Moseley Exchange	co-working space
		Equanimity Education	Paid for tuition, volunteer hours
Acocks Green	4	Acocks Green BID	rental of space
Northfield	7	Moneyline	rental of space
Balsall Heath	8	BCU University	possible volunteering
Erdington	8	Subject to market testing	Explore coffee shop
Harborne	11	Harborne Business Association	District Committee identified the potential for space that could be offered to partners
Mere Green	12	Bibliothecca	Sponsoring open plus equipment
Sutton Coldfield	13	Sutton Coldfield Town Council – exploration of alternative options	Seeking to work in partnership to develop sustainable solution
		Library Lobby – exploration of alternative options	Seeking support from a LIF bid to fund a community hub to co-locate with Library
		BIDs Ambassador	Explore potential of start-up entrepreneur hub/business centre
Handsworth	14	Police	Potential local drop in location
Aston	20	West Midlands Fire Service	Potential to explore location of Tier 3 service (IT, popular books) in plans being developed for Heritage Centre in the Fire Station
Birchfield	21	Subject to market testing	Rental of space
Walmley	22	Local citizens	offer one to one PC sessions for over 50's 2 x 2hrs per week
		Local group tbc	Possible interest in CAT
Kingstanding	23	Birmingham Careers Service	Pilot working from library when closed on a monday

		Witton Lodge Community Association	Seeking to enhance library offer and maintain current opening hours (21 hrs) through a minimum 1 day/week 'one stop shop' service provision from this site including jobs and skills advice, wellbeing services and housing advice. Volunteers will also be trained
Perry Common	24	Witton Lodge Community Association	Seeking to enhance library offer and maintain current opening hours (24hrs) through a minimum 1 day/week 'one stop shop' service provision from this site including jobs and skills advice, wellbeing services and housing advice. Volunteers will also be trained
Frankley	25	Frankley Parish Council and local organisations	Develop increased community use to develop sustainable provision
Tower Hill	29	Let to Birmingham -	there may be options to work in partnership at the current site with developer/partner
Glebe Farm	31=	Friends of Glebe Farm Library, Welcome Change CIC, Spitfire Advice and Support Services and the Pioneer Group including Compass Support	working together to develop a proposal to work with the council to offer services (social events, advice, information, employment) from Glebe Farm Library. The partnership is targeting opening hours of 30+ if enough volunteers can be activated.
Stirchley	31=	Save Our Stirchley Library/Friends of Stirchley Library	Possible fundraising, volunteering
West Heath	33	Wychall Farm Community Association	Interest shown in CAT
Bartley Green	34	Bartley Green Community Association	tbc
Kents Moat	36	The Pump	Tier 3 – although latest proposals do not allocate funding to this
Selly Oak	37	Sense	Re-housing the children's library from Selly Oak within our Community Hub space Providing shelf/display space for a small 'adult fiction best-sellers' section Accessible and other IT equipment for public use

8.	Castle Vale	-	Castle Vale TRA	Run library
	Bournville	-	Bournville Hub (Busy Parents Network)	already offers books for use on site in SCL categories. Provides a range of activities/sessions for local community
	Falcon Lodge	-	Compass Support	Improve digital inclusion within Falcon Lodge and people's access to IT facilities and particular the internet through the provision of a Digital Library .
	Tyburn	-	Castle Vale TRA	Tyburn Ward pop up – books, DVD, audio books, music and advice services

8

Non site specific matters resulting from consultation and amended budget details following consultation.

8.1 There have been a range of items flowing through the consultation that are not related to specific sites as set out in the previous section 6 of this report. The following paragraphs details those then the subsequent response.

8.2 Links between libraries and community centres

The public consultation meetings have shown how users of the library service value the community space that is provided by the facilities. The questionnaire had 56% of people saying important functions of a library were events/activities, 34% a space meet and 23% for hiring meeting rooms. The consultation surrounding specific sites such as Stirchley, Mere Green and Walmley have also brought to light either the links that already exist or highlighted where links could exist. As a result we will explore the potential for the combined management of certain community centre and community libraries where they are co-located or in close proximity to one another.

8.3 Training

During the consultation the lack of staff training was identified. As a result of this and the need to ensure our library staff are well trained and delivery a high standard of library services as well as being well placed to respond to the needs of a dynamic and evolving library service we will set aside a training day for staff every quarter when libraries will be closed to the public.

8.4 Self-service

Through the internal consultation process with staff and trade unions there has been a counter proposal not invest in self-service and instead redirect the resource to fund library staffing instead. But the public questionnaire found that 51% supported the fact that people should be encouraged to use self-service whilst only 27% were against.

Although the revenue (prudential borrowing) associated with the capital investment is £174,000 which is the equivalent of 5-6 library assistants. The council remains of the view that, like every other library authority in the West Midlands, self-service is a fundamental part of a modern library service. It will therefore install self-service equipment in all Tier 1 libraries and other locations where appropriate.

8.5 Staffing Levels

The original proposals were based on a standard staffing structure of 3 staff at each site. Both the public consultation and the internal consultation identified concerns over this standardised staffing structure. Following a review of sites it is now proposed that staffing structures overall will increase by 11.5fte and will vary with 6 sites now allocated 4 staff and 7 sites allocated 3.5 staff and others having 3 and 2 staff, however operational numbers will vary on a day to day basis at each site

- 8.6 **Verification:** Through the internal consultation process with staff and trade unions there has been concern over the introduction of verification to the service. Part of this concern is about the volume of activity the service brings into libraries. It is therefore proposed that initially the service will operate from Tier 1 sites but that it will be rolled out to Tier 2 sites as required by demand.

The concerns of staff are recognised and learning from the pilot work will be used to roll the process out to library staff by geographical areas.

- 8.7 **Assisted Digital:** In line with the 'libraries first' principle recently set out by the National Libraries Task Force the library service will seek to deliver assistance with the digital access required for universal credit. In taking on this activity the service will be provided with an appropriate budget to enhance staffing levels.

- 8.8 **Reservation charge:** 1867 responses were received via the questionnaire on charging £1 for reservations. Of these response 39.3% agreed with the charge and 45.0% disagreed. Although the feedback on this is relatively balanced, this paper proposes that a decision on implementing a reservation charge is delayed until it is known whether or not increased income can be generated through the leasing of library space at Sutton. This would also assist in further considering the feedback from some Community Library Partners who felt that charging for reservations may result in less stock rotation which could impact on smaller (Tier 3) libraries.

- 8.9 **Charging for internet access after 1 hour:** Unison has proposed that a charge for internet access via netloan be brought in after 1 hour's usage on any particular day. This is not supported at this stage but will remain under review.

- 8.10 **Room hire charges:**

In a question to City Council on 10th January 2017 The Friends of the Library of Birmingham summarised four main issues that the public had raised with the model, one of them being around room hire charges. They stated that *"The main public responses to the proposed new model for community libraries were strong opposition to the introduction of charges for the community rooms in libraries....."*

Unison on the contrary has proposed a standardised room hire charge which is in line with the current proposals.

The city council does already have a charging basis for community rooms and this would remain with further emphasis being given to library managers to maximise bookings.

- 8.11 **Library Innovation Fund (Arts Council):**

Birmingham City Council has bid to the National Library Innovation fund (managed through the Arts Council) to provide one off investment funding £25,000 for each of the Tier 3 libraries. This fund was established to support libraries serving communities in areas of deprivation and required key criteria to be met – particularly around deprivation and innovative practices. The partnership working with groups on Tier 3 libraries is innovative and is felt to meet the parameters set out by the Arts Council for funding. A decision on this is expected at the end of March/early April 2017.

- 8.12 **Bookfund**

The top response to the consultation with 26% of the comments when asked about what would encourage you to use a library more, was an increase in the purchase of books. The model proposes increasing spend on books from circa £140,000pa to £380,000pa.

- 8.13 A summary of the proposed budget to meet the savings requirement was set out in the original consultation report. This has now been amended to reflect the changes in the model that have materialised through the consultation process. The table also includes details of the changes that are required in order to deliver against each of the proposed budgets for employees, premises, supplies/other and income.

	Proposed breakdown of the budget under the amended model	Summary as to how this is achieved
Employees	£3,107,000	<p>The budget has increased from the consultation. This is mostly down to requirement for staff at Sutton, staff on Saturdays, and at the busiest sites.</p> <p>The entire model would require the number of full time equivalent library staff to reduce from the current 112.48 to 99.6.</p> <p>The investment in kiosks will result in 22 libraries having self-service. The reduction in opening hours (reduction of 155.5hrs) enables the reduction in employee costs to be achieved.</p>
Premises	£1,042,000	<p>The premises costs have increased from the consultation this is mostly down to the changes proposed at Sutton, Aston and Glebe Farm.</p> <p>The repairs and maintenance budget has been maintained at the £50k increase.</p> <p>The rest of the premises budget is based on the actual costs incurred in running the service in 2015/16, with reductions for hours of opening, relocated and Tier 3 sites.</p>
Supplies and Services, Transport and Other expenditure	£918,000	<p>The supplies and services costs have increased from the consultation this is mostly down to the changes proposed at Sutton,</p> <p>This would require a reduction in budget for books/materials in community libraries – often called the bookfund by £140,000 (from £520,000 to £380,000)</p> <p>Retaining a figure of £380,000 is however greater than the amount actually spent on books/materials in 2015/16 at £136,000 and the £140,000 projected to be spent in 2016/17</p> <p>The establishment of a new £20,000 budget for grants to groups wanting to offer a service under the new Tier 4 proposal.</p>

		Further reduction in the budget for security .
Income	£909,000	<p>This assumes an uplift in income compared to the original proposal of £363,000.</p> <p>The overall budget is calculated on the basis that Sutton Library becomes viable through new income from leasing space <u>and also</u> from new income streams from partners.</p> <p>The other budgetary income is linked to merging the community centre and library at Walmley.</p> <p>This includes libraries delivering verification work for benefits and receiving payment of £150,000 for carrying this out.</p> <p>To achieve the income budget also requires libraries to increase income through rental of spaces by £30,000.</p> <p>The new model pauses a £1 fee for reservations as it will test whether the leasing of space at Sutton can generate the additional £50,000 income p.a. needed</p>
TOTAL net expenditure	4,062,000	

8.13 The staffing allocated to each library varies based on the Tiers/hours of opening, the level of self-service proposed in the library and other operational issues that may exist at specific sites. In addition to the staff in the table there will be eight library managers and two staff supporting and developing the service particularly around community groups, partners, volunteers and income.

Library	Tier	Proposed Hours	Proposed Staffing	Proposed for self-service kiosk(s)
Kings Heath	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x1	Yes
Ward End	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes
Small Heath	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes
Acocks Green	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes

Northfield	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x1	Yes
South Yardley	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes
Sparkhill	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes
Erdington	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x1	Yes
Balsall Heath	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes
Hall Green	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.5	Yes
Harborne	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x1	Yes
Mere Green	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x1	Yes
Kings Norton	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.2	Yes
Handsworth	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x1	Yes
Quinton	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.2	Yes
Shard End	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.2	Yes
Weoley Castle	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.2	Yes
Yardley Wood	1	35 hrs	Gr3x1 Gr2x2 Gr1x0.2	Yes

Library	Tier	Proposed Hours	Proposed Staffing	Proposed for self-service kiosk(s)
Birchfield	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr2 x 0.6 Gr1 x 0.2	Yes
Walmley	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr2 x 0.6 Gr1 x 0.2	No
Kingstanding	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	No
Perry Common	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr2 x 0.6 Gr1 x 0.2	Yes
Boldmere	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	No
Frankley	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6	No
Druids Heath	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	No
Spring Hill	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	Yes
Tower Hill	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	No
Sheldon	2	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	No

Stirchley	2/3	21 hrs	Gr3x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr2x0.6 Gr1x0.2	No
Glebe Farm	2/3	15 hrs support + 6 hrs	Gr2x0.6 Gr3x0.6	Depends on detail of scheme
West Heath/Oddingley	3	15 hrs support	Gr2 x 0.41	Yes
Bartley Green	3	15 hrs support	Gr2 x 0.41 (temporarily will need more staff)	Depends on detail of scheme
Bloomsbury	3	15 hrs support	Gr2 x 0.41	Depends on detail of scheme
Selly Oak	3	15 hrs support	Gr2 x 0.41	Depends on detail of scheme
Aston	3	10-12 hrs support	Gr2 2x0.41	

Sutton Coldfield staffing over 5 month period is yet to be confirmed.

Section 9 – Consultation on the proposals

9.1 Following the cabinet report in October there has been a comprehensive public consultation exercise undertaken on the proposals for a Tiered Community Library Service. This has run from 25th October to 27th January and has involved

- 4 public meetings
- 33 facilitated sessions at community libraries
- 13 ward or district committee meetings
- 24 other meetings

The full list of meetings is set out in Appendix 2 of the main cabinet report

This outward facing approach has resulted in 1947 responses submitted via the Be Heard database and there have also been responses submitted via letter, e-mail, petitions and 1675 further responses to the children's survey.

In order to ensure the impacts of the proposed model were explored further and better understood there was also a series of 6 focus groups. These concentrated on Sutton, Aston, Disability and a further three on wider impacts of the proposed changes.

Alongside the public consultation there has also been a formal consultation ongoing with staff and trade unions. Trade Unions and staff have formally submitted their proposals for amending the model and these have been considered and where appropriate changes reflected in the revised model. The formal consultation with Trade Unions will close after Cabinet have agreed the model.

A summary of the main findings from the questionnaires is set out below, however this is further detailed in Appendix 3 of the main cabinet report

Of the 1675 responses to the Children's Survey the majority of children walk to their most used library (50%) and they prefer to visit in the holidays (44%). Most children borrow books when they visit (40%) and more girls than boys responded (53%). The highest response from children was in the 9-11yr age range (39%) and Boldmere library returned the most survey forms (18%).

Section 10 – Other options considered

10.1 The savings target for community libraries was set in 2015/16. It was a three year target growing each year with a final cumulative figure to be achieved of £1.95m. During this period a number of different approaches to delivering the savings have been considered.

A. Closure of the lowest priority sites, whilst maintaining the level of budget, service provision and opening hours at all other sites. This approach would have closed at least 13 sites as many of the lower priority sites are already the least costly and therefore a considerable amount of sites would have closed.

Accessibility to the service would have been significantly reduced under this model.

B. Delivering the service via a staff led mutual. This option was considered as it has the potential to deliver cost reductions and increase income and therefore retain larger numbers of libraries. Cost reductions can be achieved in a number of ways but a significant element is the ability to achieve a reduction in business rates. The income increases were projected through charitable donations, increased income through coffee/vending sales and new fees such as reservations.

The model reviewed at the time fell short of the budget requirements. The model also required the city council to invest in self-service before the service was transferred, which it was unable to do at the time.

C. Using open plus to deliver libraries in unstaffed mode. This option would require significant investment but other local authorities such as Peterborough City Council has used this technology to reduce the hours in which libraries are open with staff. By operating in unstaffed mode the amount of hours libraries are actually open to the public is increased.

D. Birmingham City Council is looking to pilot this technology in one library, on the basis that if successful it may be able to increase hours from the 35 or 21 hours proposed in the model to something significantly larger.

10.2 In addition to the responses from the consultation already covered in section 6, other models have been submitted as part of the consultation process including

E. To temporarily fund Sutton Library through the capital resources. This has not been possible to pursue as Sutton Library requires a revenue budget (to spend on staff, supplies etc) to make it sustainable not a capital budget which is spent on capital items such as refurbishments.

- F. Hand over the Tier 3 sites entirely to the community/other organisations to run without any support from the city council in order to use that resource released to invest further in the Tier 1 and tier 2 sites. This proposal was not in keeping with the objectives of the model to work in partnership and also to maximise the footprint/accessibility of library services.

Information sources

1. References within the report

DCMS Independent Library Report for England:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-library-report-for-england>

Locality Report, Learning from Experience:

<http://locality.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Community-Libraries-Guiding-Principles.pdf>

Parliamentary Select Committee Report on library closures:

http://www.local.gov.uk/media-releases/-/journal_content/56/10180/3622109/NEWS

2. Information which was available on the Beheard website during consultation:

- Mutual business case
- Mutual Proposal
- Mutual Financial document
- Main and Summary Consultation documents
- Medium Term Financial Plans
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Initial Equalities Assessment
- Individual Library and Catchment Area Profiles
- Needs Assessment
- Library Location Maps

Birmingham Community Libraries Key Performance Information - 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016

Community Library	Weekly opening Hours 2015/16	Annual opening hours in 2015/16 (x50 weeks)	Final Budget 2015/16	Budget 2015/16 (outturn figures)	Registered Users	Total issues 2015/16	Issues per hour 2015/16	Cost per issue 2015/16	Total visits 2015/16	Visits per hour 2015/16	Cost per visit 2015/16	Total PN hours 2015/16	PN sessions per hour 2015/16	Cost per PN session 2015/16	Total attendance at activities 2015/16	Children & Young people aged 0-19 in catchment area	People aged 65+ in catchment area	Population catchment area	Average Index of Multiple Deprivation Score
EDGBASTON																			
Bartley Green	26	1300	£96,069	£64,843	4738	15446	11.88	£4.20	9650	7.42	£6.72	1342	1.03	£48.32	3797	2810	1864	10860	35.99
Harborne*	40	2000	£137,059	£175,164	20811	87623	43.81	£2.00	84333	42.17	£2.08	13906	6.95	£12.60	4875	6007	4805	28766	17.58
Quinton	39	2000	£162,266	£147,690	16363	73122	36.56	£2.02	62750	31.38	£2.35	9034	4.52	£16.35	3308	6928	4080		31.81
TOTAL	105	5300	£395,394	£387,697	41912	167429	31.59	£2.32	148300	27.98	£2.61	22892	4.32	£16.94	11,980	15,745	10,749	39626	
ERDINGTON																			
Castle Vale **	28	0	£0	£0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	£0.00	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	0	0	45.43
Erdington	40	2000	£296,122	£266,375	31549	61625	30.81	£4.32	83700	41.85	£3.18	13074	6.54	£20.37	6625	12552	6268	47631	42.38
TOTAL	68	2000	£296,122	£266,375	31549	74517	37.26	£3.57	83700	41.85	£3.18	13074	6.54	£20.37	6625	12552	6268	47631	
HALL GREEN																			
Balsall Heath	40	2000	£186,892	£221,711	16535	59113	29.56	£3.75	98900	49.45	£2.24	15064	7.53	£14.72	9401	8733	2137	24834	60.38
Hall Green	40	2000	£207,255	£211,646	17418	87180	43.59	£2.43	99250	49.63	£2.13	5,526	2.76	£38.30	12,346	10656	5444	36336	24.52
Kings Heath	40	2000	£160,408	£205,992	28215	94736	47.37	£2.17	109200	54.60	£1.89	12850	6.43	£16.03	4902	10527	6357	42710	25.85
Sparkhill	40	2000	£186,839	£137,384	27589	73963	36.98	£1.86	105000	52.50	£1.31	13236	6.62	£10.38	9282	15882	3481	43460	46.57
TOTAL	160	8000	£741,394	£776,733	89757	314992	39.37	£2.47	412350	51.54	£1.88	46676	5.83	£16.64	35931	45798	17419	147340	
HODGE HILL																			
Shard End	40	2000	£146,000	£87,942	11545	23715	11.86	£3.71	60550	30.28	£1.45	10279	5.14	£8.56	10014	3961	2238	13962	50.04
Ward End	35	1750	£258,443	£177,697	30376	67209	38.41	£2.64	75450	43.11	£2.36	11159	6.38	£15.92	4645	20105	4426	51301	49.43
TOTAL	75	3750	£404,443	£265,639	41921	90924	24.25	£2.92	136000	36.27	£1.95	21438	5.72	£12.39	14659	24066	6664	65263	
LADYWOOD																			
Aston	23	1150	£0	£91,081	16389	22449	19.52	£4.06	27700	24.09	£3.29	4582	3.98	£19.88	1788	6400	1493	17314	56.21
Birchfield	29	1450	£234,053	£184,144	11919	29278	20.19	£6.29	30720	21.19	£5.99	7610	5.25	£24.20	2387	6364	1460	18458	48.63
Bloomsbury	26	1300	£42,521	£45,277	5792	4436	3.41	£10.21	6550	5.04	£6.91	0	0.00	#DIV/0!	1417	2656	520	6739	61.82
Small Heath	40	2000	£186,197	£231,991	31506	65874	32.94	£3.52	107350	53.68	£2.16	15138	7.57	£15.33	2447	18405	3518	45809	53.58

Spring Hill	26	1300	£158,851	£167,069	8308	16760	12.89	£9.97	31800	24.46	£5.25	6912	5.32	£24.17	2269	1914	623	6580	51.06
TOTAL	144	7200	£621,622	£719,562	73914	138797	19.28	£5.18	204120	28.35	£3.53	34242	4.76	£21.01	10308	35739	7614	94900	
NORTHFIELD																			
Frankley	33.5	1675	£81,548	£90,367	6185	8369	5.00	£10.80	30450	18.18	£2.97	2908	1.74	£31.08	6176	1601	790	5436	49.71
Kings Norton***	33	1650	£71,675	£137,606	14108	50462	30.58	£2.73	69722	42.26	£1.97	4623	2.80	£29.77	3578	5482	3556	20903	34.86
Northfield	39	1950	£178,956	£232,900	27683	73135	37.51	£3.18	90050	46.18	£2.59	17393	8.92	£13.39	4,600	8383	6439	33885	28.02
Weoley Castle	40	2000	£161,433	£202,495	16220	41138	20.57	£4.92	79750	39.88	£2.54	9133	4.57	£22.17	2846	6102	3914	22963	36.28
West Heath****	26	1300	£84,941	£84,902	6265	27927	21.48	£3.04	27150	20.88	£3.13	6019	4.63	£14.11	1054	2571	1784	10043	30.82
TOTAL	171.5	8575	£564,605	£673,596	70461	158975	18.54	£4.24	250450	29.21	£2.69	36854	4.30	£18.28	18254	24139	16483	93230	
PERRY BARR																			
Handsworth	31	1550	£226,144	£244,082	26198	34173	22.05	£7.14	71200	45.94	£3.43	18429	11.89	£13.24	3057	8317	2347	25838	50.64
Kingstanding	26	1300	£92,757	£126,811	16685	29076	22.37	£4.36	35850	27.58	£3.54	4590	3.53	£27.63	347	4782	2429	16441	41.88
Perry Common	27	1350	£135,666	£123,670	11590	27486	20.36	£4.50	32350	23.96	£3.82	6635	4.91	£18.64	4279	3503	1414	10896	45.28
Tower Hill	24	1200	£80,157	£80,764	12391	26518	22.10	£3.05	22950	19.13	£3.52	4473	3.73	£18.06	527	3812	2267	14270	22.34
TOTAL	108	5400	£534,724	£575,327	66864	117253	21.71	£4.91	162350	30.06	£3.54	34127	6.32	£16.86	8210	20414	8457	67445	
SELLY OAK																			
Druids Heath*****	24	1200	£116,960	£130,022	8851	19935	16.61	£6.52	30208	25.17	£4.30	4254	3.55	£30.56	1030	2050	1250	7531	47.19
Selly Oak	20	1000	£94,550	£100,322	9303	14680	14.68	£6.83	13100	13.10	£7.66	2391	2.39	£41.96	1422	640	544	3444	16.65
Stirchley	26	1300	£130,283	£134,939	9401	39825	30.63	£3.39	24750	19.04	£5.45	3964	3.05	£34.04	3177	3907	2309	16735	22.06
Yardley Wood	34	1700	£234,476	£247,316	12182	48330	28.43	£5.12	93950	55.26	£2.63	5717	3.36	£43.26	12177	5834	3272	20905	38.47
TOTAL	104	5200	£576,269	£612,599	39737	121973	23.46	£5.02	160800	30.92	£3.81	16153	3.11	£37.92	17806	12431	7375	48615	
SUTTON COLDFIELD																			
Boldmere	26	1300	£93,194	£132,402	8976	34561	26.59	£3.83	23400	18.00	£5.66	2123	1.63	£62.37	1927	4120	4255	19058	11.83
Mere Green	35	1750	£113,598	£183,645	21306	122464	69.98	£1.50	77650	44.37	£2.37	7244	4.14	£25.35	2936	8043	8544	35226	8.63
Sutton Coldfield	40	2000	£527,027	£575,089	29625	59225	29.61	£9.71	102750	51.38	£5.60	17843	8.92	£32.23	3751	8849	8596	39721	12.41
Walmley	26	1300	£38,099	£78,474	8358	47436	36.49	£1.65	45550	35.04	£1.72	2670	2.05	£29.39	1222	3644	3425	16554	9.25
TOTAL	127	6350	£771,918	£957,585	68265	263686	41.53	£3.63	245200	38.61	£3.91	29880	4.71	£32.05	9836	24656	24820	110559	
YARDLEY																			
Acocks Green	40	2000	£186,209	£190,916	31199	51520	25.76	£3.71	94400	47.20	£2.02	17044	8.52	£11.20	19071	9377	3736	31171	41.54
Glebe Farm	26	1300	£79,016	£83,863	7779	12409	9.55	£6.76	27100	20.85	£3.09	2267	1.74	£36.99	2539	2773	905	8137	53.08
Kents Moat	26	1300	£75,182	£54,173	6763	7607	5.85	£7.12	8000	6.15	£6.77	3182	2.45	£17.02	1448	1134	387	3216	52.52
Sheldon	26	1300	£134,196	£113,895	11012	22613	17.39	£5.04	22700	17.46	£5.02	5461	4.20	£20.86	4599	2899	2065	11309	35.05
South Yardley	40	2000	£210,538	£263,110	19140	54359	27.18	£4.84	109300	54.65	£2.41	24353	12.18	£10.80	14505	8163	3591	27126	36.42
TOTAL	158	7900	£685,141	£705,957	75893	148508	18.80	£4.75	261500	33.10	£2.70	52307	6.62	£13.50	42162	24346	10684	80959	
Citywide total		59675	#####	#####	600273	1597054		#DIV/0!	2064770		£161.33	309632		£19.39	172204				

Harborne* closed for 5 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 weeks as per model

Castle Vale** no longer run by BCC therefore data not included

Kings Norton*** closed for 14 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week mode

Druids Heath **** closed for 2 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week mode

West Heath***** data from 2012/13 the last full year that West Heath was open under budget

1a

Community Library Consultation Sessions

Appendix 2

Type of meeting	Date	Time	Location	Attendees
Staff	10th October 2016	9.30am	Library of Birmingham (LOB)	Chris Jordan
Friends of Library of Birmingham	11th October 2016	1.30pm	Council House	Cllr Ward & Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes
Staff	14th October 2016	9.30am	LOB	Chris Jordan
	25th October 2016		CONSULTATION STARTS	
Sutton Town Council Clerk	25th October 2016	11am	Margaret Street	Chris Jordan/Liz Parkes/Sarah Chinnock
Tier 3 Conversation	27th October 2016	9.30am	Healthwatch	Liz Parkes
Stechford Ward Councillors	28th October 2016	2pm	Council House (Kents Moat)	Cllr Ward & Liz Parkes
Consultation Assistance	31st October 2016	2pm	Selly Oak Library (BADG Dyslexia)	Liz Parkes
Tier 3 Conversation	2nd November 2016	2.30pm	Bartley Green Library (Newman College)	Liz Parkes
Public Meeting	2nd November 2016	6pm	LOB	Cllr Ward & Chris Jordan
Tier 3 Conversation	3rd November 2016	2pm	Aston Fire Station	Liz Parkes
Public Meeting	4th November 2016	12 noon	Northfield Library	Cllr Ward & Chris Jordan
Public Meeting	8th November 2016	6pm	Mere Green Community Centre	Cllr Ward & Chris Jordan
Aston Ward Councillors	9th November 2016	3.30pm	Council House	Cllr Ward & Chris Jordan
Tier 3 Conversation	14th November 2016	11.30am	Stirchley Baths	Liz Parkes
Public Meeting	14th November 2016	6pm	South Yardley Library	Cllr Ward & Chris Jordan
Public Briefing	15th November 2016	11am	Sparkhill Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Tier 1 Conversation	16th November 2016	11am	Kings Heath Library (Wimbletech)	Liz Parkes
Erdington Ward Meeting	16th November 2016	7pm	St Barnabas Church	Chris Jordan & Sarah Chinnock
Selly Oak District Committee	17th November 2016	10.30am	Council House	Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	17th November 2016	12.30pm	Aston Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Edgbaston District Committee	17th November 2016	7pm	Council House	Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	18th November 2016	2pm	Perry Common Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	21st November 2016	11am	Acocks Green Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	21st November 2016	2pm	The POD Nechells	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Sutton Coldfield District Committee	21st November 2016	5pm	Council House	Chris Jordan/Liz Parkes/Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	22nd November 2016	11am	Bartley Green Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	22nd November 2016	2pm	Birchfield Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Tier 4 Conversation	23rd November 2016	9am	Bournville Hub	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	23rd November 2016	11am	Frankley Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	23rd November 2016	2pm	Harborne Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Tier 3 Conversation	23rd November 2016	4.30pm	BSHP	Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	24th November 2016	11am	Druids Heath Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	24th November 2016	2pm	Erdington Library	Liz Parkes
Cllr Ward & Cllr Pocock	24th November 2016	3pm	Council House	Chris Jordan & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	25th November 2016	2pm	Kingstanding Library	Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	28th November 2016	11am	Hall Green Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	28th November 2016	2pm	Handsworth Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	29th November 2016	11am	Glebe Farm Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	29th November 2016	2pm	Kings Heath Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	30th November 2016	2pm	Kings Norton Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	1st December 2016	11am	Kents Moat Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	1st December 2016	2pm	Spring Hill Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	2nd December 2016	2pm	Boldmere Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	5th December 2016	11am	Quinton Library	Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	5th December 2016	2pm	Selly Oak Library	Liz Parkes
Tier 4 Conversation	6th December 2016	9am	Bournville Hub	Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	6th December 2016	11am	Small Heath Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Tier 3 Conversation	6th December 2016	1pm	Welcome Café	Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	6th December 2016	2pm	Shard End Library	Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	7th December 2016	11am	Ward End Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	7th December 2016	2pm	Sutton Coldfield Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Longbridge Ward Meeting	7th December 2016	7pm	Reaside Community Centre	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	8th December 2016	11am	Sheldon Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	8th December 2016	2pm	Stirchley Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Tier 2 Conversation	9th December 2016	2pm	Walmley Library	Sarah Chinnock
Cllr Ward Update	12th December 2016	11am	Council House	Chris Jordan & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	13th December 2016	11am	Balsall Heath Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	13th December 2016	2pm	Tower Hill Library	Liz Parkes
Sutton Coldfield Town Council	13th December 2016	7pm	Sutton Coldfield Town Hall	Chris Jordan/Liz Parkes/Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	14th December 2016	2pm	Walmley Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Public Briefing	15th December 2016	11am	Weoley Castle Library	Liz Parkes
Public Briefing	15th December 2016	2pm	Yardley Wood Library	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Tier 4 Conversation	15th December 2016	4pm	Castle Vale Library	Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes
Billesley Ward Councillors	22nd December 2016	2pm	Yardley Wood Library	Richard Davies & Beverley Fryer
Staff	10th January 2017	9.30am	LOB	Chris Jordan
Quinton Ward Meeting	12th January 2017	7pm	Quinbourne Centre	Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Potential Partners Meeting	13th January 2017	1pm	LOB	Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes
Tier 2 Conversation	16th January 2017	2.30pm	Bournville Hub	Liz Parkes
Library Lobby	16th January 2017	5.00pm	Sutton Coldfield Library	Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes & Sarah Chinnock
Library Lobby	18th January 2017	10.30am	The POD Nechells	Liz Parkes
Kingstanding Ward Meeting	18th January 2017	7pm	Kingstanding Wellbeing Centre	Richard Davies & Sarah Chinnock
Northfield District Committee	20th January 2017	2pm	Council House	Richard Davies
Tier 3 Conversation	23rd January 2017	2pm	Vineyard Road Northfield	Richard Davies & Liz Parkes
Perry Barr Members	24th January 2017	3.30pm	Alexander Stadium	Chris Jordan
Tier 3 Conversation	25th January 2017	10am	P café Stirchley	Liz Parkes
Cllr Ward & Sutton Coldfield Cllrs	25th January 2017	12.30pm	Council House	Chris Jordan
Tier 2/3 Conversation	25th January 2017	1.30pm	Welcome Café	Chris Jordan & Liz Parkes
Yardley District Committee	26th January 2017	1.30pm	Council House	Chris Jordan & Richard Davies
	27th January 2017		CONSULTATION CLOSES	



Help us to shape the future of Birmingham Libraries

Consultation Survey Analysis

February 2017

Version 1.0

Produced by the Strategic Research Team, BCC

Contact: Steven Rose, Head of Strategic Research Team

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Total Responses and Demographics of Respondents	6
4. Findings – How libraries are used	11
5. Findings – What community libraries should do	12
6. Findings – Views on Library of Birmingham website	16
7. Findings – Views on the tiered model proposals	17
8. Findings – Community led libraries	23
9. Conclusion	25
Appendix 1 – All responses for closed survey questions	26

1. Executive Summary

Birmingham City Council held a public consultation to gather the public's views on the proposed changes to its Community Library Services, between 25th October 2016 and 27th January 2017. This report presents the main findings from the consultation survey, which had **1,947 responses**.

The survey was open to all of the public and not designed to be statistically representative of Birmingham's population; it reflects the views of the people who chose to respond. 92% of the respondents were library users, so views of people who don't use libraries will largely not be captured.

1.1 How libraries are used and what they should do

- The majority of respondents (56%) use a Birmingham library service several times a month, and mostly borrow/ reserve/ read books and find information.
- Most walk to use the services, and travel 2 miles or less to their preferred library.
- Morning and afternoons, and Saturdays are the most popular times for using a library.
- Less than a quarter say that hiring meeting rooms or volunteering opportunities are important functions of a library. Borrowing books is still seen as the most important.
- The unsuitability of current opening times was a common theme – this was the main reason why respondents hadn't used a library and when asked what would encourage them to use a library more, better opening times was mentioned a lot. Thursdays, weekends, mornings and evenings were popular in terms of preferred opening times, and many commented that they wanted them open as long as possible and to be flexible to meet the needs and lifestyles of users.
- Other ways which would encourage more use include better or more library book stock, activities and events for all but especially for children, and drinks facilities or coffee shops.

1.2 Library of Birmingham website

- Nearly a third of respondents have never used the library website.
- The most popular reasons for not using the website were that they do not want or need to use it (40%) or they did not know the website existed (36%).
- Features that would encourage more use include one catalogue for books and E-books, personalised book recommendations and children's online reading challenges.

1.3 Views on the tiered model of proposals

- More respondents disagree than agree with the various aspects of the proposals, particularly the proposed changes to the opening times. 63% disagree with the proposals overall.
- More agree than disagree with the library option statements, particularly 'it is better to keep a library open with reduced hours, than to close it' (87% agree total).
- The option statement with the least agreement is 'library services do not have to be delivered from the current library building if a better property solution exists' (38% agree total).
- 44% say the proposed opening times affect their ability to use library services a great deal, and 31% say a little. 14% say not at all.

- 45% disagree with the £1 reservation charge, whilst 39% agree.
- Overall, 43% respondents disagree that the proposals protect a future for Library Service, compared to 24% who agree.
- There was overwhelming opposition to community library changes, stating that they undermine the important role of library in the local communities, with respondents concerned for vulnerable groups not having adequate access to a library. There were strong feelings that libraries should be invested in, rather than cut, and that the council had a 'duty' to run a fully funded library service.
- Respondents felt that libraries were not protected by the proposals. Rather, respondents feared that the proposals would make libraries difficult to access and library users would be discouraged to visit a library.
- Sutton library's closure had much opposition. This was the most frequently mentioned library in the consultation. It is considered a major asset to the community and any mentioned that if Sutton library closes, accessing an alternative library would be too inconvenient and impossible for many people. There was also some opposition to the proposed closure of Aston library.
- Library users valued the knowledge and friendliness of library staff, which could not be provided by technology.
- Some agreed with the proposals; although often reluctant and unhappy about the cuts, they thought that the proposals would cause the least damage to the service.
- There were also respondents who made suggestions on how the library could make further savings, through income generation or shared services.
- Some stated that there wasn't enough information for them to make any comments on the proposals.

1.4 Community-led libraries

- Of those who can contribute to delivering library services in their local library, most can provide up to 4 hours per week.
- 65% would like more information or details of who to contact about being involved in delivering services. 38% say nothing would encourage them to support delivering services.
- The top two options that should be considered by the council are 'Sharing library space with other services' (47%), and 'Partnering with local groups to lead and develop the libraries offer' (37%).
- There was a strong consensus that libraries should be run by professional staff that have the skills, experience, and expertise to run the service. Some would only volunteer if libraries were going to be closed and disagreed with volunteering if it meant making library staff redundant.
- Many respondents did not support using volunteers and stated that the council have a statutory duty to provide library services for local communities, that library services are a public service, and therefore the council should be responsible for delivering these services.

It is important that the Library Service takes on board the findings and explore further the concerns raised, provide more information so that people are better informed, and try and reduce the impact of any changes to specific groups. Where suggestions have been made, these could be looked into further, by engaging with local communities and working with them to find appropriate solutions.

2. Introduction

Birmingham City Council held a public consultation to gather the public's views on the proposed changes to its Community Library Services, between 25th October 2016 and 27th January 2017.

As part of this consultation, an online survey via the council's Be Heard consultation and engagement platform, and paper copies of the survey, were the main channel for the public to respond to the consultation and comment on the proposed changes.

The survey also asked about current library use and feedback on services, as well as suggestions for improving aspects of the libraries. The survey also provided the opportunity for individuals or groups to register their interest to run library services in their local community.

This report is an analysis of the survey responses. These findings will form part of the insight gathered by the Library Service during the consultation period, including public meetings and a survey for children, to support Cabinet and Senior Managers in their decisions on the future of the service.

2.1 Representativeness and consultation approach

The consultation survey was open to all of the public; it was not designed to be statistically representative of the Birmingham population. Therefore, it is important to highlight that the results will largely only reflect the views of those who chose to respond.

However, alongside this survey there were also six focus groups consisting of both library users and non-library users across different demographics groups. The aim of the focus groups was to gain a richer understanding of the potential impact of the proposed changes on specific groups.

2.2 Format of report

All questions were optional. Not all of the respondents answered all questions, so the number of respondents varies per question. The percentages are based on the total number of respondents to the question, not the consultation overall; i.e. respondents who did not provide a response to the question are excluded when calculating percentages.

For some questions, respondents could choose more than one answer, so the percentages will not add up to 100%.

Tables with all of the counts, percentages, and number of respondents who did not provide a response to each question in the survey are in Appendix 1.

3. Total Responses and Demographics of Respondents

There were **1,947 responses** to the consultation survey.

The majority of the respondents are residents of Birmingham (92%) and library users (92%).

Table 1:

Respondent Type (can choose more than one)	Number of respondents	% of total respondents
Library user	1,775	91.8%
Resident of Birmingham	1,771	91.6%
Represent a community group	82	4.2%
Other	73	3.8%
Represent a voluntary organisation	59	3.1%
Birmingham library staff	53	2.7%
Represent/own a local business	44	2.3%
Library Service at Home user	43	2.2%
Represent a school	32	1.7%
Represent a public sector organisation	26	1.3%
Volunteer at a Birmingham library	20	1.0%
Individual interested in running a library	19	1.0%
Birmingham councillor	14	0.7%
Represent a group interested in running a library	10	0.5%
Parish/town councillor	6	0.3%
MP	1	0.1%

8% (145 responses) were by employees of the council, and 1% of responses were by councillors.

3.1: Age, Gender and Sexual Orientation

Table 2: Age of respondents

Age	% of total respondents	% Birmingham population (ONS mid-year 2015 estimates)
Under 18	1.0%	25.5%
18-24	2.2%	12.3%
25-34	9.8%	15.3%
35-44	21.5%	12.7%
45-54	15.0%	12.0%
55-64	17.8%	9.0%
65-74	20.9%	6.7%
75-84	8.6%	4.5%
85+	3.1%	1.9%

Respondents are generally aged 35-74yrs. However, more than twice the proportion of people aged 65+yrs (34%) responded compared to the Birmingham resident population (13%).

Figure 1:




Figure 2:




Around two-thirds of respondents are female.

The majority are heterosexual or straight.

3.2: Ethnicity and Religion

Figure 3:




Just over half (56%) of respondents are of Christian religion.

The proportion of 'no religion' is far higher compared to the proportion for Birmingham residents overall, whilst Muslim, Sikh and Hindu are underrepresented amongst the respondents.

Christian includes Church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and all other Christian denominators.

Figure 4:



87% of respondents are of White ethnic background, which is much higher than found in the Birmingham resident population (58%).

All other ethnic groups are underrepresented, particularly Asian/Asian British and other ethnic groups.

3.3: Physical or mental health conditions and caring responsibilities

Figure 5:

Physical or Mental Health Conditions lasting 12mths





Figure 6:

Caring Responsibilities



18% stated they have a physical or mental health condition lasting 12mths or more, and the majority of these respondents have conditions related to mobility.

41% have a form of a caring role, with the majority being a primary carer of a child or children.

3.4: Location based analysis – ward of respondents

No. of respondents per ward
Birmingham City Council
2018/19





Table 3: Top 10 wards of respondents

Ward	% of total respondents
Bournville	11.9%
Sutton Vesey	7.8%
Sutton New Hall	5.4%
Quinton	5.1%
Billesley	5.0%
Moseley and Kings Heath	4.9%
Sutton Trinity	4.7%
Sutton Four Oaks	3.5%
Selly Oak	3.4%
Hall Green	3.2%

There is at least one response from each ward. Bournville had the most respondents (194) whilst Washwood Heath had the least (4).

Six of the wards are located next to each other in the south of the city, accounting for 31% of responses (Selly Oak, Bournville, Brandwood, Billesley, Hall Green and Moseley & Kings Heath).

In terms of districts, Sutton Coldfield had the most respondents (21%).

Map 1: Ward of respondents – based on respondents who live in Birmingham and have provided a valid postcode (1,627 respondents)

3.5: Location based analysis – Mosaic Public Sector segmentation

Mosaic Public Sector is a UK segmentation classification by Experian designed specifically for use by the public sector, describing the social and service needs of people and households. Using the postcode, it classifies a person into one of 15 segment groups, and provides an understanding of their living environment, demographics, income, and lifestyle.

Table 4: MPS segment group of respondents – based on those who have provided a valid postcode

Experian Mosaic Public Sector - Group	Number of respondents	% of respondents	% of Birmingham population
A Country Living Well-off owners in rural locations enjoying the benefits of country life	0	0.0%	0.0%
B Prestige Positions Established families in large detached homes living upmarket lifestyles	161	9.5%	3.9%
C City Prosperity High status city dwellers living in central locations and pursuing careers with high rewards	39	2.3%	1.0%
D Domestic Success Thriving families who are busy bringing up children and following careers	232	13.6%	4.6%
E Suburban Stability Mature suburban owners living settled lives in mid-range housing	90	5.3%	2.9%
F Senior Security Elderly people with assets who are enjoying a comfortable retirement	197	11.6%	5.5%
G Rural Reality Householders living in inexpensive homes in village communities	0	0.0%	0.0%
H Aspiring Homemakers Younger households settling down in housing priced within their means	196	11.5%	8.2%
I Urban Cohesion Residents of settled urban communities with a strong sense of identity	219	12.9%	27.4%
J Rental Hubs Educated young people privately renting in urban neighbourhoods	118	6.9%	8.6%
K Modest Traditions Mature homeowners of value homes enjoying stable lifestyles	76	4.5%	5.3%
L Transient Renters Single people privately renting low cost homes for the short term	92	5.4%	7.0%
M Family Basics Families with limited resources who have to budget to make ends meet	117	6.9%	13.4%
N Vintage Value Elderly people reliant on support to meet financial or practical needs	119	7.0%	6.3%
O Municipal Challenge Urban renters of social housing facing an array of challenges	30	1.8%	4.8%
Unclassified	14	0.8%	0.9%
Total	1,700	100.0%	100.0%

Segment D had the highest proportion of respondents, followed by segments I, F, and H (all highlighted in the table). These segments have a mix of demographics, incomes, and life stages.

Segment D - Domestic Success

This group is highly overrepresented compared with its proportions as a whole in Birmingham. This group are high-earning families with school-age children who live affluent lifestyles in upmarket suburban homes in sought-after neighbourhoods. They tend to have successful careers in higher managerial and professional roles, but also have the highest proportion of part-time/housewife employment status. They are keen internet and tablet users. The majority of respondents in this group come from Bournville or the Sutton Coldfield wards.

Segment I - Urban Cohesion

This is the second highest group of respondents, although it is highly underrepresented compared to its Birmingham proportions. It is the largest segment in Birmingham, composed of highly diverse, settled extended families and older people who live in multi-cultural city suburbs, often with a strong community feel. Household incomes overall are moderate, derived from work in lower managerial, intermediate and semi-routine occupations. They are keen on communication using the latest smartphones. Segment I respondents come from a wide spread of wards, with many coming from Aston and Springfield.

Segment F- Senior Security

This group is highly overrepresented compared to its Birmingham proportions. This is the most elderly group of all, their average age is 75, and almost all are retired. Women outnumber men. They are still living independently with relatively good health, in comfortable homes that they own, with state pensions often supplemented by private pensions. They prefer more traditional forms of communication. Respondents come from a wide spread of wards, with many coming from Sutton Vesey and Quinton.

Segment H - Aspiring Homemakers

This group is slightly overrepresented compared to its Birmingham proportions and is one of the youngest segment groups. Often, they have only recently bought their first home in private suburbs, which they have chosen to fit their modest budget. They are typically young families, couples without children, or singles in their 20s and 30s. They tend to be full-time employed, and often on good starter salaries. They are keen social network users with a lot of smartphone apps. 30% of respondents in this group come from Bournville and Selly Oak wards.

Therefore, based on Mosaic Public Sector segmentation respondents to this consultation are of mixed backgrounds and lifestyles but particularly are: high-income families with young children; comfortably retired; young families or couples; or diverse extended families or older people with modest incomes.

4. Findings – How libraries are used

Respondents were asked about their current use of library services, including mobile libraries and libraries at home services. Questions included which libraries they used, how often and when they used them, how they travelled to them, and what they use libraries for.

Respondents were asked which specific library or library service they used most often, and could choose up to three and indicate if they used it 'most often', '2nd most often' or 3rd most often'.

Table 5: Top 5 Libraries ranked by 'most often'

Library	Number of Respondents
Stirchley	206
Sutton Coldfield	167
Yardley Wood	129
Quinton	120
Kings Heath	107

Table 6: Top 5 Libraries ranked by total mentions

Library	Number of Respondents
Library of Birmingham	637
Sutton Coldfield	343
Stirchley	260
Kings Heath	231
Yardley Wood	167

Stirchley had the highest number of respondents ranking it as the library they used '**most often**' (11% of total responses for 'most often'). This was closely followed by Sutton Coldfield (9%) and Yardley Wood (7%).

When looking at the combined total of 'most often', '2nd most often', and '3rd most often', the **Library of Birmingham** is ranked highest as it had the highest total number of respondents who included it somewhere in the rankings (i.e. many people chose it as their second and third most used library).

Figure 7: How often the respondent visits or uses a library service - percentage




The majority of respondents (56%) use a Birmingham library service **several times a month**.

Most walk to use a library service (63%), followed by car or motorbike (39%).

86% travel **2 miles or less** to their preferred library.

Morning and afternoons are the most popular times for using a library service, whilst Saturdays are the most popular days.

Figure 8: How libraries are used by respondents – ranked by activity most respondents have done



The more traditional functions of a library are the main functions that respondents have used a library for, i.e. to borrow/reserve/read books and find information.

Most respondents state that they use a library **several times a month or a few times a year** for these activities.

5. Findings – What community libraries should do

Respondents were asked to specify which library functions they consider the most important, when local libraries should be open, the reasons for not using a library in Birmingham, and the kind of things that would encourage them to use a Birmingham library more. Respondents could choose as many answer options as they liked to each of these questions, as well as provide free text comments to some questions.

Table 7: Important functions of a library

Function (more than one choice permitted)	Number of respondents	% of total respondents
Borrow books	1,827	95.7%
Access to information	1,392	72.9%
A quiet place to sit and/or read	1,339	70.1%
Reserve books	1,287	67.4%
Public computers	1,245	65.2%
A place to study	1,152	60.3%
Library events/activities/groups	1,074	56.3%
Printing/photocopying/scanning/fax services	908	47.6%
Access to free Wi-Fi	843	44.2%
A space to meet people	657	34.4%
Meeting rooms to hire	435	22.8%
Volunteering opportunities / work experience within the library	410	21.5%

96% state that **borrowing books is an important function of the library**. Less than a quarter of respondents say that hiring meeting rooms or volunteering opportunities are important.

In terms of the **days and times that a library should be open**, respondents were able to choose any of the time options (morning 9-12, afternoon 12-3, late afternoon 3-6, and evening 6-9) for any days of the week, 30% of respondents chose most or all the times and days.

Generally, Thursdays (any time) and mornings (any day except Sundays) were popular.

Specifically, of all combinations of days/times, **Saturday morning** (1,505 respondents) and **Saturday afternoon** (1,406 respondents) had the highest number of respondents.

353 respondents used the free text box to make any other comments on opening times – the most common comments are summarised:

Evenings, late afternoons, and weekends were the most popular options, with people wanting later opening times to accommodate those who cannot go during the day. Opening times should focus on being accessible for those who work, for schoolchildren, students and working families.

Many of those who mentioned evenings did not have a specific day in mind, as long as there were evening openings some of the time.

"I think there needs to be some evening and weekend service for those people who work in the day time. If hours were to be reduced, I would rather see libraries open late afternoon and evening than daytime-only."

"Maybe on some days libraries should to open later in the mornings, 10 or even 11 a.m., but stay open later in the afternoon, as indicated, until 6, or 7?"

In terms of weekends, Saturday was the most popular day to be open, with those who mentioned Sundays having differing views.


There were many who wanted libraries to be **open every day or for as long as possible**, with no specific days mentioned.

Some suggested that library opening times/days should be **flexible depending on local need** - e.g. hours based upon specific local usage or nearby libraries staggering their opening times/days:

"Libraries should be open on a range of days and times so that users have options on which libraries to use when they want to visit a library."

"Option to open late nights and weekends across a district rather than individual libraries."

Figure 9: Reasons for not using a Birmingham library in the past 12mths – number of respondents



Of the 102 respondents who completed this question, most stated that the **current opening times/days were not suitable**, and this was also the most common reason where respondents chose 'other reasons' and gave a free text response.

Respondents were then asked what would encourage them to use a library in Birmingham more – the most common option was '**more suitable opening times**' (43%), which is unsurprising considering the responses and comments for the two questions above.

33% chose 'more suitable opening days' and 22% chose 'more improved services or facilities'.

It should be noted that 41% stated nothing would encourage them as they go as often as they need or want.

337 respondents used the free text box to make any other comments on what would encourage them to use libraries more.

Overall, new books and equipment, additional activities and events, coffee shops and facilities would encourage respondents to use libraries more, as would an increase in opening hours and days of the week.

Purchasing new books: Respondents were concerned about the quality and quantity of books in libraries, and there was a consensus that a larger selection of books is needed, and that funding should be provided to ensure this happens. Some respondents stated it had been around two years since new books had been purchased.

Opening hours: Respondents were concerned that many libraries in Birmingham have reduced their opening hours and days, which has impacted people greatly. Changes in opening hours across some libraries have not been communicated effectively, with some people turning up to find the library is closed. Some cannot visit the library during opening times as it coincides with their working patterns. With fewer evening and weekend opening hours, working people are more likely to be affected by these cuts; this will also impact on children with working parents/guardians. A number of comments suggested that libraries should be open for 24 hours a day.

"It is not a question of more suitable opening hours, but just that they should be open for more days, for longer, and branch libraries should be given a chance to attract users before they are closed by the council. Unfortunately reducing library hours only creates a spiral of decline, reducing the number of users able to access it."

Activities & events including children: 55 comments were received about having activities and events at libraries, of which 27 were about children activities. Examples included talks with professionals, exhibitions, creative stories, and performances. Respondents felt that events and activities for both young and older people would encourage them to use libraries more. It is possible that people attending certain events are likely to find out about other events and attend them, too.

28 comments were about having better community engagement at libraries, including working with support/local groups to strengthen community engagement and help bring local people together.

Drinks facilities: Respondents felt that drinks facilities could help encourage use of the libraries and create a comfortable relaxing atmosphere, as well as encourage groups of people to meet. It would also help generate revenue for libraries.

"Introduce a coffee shop and integrate it into the library. This would raise revenues and go some way to offsetting running costs. Libraries need to be run on a more commercial basis."

There were some positive comments received about the current services provided, including facilities to borrow and return books from different library locations: *"The service is great and the coordination between libraries and being able to return books from the central library to Selly Oak is a real boon!"*

Respondents also used the free text box as an opportunity to comment on concerns they had about the library service:

Respondents commented that they did not support libraries closing and felt closing libraries would cause a barrier to community engagement. There was a strong sense of feeling that professional, experienced, paid staff should be running library services and that volunteers should not be running the service alone, but possibly in conjunction with professional staff. A few respondents stated that they would volunteer to stop local libraries from shutting down. Fewer staff working in libraries and the use of untrained volunteers could lead to longer queues and waiting times, therefore resulting in unsatisfied library users.

The reduction in some of the services was raised as a concern from respondents. They felt that the cuts in services impact on vulnerable people.

"Cuts in funding has meant a reduction the loss of literacy outreach is doing our children no service, especially for the most in need, who may have no access to books or encouragement to read at home" and "I am a deaf BSL user, my deaf daughter, who is 3 years old loves coming to the library to choose books, but I find it a challenge to communicate with staff about what new books you have, what events are going on and so on."

6. Findings – Views on Library of Birmingham website

Respondents were asked whether they use the Library of Birmingham website, to rate specific features of the website, and to specify all the reasons for why they may not have used the website and what would encourage them to use it.

Figure 10: How often the respondent uses the Library of Birmingham website - percentage



Nearly a third of respondents have never used the library website. Otherwise, the majority have used it several times a month or a few times a year.

Table 8: Rating of website features

Website features	Excellent / Good	Fair	Poor / Very Poor	Don't Know	Total
Library catalogue	63.5%	16.5%	4.4%	15.5%	100%
Reservations and renewals	68.6%	13.0%	2.5%	15.9%	100%
E-books, e-Mags and e-Audio loans	24.3%	9.9%	4.9%	60.9%	100%
Online joining	32.6%	9.4%	2.7%	55.3%	100%
Finding nearest library / open times	69.8%	13.9%	3.1%	13.2%	100%
General information	64.5%	18.3%	4.1%	13.2%	100%
Online resources	34.0%	8.6%	3.1%	54.3%	100%
Event and activity information	48.8%	17.9%	5.8%	27.4%	100%
Overall appearance	58.6%	26.1%	7.3%	8.0%	100%
Ease of use	57.5%	26.6%	8.9%	7.0%	100%

Generally, more respondents rate the various features of the website as excellent or good, rather than poor or very poor. In particular, **finding nearest library / open times, and reservations/renewals services** has the highest rating of excellent or good. E-books, e-Mags and e-Audio loans services have the lowest proportion of excellent / good rating due to the high proportion of 'don't know'. 9% state that the website is poor or very poor for ease of use.


The most popular reasons for not using the website were that respondents **do not want or need to use it** (40%) or they **did not know the website existed** (36%).

Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree on whether certain features would encourage them to use the website – features with the highest number of respondents agreeing were **one catalogue for books and E-books** (763 respondents), **personalised book recommendations** (689), and **children's online reading challenges** (681).

7. Findings – Views on the tiered model proposals

This section is related to the questions on the tiered model proposals. Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with various aspects of the tiered model proposals, how the proposed opening times would impact them, if they agree or disagree with a £1 reservation charge, and to give any comments on why they agree/disagree with the proposals and how the proposals could be improved.

Figure 11: Agreement with aspects of the tiered model and overall



Total Agree = agree + strongly agree; Total Disagree = disagree + strongly disagree.


More respondents disagree than agree with all the aspects of the proposals, particularly proposed changes to the opening times.

63% disagree with the proposals overall.

How the tiered model was decided had the highest proportion of 'neither agree nor disagree' and 'don't know'. This seems to tie in with a number of comments that there wasn't enough information for respondents to make any comments on the proposals.

Figure 12: Agreement with statements

Respondents were asked to state if they agree or disagree with a list of seven statements.



More agree than disagree with all of the above statements, particularly that it is better to keep a library open with reduced hours, than to close it.

The statement with the least agreement and closer margin between agree and disagree is: Library services do not have to be delivered from the current library building if a better property solution exists (38% agree and 37% disagree).

44% say the proposed opening times affect their ability to use library services a great deal, and 31% say a little. 14% say not at all.

621 respondents used the free text box to make suggestions on how the proposals could be improved.

There was **overwhelming opposition to community library cuts**, stating that they undermine the important role of library in the local communities in terms of social cohesion and education, with respondents concerned for vulnerable groups (children, elderly, deprived households) not having adequate access to a library. There were strong feelings that **libraries should be invested in**, rather than cut, and that the council had a 'duty' to run a fully funded library service. Very few respondents explicitly agreed with the cuts.

Sutton library's closure had much opposition. This was the most frequently mentioned library in the consultation (18% of respondents mentioned it, with 15% explicitly against closure). This is a popular library, regarded as centrally located and easily accessible by its proponents. There was concern over Boldmere and Walmley having hours reduced when Sutton library is being closed;

instead, respondents felt those hours should be increased. **Mere Green was often mentioned negatively**, in terms of less accessibility compared to Sutton Coldfield.

"Instead of increasing the opening hours at Mere Green (they already have a greater allocation of opening hours) why wasn't Boldmere library considered for additional opening hours. For people living this side of Sutton Coldfield town centre Mere Green is a long way to travel. "

On a related note, there was criticism over how accessibility via public transport and adequate car parking facilities had not been a prioritised criterion within the tiers, and that **focusing on distance alone was flawed**.

"Ensure that convenient public transport links exist between where the library was, to where the new location is. People without internet who depend on library services the most are often elderly or disadvantaged and are more likely to be without personal transport."

Aston was mentioned by 18 respondents.

There were comments around the underestimated value of trained, experienced staff, and deep concerns over staff being replaced by community groups/volunteers, or self-service kiosks. Many respondents believed that **community groups/volunteers do not have the experience**, qualifications or commitment of librarians, and that the staff role has been underrated, and that it is about more than books, but a wider social support role within the community.

Changes to library opening hours were mentioned many times. **Many were against library opening hours being reduced and therefore being less accessible for particular groups** (depending on when the library is being closed). This particularly included the reduction in Boldmere and Walmley, as already mentioned. Alternatively, a few suggested that it is preferable to reduce hours in libraries over closing any branches.

There were a number of respondents who thought that **'failing' libraries should be closed**, with their staff and resources consolidated to larger 'super' libraries.

"Close the libraries that are very poorly used or the buildings that are no longer in a fit state and increase the staffing levels and opening hours at the libraries that are viable."


A number of respondents commented that there **wasn't enough information for them to make any comments on the proposals**, from wanting to know proposed opening times to those who had missed the information on which libraries were in each tier.

Although the responses to this consultation were overwhelmingly about opposition to library cuts/closures, some respondents did provide specific suggestions to the proposals, including alternative venues (e.g. churches, schools, and charities), shared services with other public sector organisations, and income generation examples, particularly having coffee shops based within libraries for extra income.

"Maybe Virgin or Microsoft libraries are a bit ambitious but what about trying to get local businesses to sponsor book buyinge.g. the Homebase DIY collection, the crime fiction collection sponsored by a local security firm, or a cookery collection sponsored by a local cafe or restaurant. Books in exchange for publicity, it might make things happen."

In terms of the proposed **£1 reservation charge**, **45% disagree**, whilst 39% agree and the rest don't know or neither agree or disagree.

Figure 13: Agreement that the proposals protect a future for the Library Service



Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree that the proposals will protect a future for Birmingham's Community library Service.

Just over two-fifths (43%) disagree with this.

33% neither agree nor disagree or don't know, which is more than the number who agree in total (24%).

806 respondents used the free text box to explain their response to the above question of whether they agree the proposals protect a future for the library service.

There was an overarching, **widespread opposition to the proposals**. Respondents commented that libraries are an essential, statutory service and the proposals only undermine the role that they play. Libraries are important by: providing essential resources, books, internet access, knowledgeable staff and safe, quiet spaces for the community (especially for those who don't have these resources at home). Also, libraries play an important community role, by educating children, fostering greater social cohesion, and by providing a free space for vulnerable persons and groups.

Respondents felt that **libraries were not protected by the proposals**. Rather, respondents feared that the proposals would make libraries difficult to access and library users would be discouraged to visit a library.

148 respondents commented on staff. There was a widespread concern for how libraries would survive under the new proposals with a reduction of experienced library staff. Respondents wanted a library service provided by trained, experienced and knowledgeable staff, but the **proposals were**

seen to undermine the expertise of library staff and the professional service which they provided.

Although many express enthusiasm over volunteers getting involved with libraries, they should not replace existing members of staff, since volunteers do not have the skills and experiences to provide an adequate library service:

“Knowledge of library staff is key to ensuring services run smoothly and in my opinion libraries cannot be run properly by volunteers who have no knowledge of how a library should be run and operated.”

By reducing staff levels, or by replacing library staff with volunteers, library users feared an unreliable service:

“The staffing levels proposed are so low that there are bound to be unscheduled closures which will make people reluctant to attend for fear of a wasted journey.”

The value of library staff was felt to be further undermined by proposing further implementation of self-service machines. **Library users valued the knowledge and friendliness of library staff, which could not be provided by technology.** Again, if self-service is to be implemented, it should not be at the detriment of library staff; especially since self-service machines could fail, and library users (especially the elderly) have struggled to use the machines and would always need (and want) to speak to knowledgeable staff.

Respondents also commented on the proposed closures, with **Sutton Coldfield the most frequently mentioned library** (78 respondents). Respondents were confused by the decision to close a recently refurbished library. They stated that Sutton Coldfield library is centrally located and easily accessible and many different groups (especially; school children and the elderly) rely upon it, and so, Sutton is considered a major asset to the community. Many mentioned that if Sutton library closes, **accessing an alternative library would be too inconvenient and impossible** for many people:

“It is no good increasing the hours at Mere Green library as this is on the other side of the town. A visit to Mere Green would involve a car or bus journey.”

In comparison, only 11 different comments addressed **Aston library**. However, there was a similar sentiment that increasing opening hours at a neighbouring library did not compensate for Aston's closure, and library users are unlikely to travel to an alternative library.

Beyond Aston and Sutton libraries, many respondents commented that the proposals will only work for those with the means to travel to an alternative library, whereas this wasn't an option for many people; nor will they feel encouraged to do so. **Elderly persons who are less mobile and young families would particularly suffer without having a library within walking distance.** Many commented that it is unlikely that library users would continue to visit a library if it meant having to take public transport.

Many respondents wanted **libraries to be open for as long as possible and opposed reductions to opening hours**. They fear that the proposed reductions would give people less opportunity to visit their library, resulting in reduced footfall and underused libraries, providing the council with further justification to close libraries in the future:

“By further cutting library hours, more and more people will be unable to access their local library, leading to less usage and eventual closure of the libraries.”

Respondents stated how the proposals, and further cuts and closures in the future, would **impact certain people and vulnerable groups in particular**. 95 respondents mentioned **children/young people** in their comments, and that libraries are essential for providing free books and resources for children, especially for those who do not have access to these resources at home.

“How do children whose parents are short of cash access books, the internet, homework help and reading groups?”

In particular, there was anxiety over losing the educational function of library services, which would affect children in particular. Libraries play an important role in education, by encouraging children to read from a young age, by providing a space for children to complete their homework, and by holding school visits where staff could engage with school children. Thus, there was a concern that future generations were going to miss out without a substantial library service that encouraged learning and reading from a young age.

Many argued that the council were undermining their role in providing a substantial service which is equally accessible to all. Many respondents felt that the tiers were divisive, by providing an uneven and inconsistent service which would **leave the most deprived members of the community without access to vital resources**.

“I fear that people will lose their jobs, and those who live in the more deprived areas of the city who need access to library services the most will be at a disadvantage, especially the young and the elderly.”

In particular, the proposal to implement a £1 reservation charge would discourage library users from accessing books.

“Whilst I could afford to pay a pound for reservations, not everyone can and this proposal will disproportionately affect those who are less well off”

There were also some comments that were with positive or understanding of the council. **Some agreed with the proposals**; although often reluctant and unhappy about the cuts, they thought that the proposals would cause the least damage to the service.

“Something has to change and this looks like a compromise that tries to give a service across the city still so that people can access different things. It is better than a one size fits all approach.”

There were also respondents who made suggestions on how the library could make further savings, through **income generation or shared services**.

“I would like to be part of this idea by running our day nursery from Sparkhill library and working in the library.”

“Why not hire out the video games that the younger generation spend so much time and money on. With wifi access allow ebooks for which a fee could be charged. Brainstorming ideas would yield numerous ideas that could expand not reduce the library service.”

8. Findings – Community led libraries

Finally, in this section of the survey respondents were asked a number of questions relating community involvement in libraries and whether they would be interested in delivering services at their local library.

When asked **how many hours a week** they could contribute to delivering library services in their area, 57% of respondents stated 'none'.

Of those who can contribute, the majority can provide up to **4 hours per week** (81% of respondents who can contribute).

173 respondents have provided their contact details to register their formal interest in getting involved in running a local library service. These will be passed to the library service to follow up on.

Respondents were then asked what would encourage them to get involved in supporting a local community library – half of those who responded want **more information about how it would work** and 15% want more details of who to contact about being involved in delivering services. 38% say nothing would encourage them to support delivering services.

275 respondents used the free text box to comment on what would encourage them to get involved.

There was a strong consensus (24% of respondents who commented) that **libraries should be run by professional staff that have the skills, experience, and expertise to run the service**. One respondent stated: *"Librarianship is a skill and only Aberystwyth University offers a librarianship degree now"*. Some suggested that whilst the use of volunteers could support the service, those run only by volunteers may impact on the delivery of library services and that it would be unreasonable and unacceptable to expect volunteers to offer the same service as professional staff.

Volunteers delivering library services without the support of professional staff might also have an impact on the number of people visiting libraries. Some respondents felt that volunteering could work alongside properly trained and paid staff to help maximise opening times for libraries; that **using volunteers could help to keep libraries open for more days and longer hours**, and running costs might be smaller.

Respondents stated that they would like to keep library services open to support local communities in coming together but that they themselves could not due to **lack of time** because of family and work commitments (23%), or that they are too old to volunteer (6%), or unable to because of health issues (3%).

"If I didn't have to work, and didn't have two small children"; "As I work at different hours and on varying days of the week, I could not commit to any particular time to volunteer"; and "I am my husband's fulltime carer..."

Many respondents did not support using volunteers and stated that the council have a **statutory duty to provide library services** for local communities, that library services are a public service, and therefore the Council should be responsible for delivering these services.

"Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 gives Birmingham City Council a statutory duty to provide "a comprehensive and efficient library service"; and "Community libraries are a public service and should be provided by the local council - they are not a business and do not have to make a profit".

Some respondents stated that they already pay for these services by paying their council tax.

"I work full time and pay council tax for this service" and "Libraries are a statutory right which I help fund through my council tax" and "I believe libraries should be staffed and run by professionals. I wish to be able to use a library without feeling guilty that I in some way should be volunteering there, when my taxes should already pay for it".

Some respondents would **only volunteer if libraries were going to be closed and disagreed with volunteering if it meant making library staff redundant**. They felt that library staff have the skills and expertise to run local libraries and would not want to take that away from them.

"As long as this is not a way of reducing services and making librarians redundant"; "Reassurance that this wouldn't be instead of employing professional librarians" and "If it was to close I would get involved in helping it to stay open".

Some respondents were unclear as to what is expected from them as a volunteer to work in libraries and could not find this information. Prior to agreeing to volunteer, they would **need to know what the expectations of volunteers are**. Additional to this, a few respondents wanted to know the age restrictions in volunteering as they had had children or grandchildren that may want to volunteer.

A few respondents felt that if they were to volunteer that there should be an **incentive** for them to do so. Examples included travel expenses or being paid for the work they do.

Some respondents felt they already supported their local library by visiting and using them: *"I believe that I support my local libraries by using them in the way they were intended to be used".*

A further question asked respondents what information or support would they need to help run a tier 3 library in partnership with the council.

65 respondents used the free text box to comment, and of these a number stated that they **do not support communities running libraries**, and that library services should be delivered by the council, and staffed by professional librarians and experienced paid staff.

Where respondents did comment on what they would need to run a library, they mentioned more information on how it would work, clear guidelines and lines of responsibilities, financial details and running costs, and training.

A few stated that they would need more information before they could decide if they could support or make any further suggestions.

Respondents were asked to select from a list, all of the options that they think the council should consider for their local library.

Table 9: Options the council should consider for a local library

Share the current library space with other services i.e. Housing Associations, advice agencies, community meeting rooms, business start-ups etc., thereby retaining but reducing the space available for traditional library services but offering a wider variety of service provision.	768
Partnering with a local community group/organisation to lead and develop the library offer within that locality possibly attracting local sponsorship or funding.	598
Allow staff in Community Libraries in Birmingham to operate the service through a not for profit staff led mutual organisation	372
Providing an electronic access point within the community for enquiries to be made for book requests and delivery.	212
Moving aspects of the library offer into the building of other service providers.	185
Providing a mobile library service stop instead.	74

The top two options that they chose were **sharing library space with other services** and **partnering with local groups to lead and develop the libraries offer**. This is also reflected in some of the comments above, where respondents state that sharing spaces should be considered.

Only a small proportion want mobile library stops instead of a local library to be considered.

9. Conclusion

Generally, respondents disagree with most aspects of the tiered model proposals.

Respondents have highlighted concerns that the proposed changes would negatively impact on vulnerable groups, including children and the elderly, and would lead to less people using the services overall.

Many already feel that the opening hours are restrictive and not enough, and so are particularly against reductions to opening hours and to staff, citing that experienced and knowledgeable librarians are essential to libraries. Many do not understand or agree to the use of volunteers or community-led delivery.

It is important that the Library Service takes on board the findings and explores further the concerns raised, provide more information so that people are better informed, and to try minimise the impact of any changes to specific groups. Where suggestions have been made, these could be looked into further, by engaging with local communities and working with them to find appropriate solutions.

Specifically, further discussion with users of Aston library and Sutton Coldfield library may be required to alleviate concerns and find a solution that meets the needs of both the users and the council.

Finally, it is recommended that the findings of this consultation and how they have been used are shared with users and groups that may be impacted, to show that they were listened to and their concerns have been considered.

Appendix 1 – All responses for closed survey questions

BCC employee	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
No	1,659	92.0%
Yes	145	8.0%
Total Respondents	1,804	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 143

Age Group	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Under 18	25	1.0%
18-24	40	2.2%
25-34	183	9.8%
35-44	378	21.5%
45-54	272	15.0%
55-64	330	17.8%
65-74	374	20.9%
75-84	164	8.6%
85+	50	3.1%
Total Respondents	1,816	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 131

Gender	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Female	1,145	67.9%
Male	541	32.1%
Total Respondents	1,686	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 261

Sexual Orientation	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Heterosexual or Straight	1,241	94.7%
Bisexual	31	2.4%
Gay or Lesbian	25	1.9%
Other	13	1.0%
Total Respondents	1,310	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 637

Religion	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Christian (including church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and all other Christian denominators)	877	55.5%
No Religion	525	33.2%
Muslim	106	6.7%
Sikh	21	1.3%
Any other religion	17	1.1%
Jewish	12	0.8%
Buddhists	12	0.8%
Hindu	11	0.7%
Total Respondents	1,581	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 366

Do you have caring responsibilities? (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
None	914	59.0%
Primary carer of child/children under 18	432	27.9%
Primary carer of disabled child/children	22	1.4%
Primary carer of disabled adult (18 and over)	42	2.7%
Primary carer of older person/people (65 and over)	85	5.5%
Secondary carer	101	6.5%
Total Respondents	1,548	

No response / prefer not to say = 399

Ethnic Group	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
White (Total)	1,441	86.7%
English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	1,325	79.7%
Other White European (including Mixed European)	40	2.4%
Irish	35	2.1%
Any other White background	25	1.5%
Jewish	7	0.4%
Polish	6	0.4%
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	3	0.2%
Asian/Asian British (Total)	144	8.6%
Pakistani	42	2.5%
Bangladeshi	19	1.1%
Indian Sikh	17	1.0%
British Asian	17	1.0%
Indian Other	17	1.0%
Chinese	12	0.7%
Kashmiri	12	0.7%
Afghani	2	0.1%
Sri Lankan	2	0.1%
Any other Asian background	2	0.1%
Filipino	1	0.1%
Vietnamese	1	0.1%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British (Total)	71	4.3%
Black British	33	2.0%
Caribbean	16	1.0%
African	16	1.0%
Any other Black/African/Caribbean background	3	0.2%
Somali	3	0.2%
Mixed/Multiple (Total)	47	2.8%
White and Black Caribbean/African	25	1.5%
White and Asian	14	0.8%
Any other mixed background	8	0.5%
Other Ethnic Group (Total)	8	0.5%
Any other ethnic group	4	0.2%
Arab	3	0.2%
Kurdish	1	0.1%
Total Respondents	1,663	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 284

Physical or mental health condition/illness lasting 12mths+	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
No	1,362	82.1%
Yes	297	17.9%
Total Respondents	1,659	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 288

If yes, do any of these conditions or illnesses affect you in any of the following areas? (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Mobility (e.g. walking short distances or climbing stairs)	144	34.2%
Stamina or breathing or fatigue	72	17.1%
Mental Health	70	16.6%
Hearing (e.g. deafness or partial hearing)	70	16.6%
Dexterity (e.g. lifting and carrying and carrying objects, using a	48	11.4%
Vision (e.g. blindness or partial sight)	41	9.7%
Learning or understanding or concentrating	24	5.7%
Memory	22	5.2%
Other (please specify)	21	5.0%
Socially or behaviourally (e.g. associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome)	9	2.1%
Total Respondents	421	

No response / prefer not to say = 1,526

Ward of home address	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
BOURNVILLE	194	11.9%
SUTTON VESEY	127	7.8%
SUTTON NEW HALL	88	5.4%
QUINTON	83	5.1%
BILLESLEY	81	5.0%
MOSELEY AND KINGS HEATH	80	4.9%
SUTTON TRINITY	76	4.7%
SUTTON FOUR OAKS	57	3.5%
SELLY OAK	55	3.4%
HALL GREEN	52	3.2%
BRANDWOOD	49	3.0%
ASTON	48	3.0%
HARBORNE	47	2.9%
WEOLEY	45	2.8%
KINGSTANDING	40	2.5%
STECHFORD AND YARDLEY NORTH	37	2.3%
ERDINGTON	34	2.1%
PERRY BARR	34	2.1%
NORTHFIELD	29	1.8%
ACOCKS GREEN	29	1.8%
NECHELLS	29	1.8%
SPRINGFIELD	28	1.7%
OSCOTT	26	1.6%
KINGS NORTON	24	1.5%
SOUTH YARDLEY	24	1.5%
HANDSWORTH WOOD	23	1.4%
SHELDON	21	1.3%
STOCKLAND GREEN	20	1.2%
LONGBRIDGE	18	1.1%
EDGBASTON	18	1.1%
SPARKBROOK	18	1.1%
LADYWOOD	18	1.1%
BARTLEY GREEN	15	0.9%
SHARD END	12	0.7%
LOZELLS AND EAST HANDSWORTH	11	0.7%
TYBURN	10	0.6%
SOHO	9	0.6%
HODGE HILL	9	0.6%
BORDESLEY GREEN	5	0.3%
WASHWOOD HEATH	4	0.2%
Grand Total	1,627	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 247; live outside Birmingham = 73

Q2. How often use library	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	512	26.8%
Several times a month	1,073	56.1%
A few times a year	273	14.3%
Once a year or less	25	1.3%
Never	29	1.5%
Total respondents	1,912	100.0%

No response = 35

Q4. Method of transport (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Bicycle	95	5.0%
Bus	516	27.3%
Car/Motorbike	732	38.7%
Train	131	6.9%
Walk	1,195	63.1%
Other	15	0.8%
Total respondents	1,893	

Q3. Libraries services used - Ranked by Total Mentions	Most often	2nd most often	3rd most often	Total
Library of Birmingham, Centenary Square	93	340	204	637
Sutton Coldfield	167	125	51	343
Stirchley	206	39	15	260
Kings Heath	107	63	61	231
Yardley Wood	129	20	18	167
Quinton	120	33	13	166
Harborne	57	73	26	156
Boldmere	101	27	16	144
Walmley	72	44	11	127
Hall Green	67	35	24	126
Northfield	58	38	26	122
Mere Green	45	48	24	117
South Yardley	82	16	13	111
Erdington	45	29	31	105
Perry Common	69	21	8	98
Acocks Green	26	40	25	91
Kings Norton	34	33	21	88
Aston	57	17	7	81
Tower Hill	59	13	3	75
Weoley Castle	41	17	12	70
Selly Oak	27	23	17	67
Handsworth	38	9	10	57
Kingstanding	10	30	13	53
Druids Heath	20	23	9	52
Balsall Heath	16	16	18	50
Sheldon	21	11	2	34
Sparkhill	13	12	9	34
Birchfield	10	11	10	31
Shard End	24	2	4	30
Glebe Farm	17	1	9	27
Bloomsbury	21	4	1	26
Library Service at Home	4	9	9	22
Spring Hill	5	9	7	21
Ward End	8	8	2	18
Mobile Library Service	4	3	8	15
Small Heath	4	9	2	15
Bartley Green	4	3	4	11
Frankley	9	1	1	11
Kents Moat	2	4	1	7
West Heath	1	1	1	3

Q5. How far travel to a library	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Less than one mile	872	47.2%
1-2 miles	720	38.9%
More than 2 miles	257	13.9%
Total respondents	1,849	100.0%

No response = 98

Q6. When visit a library (can choose more than one)	Morning	Lunchtime	Afternoon	Evening	Total
Monday	523	203	465	86	1,277
Tuesday	521	201	504	95	1,321
Wednesday	245	115	255	36	651
Thursday	398	211	601	232	1,442
Friday	480	197	479	60	1,216
Saturday	799	368	615	50	1,832
Total responses (not total respondents)	2,966	1,295	2,919	559	7,739

Q7. How often use Library services - Read	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	233	20.1%
Several times a month	375	32.3%
A few times a year	287	24.7%
Once a year or less	83	7.2%
Never	182	15.7%
Total respondents	1,160	100.0%

No response = 787

Q7. How often use Library services - Borrow a book	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	275	15.8%
Several times a month	1,056	60.8%
A few times a year	355	20.4%
Once a year or less	29	1.7%
Never	23	1.3%
Total respondents	1,738	100.0%

No response = 209

Q7. How often use Library services - Reserve a book	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	103	8.3%
Several times a month	399	32.1%
A few times a year	453	36.4%
Once a year or less	149	12.0%
Never	139	11.2%
Total respondents	1,243	100.0%

No response = 704

Q7. How often use Library services - Use public computers	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	179	16.4%
Several times a month	200	18.3%
A few times a year	229	21.0%
Once a year or less	110	10.1%
Never	374	34.2%
Total respondents	1,092	100.0%

No response = 855

Q7. How often use Library services - Access wifi	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	112	12.4%
Several times a month	137	15.2%
A few times a year	138	15.3%
Once a year or less	71	7.9%
Never	445	49.3%
Total respondents	903	100.0%

No response = 1,044

Q7. How often use Library services - Study	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	109	11.7%
Several times a month	148	15.9%
A few times a year	173	18.6%
Once a year or less	104	11.2%
Never	396	42.6%
Total respondents	930	100.0%

No response = 1,017

Q7. How often use Library services - Print,photocopy,scan,fax	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	103	9.5%
Several times a month	222	20.4%
A few times a year	298	27.4%
Once a year or less	121	11.1%
Never	343	31.6%
Total respondents	1,087	100.0%

No response = 860

Q7. How often use Library services - Find information	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	178	13.4%
Several times a month	423	31.8%
A few times a year	520	39.1%
Once a year or less	103	7.8%
Never	105	7.9%
Total respondents	1,329	100.0%

No response = 618

Q7. How often use Library services - Events, activities, groups	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	101	8.7%
Several times a month	295	25.4%
A few times a year	391	33.6%
Once a year or less	144	12.4%
Never	232	19.9%
Total respondents	1,163	100.0%

No response = 784

Q7. How often use Library services - Meet people	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	152	14.9%
Several times a month	231	22.6%
A few times a year	187	18.3%
Once a year or less	99	9.7%
Never	353	34.5%
Total respondents	1,022	100.0%

No response = 925

Q7. How often use Library services - Hire rooms	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	10	1.3%
Several times a month	32	4.1%
A few times a year	25	3.2%
Once a year or less	42	5.4%
Never	676	86.1%
Total respondents	785	100.0%

No response = 1,162

Q7. How often use Library services - Work experience / volunteer	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	18	2.3%
Several times a month	18	2.3%
A few times a year	25	3.2%
Once a year or less	22	2.8%
Never	704	89.5%
Total respondents	787	100.0%

No response = 1,160

Q8. Important functions of a library (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Borrow books	1,827	95.7%
Access to information	1,392	72.9%
A quiet place to sit and/or read	1,339	70.1%
Reserve books	1,287	67.4%
Public computers	1,245	65.2%
A place to study	1,152	60.3%
Library events/activities/groups	1,074	56.3%
Printing/photocopying/scanning/fax services	908	47.6%
Access to free Wi-Fi	843	44.2%
A space to meet people	657	34.4%
Meeting rooms to hire	435	22.8%
Volunteering opportunities / work experience within the library	410	21.5%
Total respondents	1,909	

No response = 38

Q9. Preferred opening days/times (can choose more than one)	Morning (9-12)	Afternoon (12-3)	Late afternoon (3-6)	Evening (6-9)	Total
Monday	1,396	1,332	1,329	528	4,585
Tuesday	1,393	1,336	1,340	600	4,669
Wednesday	1,153	1,085	1,106	502	3,846
Thursday	1,322	1,326	1,389	849	4,886
Friday	1,391	1,325	1,340	547	4,603
Saturday	1,505	1,406	1,119	338	4,368
Sunday	341	402	291	135	1,169
Total responses	8,501	8,212	7,914	3,499	

Q10. Reasons not use a library past 12mths (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
The opening times / days do not suit me	41	40.2%
I don't want to go / I have no reason to go	25	24.5%
Other reasons	27	26.5%
I use a library that isn't run by Birmingham City Council	16	15.7%
They are too far to travel to	4	3.9%
I don't know where the libraries are	1	1.0%
Total respondents	102	

No response = 1,845

Q11. What would encourage more use of libraries (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
More suitable opening times	744	43.4%
Nothing, I already use it as often as I want	705	41.1%
More suitable opening days	564	32.9%
More of improved services / facilities	382	22.3%
Other	130	7.6%
Nothing, I don't want to use a library	13	0.8%
Total respondents	1,716	

No response = 231

Q12. How often use LOB website	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Several times a week	171	9.3%
Several times a month	457	24.8%
A few times a year	474	25.7%
Once a year or less	145	7.9%
Never	596	32.3%
Total respondents	1,843	100.0%

No response = 104

Q13. LOB website features rating	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know
Library catalogue	280	507	205	39	16	192
Reservations and renewals	401	401	152	20	9	186
E-books, e-Mags and e-Audio loans	95	170	108	40	14	664
Online joining	136	219	103	20	9	603
Finding nearest library / opening times	345	502	169	24	14	160
General information	278	502	221	39	10	159
Online resources	134	255	98	26	10	622
Event and activity information	174	395	209	45	23	319
Overall appearance	215	488	313	65	22	96
Ease of use	244	455	323	84	24	85

Q14. Why never used LoB website (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
I don't need or want to use it	277	40.3%
I didn't know the website existed	244	35.5%
I don't have access to the internet	108	15.7%
Other	73	10.6%
It's difficult to use or find what I need	48	7.0%
Total respondents	687	

No response = 1,260

Q15. Features to encourage more use of LoB website	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
One catalogue for books and E-books	340	423	420	71	46	209
Online reading groups	142	295	501	167	87	251
Personalised book recommendations	206	483	431	119	69	179
Children's online reading challenges	282	399	336	88	76	264
Online payment of fines	200	431	400	109	72	207
Improved library service online mobile app	244	343	428	83	64	266

No response = 1,260

Q.16 Agreement with aspects of the proposal	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Grouping into four tiers with different levels of service						
Libraries selected for each tier	73	271	379	358	412	220
How it was decided	66	200	395	358	373	308
Proposed changes to opening hours	79	226	266	550	531	101
Proposal overall	67	219	263	468	644	102

Q17. Agreement with statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Reading; Learning; Health; Digital and Information as main focus	573	632	258	62	38	171
Better to keep library open with reduced opening hours, than to close it	982	634	92	74	42	26
If a library is to close then the service at a neighbouring library should be enhanced	852	603	165	75	58	45
Community groups wanting to work in partnership with libraries should receive staff support, books and IT	625	681	225	68	86	87
Customers should be encouraged to use the self-service kiosks so that staff can concentrate on dealing with enquiries, delivering sessions for children and adults and outreach work	335	583	350	308	177	45
Library services do not have to be delivered from the current library building if a better property solution exists	186	482	371	332	309	89
Small one-off grants that enable the community to work in partnership should be made available for service proposals in Tier 4	321	540	398	117	166	203

Q18. Extent proposed opening times affects ability to use library	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
A great deal	780	43.7%
A little	544	30.5%
Don't know	220	12.3%
Not at all	241	13.5%
Total respondents	1,785	100.0%

No response = 162

Q20. Agreement to £1 reservations charge	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Strongly agree	222	11.9%
Agree	512	27.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	263	14.1%
Disagree	354	19.0%
Strongly disagree	487	26.1%
Don't know	29	1.6%
Total respondents	1,867	100.0%

No response = 80

Q21. Hours contributing to delivering library services - per week	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Less than 2 hours	188	10.8%
2-4 hours	204	11.8%
4-6 hours	51	2.9%
6-10 hours	23	1.3%
More than 10 hours	20	1.2%
None	984	56.7%
Don't know	266	15.3%
Total respondents	1,736	100.0%

No response = 211

Q22. Type of group or organisation (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Currently share a building with a library	54	23.2%
Interested in having a library service occupy space in our premises	11	4.7%
Interested in moving our business/service/group into an existing library building	22	9.4%
Have a building that could be available to host a community-led library	13	5.6%
Interested in offering aspects of a library service i.e. books for loan or public Wi-Fi	34	14.6%
Other	126	54.1%
Total respondents	233	

No response = 1,714

Q24. What would encourage more involvement (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Nothing	488	37.2%
More information about how this would work	660	50.3%
More information on who to contact about it	191	14.6%
Other	138	10.5%
Total respondents	1,311	

No response = 636

Q26. Options BCC should consider for your local library (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents
Share the current library space with other services i.e. Housing Associations, advice agencies, community meeting rooms, business start-ups etc., thereby retaining but reducing the space available for traditional library services but offering a wider variety of service provision.	768
Partnering with a local community group/organisation to lead and develop the library offer within that locality possibly attracting local sponsorship or funding.	598
Allow staff in Community Libraries in Birmingham to operate the service through a not for profit staff led mutual organisation	372
None of the above	316
Don't know	269
Providing an electronic access point within the community for enquiries to be made for book requests and delivery.	212
Moving aspects of the library offer into the building of other service providers.	185
Providing a mobile library service stop instead.	74
Total respondents	1,625

No response = 322

Q27. Agreement proposals protect future for Library Service	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Strongly agree	76	4.2%
Agree	345	19.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	357	19.9%
Disagree	377	21.0%
Strongly disagree	400	22.3%
Don't know	236	13.2%
Total respondents	1,791	100.0%

No response = 156

Libraries Services Consultation: Focus Groups

Lead Researcher and Author: Kamaljit Caulton
Lead Officer: Steven Rose
Strategic Research Team (Corporate Strategy Team)
Council House, Birmingham
03 February 2017

Contents Page

• Methodology	3
• Sample demographics	4
• Introductions to findings	5
• Executive summary	6
• Current users of library services	10
• Library users and service used	11
• Views on community libraries	12
• Non-library users	13
• Groups likely to be impacted	14
• Potential impact of proposals	15
• Self service facilities	18
• Open access	19
• Mobile libraries	20
• Volunteers	22
• Opening hours	23
• Proposal to close Aston library and Sutton Coldfield	24
• Alternative proposals for Aston	27
• Alternative proposals for Sutton Coldfield	28
• Perceptions of council approach and proposals	29
• Suggestions	31
• Key considerations	32

Methodology

- **Researchers:** Strategic Research Team (SRT) researchers
- **Sample:** 45 Birmingham residents
- **Focus groups:** Six focus groups, with three focussing specifically on either Sutton Coldfield Library, Aston Library or impact on people with disabilities.
- **Analysis:** Qualitative data analysis



Sample demographics

The demographic breakdown of the sample are as follows:

- **Age:** 18-24yrs = 5; 25-34yrs = 6; 35-44yrs = 6; 45-54yrs = 7; 55-64yrs = 11; 65+yrs = 9; Prefer not to say = 1.
- **Disability:** Yes = 7; No = 37; Prefer not to say = 1.
- **Ethnicity:** White = 27; Asian/Asian British = 11; Black African/Caribbean/Black British = 6; Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups = 0; Other = 1.
- **Religion or belief:** Christian = 18; Hindu = 1; Jewish = 1; Muslim = 10; Sikh = 2; No religion or belief = 13
- **Sex:** Female = 26; Male = 18; Prefer not to say = 1.
- **Sexual Orientation:** Bisexual = 0; Gay or lesbian = 1; Heterosexual or straight = 14; Other = 1
Prefer not to say = 4; No data = 25.

Introduction to findings

- A short presentation (the same one presented at some of the public meetings) was given to the group prior to discussions to help inform the participants of the proposed changes.
- The focus group discussions explored themes such as current usage, impacts of proposed changes, views on the approach to proposals (e.g. approach and tiers and any ideas or suggestions to help achieve savings).
- Following this format, the analysis and reporting reflects key high level themes and appropriate sub-themes.
- Key findings and quotes are followed by the reference number for the focus groups that they were mentioned in (i.e. the number in the brackets).
- Key quotes have been used to illustrate the findings. These can be found in the notes section. Not all quotes have been used.

Executive summary (1)

- Many spoke passionately about what the library means for them, their families and their community. Non-library users, while accepting they have other means of accessing services provided by libraries, still spoke of the importance of libraries for those that use and depend on them.
- Generally participants engaged well on many of the topics. Unsurprisingly, much of the feedback related to what services are used and are important, who might be impacted by the proposals and how and what areas they were unhappy about. Having said this, however, there were some ideas exchanged about helping to meet the savings challenge.
- While many seemed to understand the challenge facing the council, some believed that the situation has been exacerbated due to council finances being mismanaged and too much money was being spent on the Library of Birmingham at the expense of community libraries. In addition, there was also a perception that longer term risks and impacts were not being considered (e.g. having to make further cuts and closures in the future and impacts on individuals' health and wellbeing).
- There was a mixed response to the proposals and approach. Some thought it was comprehensive and well thought out, whilst others thought the approach was confusing or that decisions were made regardless of the results of the assessment and criteria. The concerns were equally mixed, ranging from consequences of closing libraries (i.e. Sutton and Aston) to proposals not being enough to make the savings.

Executive summary (2)

- The library is perceived to be not just a source of information, but rather a place that enables learning, social interaction and inclusivity. Groups that use or rely on libraries services included:
 - people who may struggle to access computers, the internet, books or quiet space (e.g. individuals and families from deprived households),
 - those who might require support to use computers and access online services (e.g. older people and people with disabilities),
 - those who use libraries to socialise and meet new people (children and parents, older people, people with disabilities), and,
 - people who want or need to access books, information and learning sources (e.g. children, students, adults).
- Linked to this, many of the individuals and groups thought to likely be impacted by changes, reductions or cuts to library services include those mentioned above. Key impacts identified included reduction in the availability of places that provide a safe space to access information, study and socialise. Additional potential barriers identified included: additional travel expenses, greater inconvenience, further distance to travel to alternative libraries and fewer resources and staff to support those that need it.

Executive summary (3)


- While some acknowledged that technology (e.g. self service machines and open access) could help alleviate some of the impacts, generally it was viewed very negatively and was not seen as a suitable solution (i.e. it would not replace service staff provide currently and it is not cost effective). There were concerns that this would particularly impact groups such as older people and people with disabilities. Participants found it particularly difficult to engage with the concept of open access, as they felt they needed more detailed information to understand how it works and what the cost and benefits are.
- There was a mixed response to opening hours being increased and reduced. A key concern relating to the reduction of hours was that it would further discourage people to use the library. Participants thought that current opening hours are not suitable for some residents (e.g. people who work full time) and that it would be beneficial if these reflected the demand.
- Views about mobile libraries were mixed. While some questioned the effectiveness and efficiency, others believed that it was a service that certain groups, such as older people, people with disabilities and those living in areas with poor transport links, depended on.
- The idea of using volunteers also had a mixed response. Some stated that if it helped keep the service running, it was a good idea to explore further and that there was an appetite amongst members of the community to take on such roles. Others were concerned that it was being used as a way of replacing skilled and experienced staff and that there would be risks such as lack of commitment and lack of skills that would impact the quality of service.

Executive summary (4)

- As expected, views regarding the proposed closure of Aston library and Sutton Coldfield library were largely focussed on concerns. Key concerns included: that the communities will be losing a valued community asset, the proposed alternative provisions will not be suitable and will not be able to meet the demand and needs of users.
- Participants did spend some time thinking about what could be done to help meet the savings challenge. Suggestions included:
 - working in partnership with local organisations and possibly combining or co-locating appropriate services (e.g. citizen advice, benefit advice, job centre) in the same building so as to create a community hub of sorts,
 - generating income by charging a fee to use spare rooms and spaces, incorporating cafes or shops into the buildings, and,
 - charging users an annual library card membership fee (e.g. between £2.50 and £5.00) and reservation fee (e.g. 25-50p), although it was acknowledged that these would not be suitable for all users.
- Libraries services may find it useful to understand concerns and risks identified by participants, assess these risks and identify mitigations that would eradicate or minimise such risks. This may help avoid issues in the future and, if communicated effectively with users, help alleviate concerns and potentially improve the perception of the council.
- Suggestions made by the participants should also be explored for viability and results shared with users.

Current users of library services

- Jobseekers
- Community
- Readers
- Children and families
- Researchers
- Students (young people and mature students)
- People with disabilities
- Mothers
- Adults
- Older people
- People looking for homes
- Local schools and play groups
- Young people
- Groups or individuals at risk of exclusion (e.g. older people, people with disabilities, people from deprived backgrounds)
- Organisations **and groups** such as charities **and councillors**
- Those without access to computers and/or internet



Library users and service used

- Many participants were library users and identified the following reasons for visiting the libraries:
 - borrowing books, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
 - computers and internet access, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
 - accessing information (e.g. jobs, tourist info, info for targeted groups such as people with disabilities), (1, 2, 4, 5, 6)
 - social meeting place, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
 - organised activities (e.g. story time sessions for younger children), (1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
 - space to study, (1, 2, 3)
 - engaging with council (e.g. councillor sessions), (3)
 - hire rooms (e.g. for workshops with targeted groups such as people with disabilities), and, (5)
 - archives. (1)
- This suggests that the library is not just perceived as a source of information, but rather a place that enables learning, social interaction and inclusivity.



Views on community libraries

Many participants spoke of what community libraries mean to them. Key messages included:

- community libraries are a community asset/hub, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- they offer access to free or cheap resources for all of the community, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- they are seen as a place that encourages lifelong learning, beginning with children (e.g. access to children's books and story time sessions) but also providing a facility for information (e.g. access to computers, internet and archives) and study space for adults and older people, (1, 2, 4, 5, 6)
- community libraries allow an inclusive and safe place for people to visit. In addition, social meetings, organised sessions (e.g. outreach sessions, IT workshops, CV writing, story time sessions) and a quiet place to study and socialise are all thought to contribute to helping people become more independent or remain independent (e.g. children, people with disabilities and older people), and, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- many participants spoke about the need to improve services and/or increase the use of libraries (e.g. greater promotion of activities and facilities), despite acknowledging that there was a reduced budget. (1, 3, 4, 6)

Non-library users

- Few participants were currently non-library users. They identified the following reasons for not using the community libraries:
 - technology allows greater and more convenient access to some services (e.g. enable computer use at home, easy access to internet and ability to download books at home), (3, 6)
 - stopped going when the library was temporarily shut and have not got back into the habit of going, (3, 6)
 - prefer to buy books, (3)
 - don't have time to visit the library, and, (3)
 - appropriate academic books are not available in community libraries. (4)
- While some do not themselves use library services, it was generally accepted that these services were very important to those that do currently use them and generally seemed concerned about the impact it would have on groups and individuals that used and relied on the service. (3, 4, 6)

Groups likely to be impacted

– as a result of proposed reduction or cuts in services

- Children (1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
- Older people (1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
- Job seekers (1, 2, 5)
- Transient community (1)
- Parents (1, 2, 4)
- People with disabilities (1, 5, 6)
- Children with additional support needs (1, 6)
- People from deprived households (1, 2, 3, 5)
- People who do not have sufficient access to IT and internet at home (1, 2, 4, 5)
- People who struggle with using IT and online services (5, 6)
- Community (including transient community) (1, 2, 3, 4)
- Students (including mature students) (1, 2, 3, 4)



Potential impact of proposals

- reduction or cuts in services (1)

The following impacts were identified

- Reduction in places for people to use where people feel safe, which would likely affect:
 - children, (1, 2, 6)
 - women, and, (2)
 - parents and carers. (1, 2)
- Reduction in a public place where community gather and interact socially, which could affect:
 - general community, (1, 2)
 - children and families, (1, 3, 4, 6)
 - older people, and, (3)
 - people with disabilities. (5)
- Fewer reasons to leave the house for some individuals and groups, such as:
 - older people, (3)
 - people with disabilities, and, (5)
 - mothers and carers. (1)

Potential impact of proposals

- reduction or cuts in services (2)

- Additional travel and related costs to get to alternative library sites when the preferred community library is closed, particularly likely to impact:
 - older people, (1)
 - students, (1, 2)
 - those on low incomes, including those on benefits who are facing additional cuts to their income, and, (1, 2, 4, 5)
 - people experiencing mobility issues. (1)
- Some people would find it difficult to go to another library and so the likely outcome would be that they just not go. Specific groups that were identified included people with disabilities and older people, as they are less resilient to change and more likely to experience social exclusion (e.g. people with disabilities, older people and parents and carers). (1, 2, 3, 5)



Potential impact of proposals

- reduction or cuts in services (3)

- Make it more difficult for people to access computers, which could negatively affect:
 - job seekers, who currently rely on library computers, to meet the requirements set out by the Job Centre (e.g. amount of time spent on job searches, or fill out job applications), (1, 2, 4, 5)
 - people who do not have access to a computer or internet (e.g. people from low income backgrounds and older people), (2, 4, 6)
 - students (including adult learners) and school children for studying, and, (1, 2)
 - people who require additional support and are unfamiliar or learning how to use computers and access online services (e.g. older people and people with disabilities). (3, 4, 5)
- Cuts to staff were also thought to result in staff having less time to support people who require face to face service and support (e.g. older people and people with disabilities). (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- Reduced hours, facilities, staff and lack of promotion of activities could result in less use and provide a reason for the library to be closed in the future. (1, 3, 6)

Self service facilities

Most groups discussed self service facilities. Key comments included:

- largely negative response to this (e.g. unreliable), (2, 3, 5, 6)
- should not be used to replace staff and/or staff will still need to be available, (2, 3, 5, 6)
- difficult to use, (5, 6)
- certain groups will be impacted most:
 - older people, (3, 6)
 - people with disabilities (e.g. those that use wheelchairs, have sight impairment, and have learning disabilities), (5, 6)
- concerns that it will be costly– up front cost and cost of maintenance, with particular concern about ‘risky’ and ‘unreliable’ technology, (4, 6)
- would discourage the use of libraries, (3, 5)
- questioned whether cost and benefits have been assessed and trialled, and, (6)
- those that made positive comments thought that younger people/students would use them but usually also stated that they would not be suitable for everybody and that staff would still be required. (3, 4, 6)



Open access

- Open access was discussed in some groups but the general view was that there was not enough information to fully understand the concept.
- Participants in three focus groups did not talk about open access. (1, 2, 3)
- In the focus groups that discussed open access, some participants stated that:
 - they were against this idea, (6)
 - they think it is a good idea (i.e. it could help extend opening hours), (5)
 - it could risk alienating certain groups who struggle with technology (e.g. older people), (4)
 - it would be a waste of resources, (6)
 - there was high risk of theft in certain areas, far too risky, and, (6)
 - they believed that it wouldn't help make the savings required (i.e. cost of security to ensure safety and building would still have running costs). (6)



Mobile libraries (1)

All groups discussed mobile libraries. Key themes included:

- mixed views amongst different focus groups regarding mobile libraries:
 - some believed that they are not effective (e.g. they are too small or not cost effective), (1, 2, 3)
 - while others believe that they currently provide or could provide a service to specific groups or areas (e.g. older people and those that have difficulty travelling to a 'fixed' library, where there are limited transport options, where there are few library provisions in the area or where there are proposed closures such as Sutton Coldfield and Aston). (3, 5, 6)
- mixed views on whether there should be a change in service:
 - some stated that there should be no mobile service and invest that money in 'fixed' libraries or work with partners to provide transport to help people get to 'fixed' libraries, (3)
 - others thought a reduced service should be provided to only to those in greatest need, although it was acknowledged by some that this could have a negative impact on particular groups, such as older people, (3)
 - some believed an increased service (if the service is cost effective) and reduce opening hours of 'fixed' libraries further, (5)
 - some also questioned why there was a concentration of mobile libraries in certain areas (e.g. Ladywood) and suggested they be moved to areas with the greatest need. (6)

Mobile libraries (2)

Other key points made about mobile libraries included:

- questioned how much the mobile library service is used and how much they cost, (3, 4, 5)
- needs to be a reliable and consistent service, and, (6)
- suggestion for mobile libraries to 'follow footfall' and go where people are to increase the use of the service (e.g. Grand Central). (4)



Volunteers

- There was a mixed response to the idea of using volunteers:
 - three groups generally agreed that volunteers could and/or should be used if it helped supplement or retain the level of services available, (2, 4, 5)
 - one group thought that volunteers should not be used, and, (1)
 - two groups had mixed views and thought that while all options should be explored, the council should be aware of risks associated with using volunteers (e.g. not being available when required and not having the required skills). (3, 6)
- Two groups spoke about there being an appetite amongst the community to volunteer to help existing staff keep the libraries running, and furthermore, stating that there might be benefits to the community, (e.g. gaining work experience). (2, 6)
- Key concerns about using volunteers included:
 - availability of volunteers, (1, 3)
 - commitment issues, (1)
 - not skilled enough, (1, 6)
 - devaluing experienced staff and librarians or that they will replace current staff, and, (1, 4)
 - getting enough support to undertake the job. (5)



Opening hours

- The increase in opening hours for some libraries, particularly Stirchley library was welcomed by some but others had concerns (i.e. additional pressure on staff). ⁽⁶⁾
- Reducing hours could have negative impacts, such as becoming less convenient, more confusing and discourage people from using the library (e.g. not being open when they visit or changes difficult to cope with for people who suffer from anxiety and stress). ⁽⁵⁾
- The importance of effectively promoting opening hours when they change was highlighted. Whilst this would be useful for all users, it would particularly benefit those that are dependent on services provided by the library. ⁽⁵⁾
- There was a suggestion that libraries be open for fewer days and longer hours, as opposed to open on more days but with reduced hours. ⁽⁵⁾
- It was noted that current opening hours are not suitable for some residents (e.g. people who work or are in full time education) and that it might be beneficial if opening hours reflected the demand. ^(2, 3, 4)

Proposal to close Aston library and Sutton Coldfield (1)

There were some points that were made in both Aston and Sutton Coldfield focus groups about the proposal to close these libraries:

- both libraries were considered a key part of the community that generations have used and enjoyed, (1, 2)
- current provisions were perceived to be superior to alternative libraries, (1, 2, 4)
- there were concerns about capacity of the alternative libraries to meet the needs and demands of the community (e.g. access to computers, space, books, staff), (1, 2)
- both of the current locations were considered more convenient and more accessible than alternative libraries, (1, 2)
- the current locations are safer, and, (1, 2)
- skilled, knowledgeable and helpful staff, that meet the needs of users, were an essential part of the library experience. (1, 2)

Proposal to close Aston library and Sutton Coldfield (2)

Key concerns raised in both the Aston and Sutton Coldfield focus groups included:

- a valued community asset will be lost, (1, 2)
- proposed alternative provisions are not going to be able to meet the demand and needs of their existing users and additional users of the libraries proposed to be closed, (e.g. access to computers, space, books, staff), (1, 2)
- location of proposed alternative libraries will not be convenient and will be less accessible, which is likely to impact particular groups and reduce library usage, (1, 2, 5)
- concerns about alternative libraries not being as safe (e.g. children have to travel further and cross more busy roads to get to Birchfield, easier for children to run out of the library at Mere Green, than it is at Sutton Coldfield), and, (1, 2)
- loss of skilled, experienced and helpful staff will have an impact on the library experience all service users, but particularly people with disabilities, older people and children. (1, 2)

Other concerns are similar to impacts identified generally by all of the focus groups. The key difference is that the perceived impact on the Aston and Sutton Coldfield community would be sharper and more permanent, due to the proposed closure of the libraries. See slides 15-17 for more details.

Proposal to close Aston library and Sutton Coldfield (3)

Aston Library:

- Aston is a deprived area and closing down the library will leave a 'hole' in the area, particularly as it is a deprived area. (2, 3)
- Aston has a high population of young people and they will be affected by the closure. (3)

Sutton Coldfield library:

- There was mistrust of the council amongst some participants and a perception that Sutton Coldfield is treated unfairly by the council because:
 - it was seen as an affluent area, and, (1)
 - largely differs in political view. (2)
- Sutton library should not be seen as a community library, but rather a central library for the town, and this is not suitably reflected in the criteria/assessment. (1)
- There were also concerns that once the Sutton library was closed, there would never be another library in the centre of Sutton again. (1)
- It is not just the residents that live in the two mile radius of the library that use it, there is a 'transient' community that uses it, (e.g. people that work in Sutton Coldfield, shoppers, people that travel into Sutton from other areas). (1)
- Many did not understand how the running costs were calculated and questioned why they were so high, despite the council owning the building. (1)

Alternative proposals for Aston

- Many participants agreed that the council should try to find an alternative building for the Aston library service, which was close to the current location.
- There were a number of empty properties that were discussed as potential alternatives for locating the library, (e.g. old Albert Road library). But some participants understood that these buildings had been sold or are in the process of being sold, and so would not be viable options. (2)
- Participants also discussed the potential of local schools and nurseries incorporating the library in their building(s). Some participants, however, believed that schools would not have the space to accommodate this. (2)
- Another idea included the council bidding for the current building or negotiating with the current owners, as it was argued that there is a real need for this service. (2)
- Some participants felt that an alternative building would need to also accommodate the adult education centre as well, which is currently located in the same building as the library. (2)

Alternative proposals for Sutton Coldfield

- Participants were open to the idea of relocation, as long as it remained central to Sutton Coldfield, was a 'practical' alternative, was easily accessible and was more visible than the current library.
- Two alternative sites were discussed. The first was a suggestion by a participant to explore the viability of a former club in Sutton Coldfield city centre (i.e. Lower Parade, next to McDonalds) and the second was a reference to a former proposal of moving the library to the Town Hall (although it was not stated who proposed this). It was acknowledged, however, that these options would need a lot of refurbishment and this would require further investment, which was unlikely to happen. ⁽¹⁾
- Participants also suggested that if the shopping centre is to be closed, the council could include criteria which would stipulate that developers must include a library as part of the development. ⁽¹⁾

Perceptions of council approach and proposals (1)

Key themes identified relating to the council's approach and proposals included:

- Approach/criteria/tiers:
 - Sutton Coldfield library has been unfairly targeted and key aspects are not properly recognised in the criteria and assessment (see slide 27 for more details). (1, 2)
 - Perception that the north of Birmingham is affected more than the South. (2)
 - Tier 3 and/or 4 offer is not a sufficient offer. (1, 3, 6)
 - Mixed response to approach:
 - * Some thought it was “well thought out” and “sensible”, while, (3, 5)
 - * Some stated “no thought” had gone into it and were sceptical about motives. (2, 6)
 - Consider using volunteers for libraries where hours are proposed to be reduced (see slide 22 for more details on participants' views regarding volunteers). (2, 4, 5)
- Some solutions suggested by the council are unsatisfactory (e.g. providing computers in a room and reducing hours and staff at busy libraries). (1, 6)

Perceptions of council approach and proposals (2)

- Some participants were concerned that there will be more cuts in the future. (3, 6)
- Some were concerned lack of facilities will mean libraries will be used less and this be used as a rationale to close libraries in the future. (3)
- Comments related to working with partners included:
 - difficulty understanding what 'partnership working' meant, (1, 2)
 - questioned how proactive the council has been to explore this concept and find suitable partners, (1)
 - some suggestions made about which organisations' libraries services could partner up with or locate with, (1, 2, 4, 6)
 - some concerns about partnership working (e.g. lack of interest, issues relating to funding, lack of required commitment of organisations, lack of interest and risk of privatisation), (1, 2)
 - keen to help find interested partners, but need more information. (1)

Suggestions

Key suggestions identified by participants included:

- Encourage partnership working by extending or combining the library service to also offer other services (e.g. those that cater for health issues or languages, citizen advice, small enterprises or incorporate a cafe). This may enable it to become part of a community hub as opposed to just a library service and make achieve efficiencies. (1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
- Charging for services (e.g. library card membership fee, reservation fee, hire out rooms for a fee), although it was acknowledged that this may not be suitable for all residents and organisations. (1, 3, 5, 6)
- Identifying and accessing grants (e.g. health grants) (3)
- Utilisation of services that could help get residents with additional support needs to libraries. (5)
- Selling refreshments and other items. (2, 4)
- Understanding risks, particularly in the long term. (4, 6)
- Some thought having fewer libraries that are fully resourced and open for longer would be better a option than more libraries open with reduced hours, facilities and staff. However, others disagreed with this approach and preferred bolstering the service by combining or bringing together other services that would service community needs. (4)
- Use data to target and improve services. (3)
- Outreach for those that are housebound. (4, 6)

Key considerations (1)

- Understand and assess the risks and impacts (including in the long term) to specific groups, particularly older people, people with disabilities, children and families and people from deprived households. Key questions that could be explored include: What are the alternatives? What can be done to mitigate or minimise this risk? How can we enable increased resilience?
- Can future communication or engagement information be made more user friendly? It may be worth exploring how different groups like to be communicated with and what sort of information they would find most useful.
- Concerns regarding the implementation of IT solutions to save money could be explored further, risks assessed, cost benefit analysis conducted and if possible, benefits relayed back to residents. User feedback may also be valuable, however, it is important that users fully understand the solutions prior to seeking their views.
- Can current data be used to enable a more targeted service that meets the demands of current users and potential future users? Is more data required and can this be collected/acquired?

Key considerations (2)

- It may be worth assessing the provision of mobile libraries to understand whether it is cost effective and adequately meets the needs of users that are likely to require the services. Again, relevant data may help with this assessment.
- When exploring the idea of using volunteers, ensure that risks associated with this are assessed and mitigated/minimised to avoid issues in the future. It may also be helpful to understand the limitations of volunteers, if they are to be used to supplement services that have seen a reduction in staff.
- It may be useful to understand and address concerns of the users of Aston library and Sutton Coldfield library. Further discussions or communications may be required to find solutions or alleviate concerns.
- Explore further the suggestions (e.g. for more efficient provision of services, such as combining key services), and test for viability. It may also be useful to share any feedback with users to demonstrate that they were listened to and their ideas were explored.

Flickr attributes

- Meeting table: Mnadi, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/mnadi/32325828>
- Croquette: Hendrik van Leeuwen, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/hndrk/1146746948>
- Disabled: Jorge Diaz, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/xurde/5291066803>
- Job Centre Plus: HelenCobain, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/88097768@N02/8059834283>
- Kindergarten-4308: Howard County Library System, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/hocolibrary/7823663844>
- 167/365 Look after the pennies...: Dave, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/venndiagram/4706101981>
- Computer keyboard concept: KKnowles123, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/88526437@N03/8080188256>
- Studying: Harry MacKenzie, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/15311119@N02/1620237005>
- Children: silvioassuncao, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/silvioraof/6205262641>
- Mary-Lou: Rachel, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/rachelpasch/4289230386>
- IMG_7055.jpg: Michael, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/helloturkeytoe/5781720403>
- architel_legal_computer_support.jpg: Alexander Muse, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/alexmuse/101005409>
- Student: CollegeDegrees360, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/83633410@N07/7658278494>
- Disability: Britah, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/53290940@N05/4949618813>
- Old woman – Morbi India: Adam Cohn, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/adamcohn/22092769732>
- Self service loan: UTS library, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/utslibrary/4791886971>
- Security camera: Mike Mozart, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/jeepersmedia/13046700524>
- Money and calculator: Images Money <https://www.flickr.com/photos/59937401@N07/5474761220>
- DSC_3054: Jim Maloney, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/arkoptrix/8688682425>
- Help wanted?: Paul Townsend, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/brizzlebornandbred/6136653327>



Kamaljit Caulton

0121 303 4301



@BCC_CK

<https://researchbcc.wordpress.com/>

Kamaljit.caulton@birmingham.gov.uk

birmingham.gov.uk

Analysis of Birmingham Libraries Consultation – Children’s Survey

Monday 16th January 2017 to Friday 27th January 2017, 1574 responses

Q1. Which library do you visit most often?

Library	Number of Responses	Percentage of responses
Acocks Green Library	31	1.9%
Aston Library	135	8.6%
Balsall Heath Library	43	2.7%
Bartley Green Library	32	2%
Birchfield Library	148	9.4%
Bloomsbury Library	0	0%
Boldmere Library	282	18%
Druids Heath Library	0	0%
Erdington Library	5	0.3%
Frankley Library	0	0%
Glebe Farm Library	5	0.3%
Hall Green Library	3	0.2%
Handsworth Library	21	1.3%
Harborne Library	121	7.7%
Kents Moat Library	0	0%
Kings Heath Library	3	0.2%
Kings Norton Library	1	0.06%
Kingstanding Library	4	0.25%
Mere Green Library	8	0.5%
Northfield Library	3	0.2%
Perry Common Library	5	0.3%
Quinton Library	26	1.6%
Selly Oak Library	0	0%
Shard End Library	4	0.25%
Sheldon Library	0	0%
Small Heath Library	29	1.8%
South Yardley Library	28	1.77%
Sparkhill Library	0	0%
Spring Hill Library	16	1%
Stirchley Library	85	5.4%
Sutton Coldfield Library	235	15%
Tower Hill Library	25	1.6%
Walmley Library	15	0.9%
Ward End Library	93	6%
Weoley Castle Library	3	0.2%
Yardley Wood Library	0	0%
Library of Birmingham	114	7.2%
Mobile Library Service	4	0.25%
Other (includes School libs, Solihull, Walsall & Daventry Libs)	47	3%
Total	1574	100%
No response/ Void surveys/ Non-users	128	

Q2. How do you get there? Please tick all that apply.

Please note that this question was multiple choice therefore respondents could select more than one category.

Mode of travel	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Walk	993	52%
Bus	132	7%
Car	717	38%
Train	68	4%
Total	1,910	100%
No response	3	

Q3. When do you visit? Please tick all that apply.

Please note that this question was multiple choice therefore respondents could select more than one category.

Visits	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
After school	592	25%
Saturdays	736	31%
In the holidays	1034	44%
Total	2,362	100%
No response	110	

Q4. What do you do at the library? Please tick all that apply.

Please note that this question was multiple choice therefore respondents could select more than one category.

Activity	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Borrow books	1338	39%
Use the computers	631	19%
Attend activities	574	17%
Reserve books	422	12%
Do your homework	434	13%
Total	3,399	100%
No response	8	

Q5. Are you a Boy or a Girl?

Gender	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Boy	736	47%
Girl	838	53%
Total	1,574	100%
No response	9	

Q6. How old are you?

Age	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
0-4	216	14%
5-8	532	34%
9-11	595	38%
12-14	116	7%

15-18	115	7%
Total	1,574	100%
No response	0	

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION COMMENTS

Themed comments from 4 Public meetings	Number of comment forms
Volunteers supporting libraries	1
Self Service	2
Provision of tourist information in libraries	1
Charging to use the library service	2
Verification Service	1
Reducing the number of BCC councillors	1
Support with IT	2
Corporate Social Responsibility	1
Objection to the tiered model proposal	5
Library staff training	1
Income Generation	4
Development and investment in library service	2
Aston Library proposals	1
Glebe Farm Library proposals	2
Selly Oak Library proposals	1
Sutton Coldfield Library proposals	4

Additional Comments received via email, post and social media	Number of comment forms
Income Generation	1
Development and investment in library service	1
Objection to the tiered model proposal	4
Potential partnership organisations	1
Support for staff led mutual	1
Boldmere Library proposals	1
Glebe Farm Library proposals	1
Kents Moat Library proposals	1
Northfield library proposals	1
Selly Oak Library proposals	2
South Yardley library proposals	1
Sutton Coldfield Library proposals	13
Stirchley Library proposals	20
Walmley Library proposals	1
West Heath Library proposals	2
Yardley Wood Library proposals	1

Subject of Petition	Name of Petition organiser	Date received	Number of signatures	Petition number
Sutton Coldfield Conservatives Petition to save library services in Sutton Coldfield	Cllr E Mackey	06/12/2016	957	1896
Keep Library services open in Royal Sutton Coldfield Town centre	Cllr R Pocock	10/01/2017	1242	1905
Oppose the closure of Sutton Coldfield Library	Cllr R Pocock	10/01/2017	2781	1906
Save Sutton Library	Cllr J Hunt	10/01/2017	868	1909
Glebe Farm Library	Cllr B Dad	10/01/2017	177	1911
Stop the asset transfer of Glebe Farm Library	Cllr B Dad	10/01/2017	504	1912
Sutton Coldfield Conservatives Petition to save library services in Sutton Coldfield	Cllr E Mackey	10/01/2017	63	1915
We support Tower Hill Library	Cllr K Trench	10/01/2017	203	1916
Aston Library/Friends of the Library of Birmingham	Cllr M Afzal	24/01/2017	841	TBC
Total number of signatures			7,636	

**COMMUNITY LIBRARIES
PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT
2nd NOVEMBER 2016
LIBRARY OF BIRMINGHAM**

Numbers in Audience: 12 approx

	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.	Community group (S.L.A.M.) took Surrey Council to court and won. VF being introduced into libraries which is very unpopular with staff and will change the relationship with users.	Notes
2.	Tier 3 – If no adequate partners come forward to run the library service, what will happen?	A few organisations have already advised that they are interested in working with us but if we aren't successful in finding suitable partners we will look for best solution to run this library service with the budget we have.
3.	What exactly do you mean by partners?	The organisation will take on the building and help run the service, including 3 rd Sector, Private and Community organisations. We will provide 15 hours of staffing support.
4.	Will stock be reduced?	Once the model is in place, the benefit of operating inside the budget is that there will be a guaranteed bookfund. Expect 6000 books for Tier 3 but it does depend on who comes forward and what model would best suit that library.
5.	On the 2 mile radius map there is a huge bias towards the South of Birmingham - why? Sutton Library should not be closing it could be a revenue raiser and an asset. Rates are coming back into the Council, therefore rates shouldn't be included. The public need to see more details about the budget.	We have applied a ranking system.
6.	Some Sutton areas can't be replaced by Mere Green Library as it isn't easily accessible, and Erdington depends on Sutton. We need more information/figures	We have looked at what areas the borrowers come from and taken this into account. All documents are on the Be Heard site.
7.	Mere Green Library is not very big, therefore not a suitable replacement for Sutton. Sutton Library is in the centre of town and you should be looking more closely in how this asset can be kept.	On the Be Heard site there are details of how the decision was made. We are still in talks with Sutton Town Council and we may still end up with a different solution.
8.	Sutton Neighbourhood Office was recently refurbished but is now empty. Could this building be let out?	Attempts have been made but no one has come forward and Sutton Library is the most expensive Library to run.
9.	What does CAT mean?	Transfer the building to an organisation on a long term lease, they take ownership and run the service.

10.	If more than 1 organisation is interested how do you choose?	There is a set of criteria that we work from to find the most suitable organisation to take this service forward for the local community
11.	With Tier 3 please explain how the partnership would work. How can you work in partnership with an organisation when you are running a VF service? It needs the experience of the N.O. staff, the library staff have no training or understanding.	We are not putting a N.O. within the library just the VF service which is the scanning of documentation, which is only the proof required to claim benefit. Although we are looking at introducing more services within libraries it won't be whole services, i.e. link up with Housing Associations etc. All budgets have been reduced drastically, therefore we need to look at all services, not just libraries and this will be the model for the future.
12.	How was this budget decided for libraries?	Senior Officers looked at reductions to all services and when the budget was set by the Council it was felt that this saving should be made within libraries.
13.	It states in the figures that half the budget be spent on self-service, why?	We needed to borrow the money to start self service in order to keep the library services open. The cost of borrowing the money will come from elsewhere. NOTE: The annual cost of self-service at £173,000 is not half of the £3.7 running cost for libraries.
14.	What cuts are due to happen to Library of Birmingham?	LoB savings have already happened and because it runs on 1 shift, LoB and Community Libraries are combining which will provide a more efficient overall service.
15.	Where is self-service being installed?	Tier – 1 All, Tier 2–Some, Tier 3–Some
16.	Why install so many, what will staff do in this spare time?	As staffing is being reduced the self-service technology and remodelling of counter areas will help.
17.	Will the internet service carry on?	There will still be access to the internet. Open+ technology is being looked at. Usage will be monitored through library cards. If other partners come forward to use the building this will also help.
18.	If buildings aren't staffed, how can noise levels be monitored?	We will be looking at the best way this can be managed in community libraries as this is very important. If this happens at LoB it needs to be reported to LoB.
19.	BCC need to reinstate a Chief Librarian. They are professionals and they have a vast knowledge about running libraries. When the Council bought Sutton Library the Conservatives were on board but it's a different story now.	The building is owned by a pension fund and there are restrictions on who the space can be let to. It was bought to get out of the restrictions.
20.	If this is saving money why does it need to close?	It is very expensive to run.
21.	Are there any other nationalised funds that can be applied for, as it's not a huge amount.	We do need to get back to Central Government with proof that these cuts are damaging the library service.

22.	Can we use new West Midlands funds?	This is a national issue not just West Midlands.
23.	Do you think support could be given for a Professional Librarian?	A discussion hasn't taken place yet, but perhaps we do need to have this discussion with library colleagues.
24.	Has the option to re-finance LoB been looked at?	Birmingham City Council are very good at managing finances. Last year we managed to balance the overall budget. It was bold to create a new LoB but we were aware that the old building would have cost a lot more money
25.	Sutton is separate and LoB has a large expenditure, bigger than Sutton	Sutton <i>is</i> part of Birmingham. We had a list of criteria and this was the best option
26.	The information available on Be Heard is not sufficient and the information is difficult to find. Can we have more information?	All of the information is on Be Heard but any issues/questions you can e-mail communitylibraries@birmingham.gov.uk . We will look into trying to make the documents more accessible, but hard copies of the documents are also at individual community libraries.

**COMMUNITY LIBRARIES
PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT
4th November 2016
NORTHFIELD Library**

Numbers in Audience: 70 approx

	Question/Comment	Response
1.	You are proposing to reduce staff numbers considerably. How can you maintain the same standard of service?	It is intended to have 3 members of staff in each library. Therefore there will be impact in those libraries where there is a considerable amount of activity, but little impact on others
2.	Will the books be re-distributed from those libraries that are closing?	Yes
3.	If there are only 3 members of staff in each library will the library shut during periods of sickness or leave?	There is a budget that will enable us to bring in cover staff if required
4.	The majority of people who use the Library of Birmingham are not Birmingham Council Tax payers. What is the cost of the Library of Birmingham?	The cost is £20 million per year, but half of this is the repayment on a loan. It is an expensive service and is 7 times more expensive than the community library service. However, there needs to be a reference library in Birmingham. It is the largest cultural space in Europe and the building has become a landmark of Birmingham in the same way that Spaghetti Junction and Selfridges have. It helps to identify Birmingham as a City of culture, knowledge and reading. It now operates on 1 shift of staff but cannot operate below this level so there will be no further reduction in opening hours.
5.	Why could there not be system of voluntary donations? - A number of people would be happy to pay a nominal sum to keep the library service open.	We can explore this idea further
6.	Have the most recent indices of deprivation been	The figures used are those for 2015, which are

	used?	the latest ones
7.	Will there be investment in good, fast IT equipment?	We are not looking to reduce the budget but accept there are issues. IT equipment is refreshed every 5 years and was last refreshed approximately 18 months ago
8.	I cannot imagine people going into an unstaffed library. How do you think this will work?	Birmingham is not the only Local Authority to consider piloting this. It may not work everywhere but we need to consider it as an option in some areas e.g. Mere Green
9.	Can automatic checkouts cater for satellite reading groups?	Yes, they can, but there will also be a staff presence
10.	What happens if the equipment breaks down?	It will be repaired or replaced.
11.	The library should maximise income. Why is it free? People should be prepared to pay for books/IT?	We will be looking to maximise income, but the law does not allow the Local Authority to charge for books.
12.	What is the Benefit Verification system? How will it work in an open library? Will there be data protection issues?	It is basically a scanning procedure. The intention is to move the Neighbourhood Office service into a library. There are currently 4 locations undertaking 90,000 verification checks per year. We are intending to change the way this operates and spread this service across the libraries.
13.	What do staff think of this proposal?	Staff and Trade Unions don't like the proposal but a pilot using the current neighbourhood office staff has been agreed and will test out the issues
14.	Do we get funding from UK On-Line Digital Inclusion	We don't receive any funding from UK On-Line, but there is government funding available which the library service may be eligible for.
15.	How and when will residents receive further information?	There will be further sessions held at libraries with feedback at public sessions or information on public notice boards. The consultation will end at the end of January and a Cabinet Report will follow shortly after with implementation of the new model from 1 April
16.	Will reading groups be charged the £1 reservation fee?	No
17.	Why do you use a 2 mile radius? This is not sensible for people over 65 years old, particularly when they have to carry heavy books. A 1 mile radius would be preferable.	The 2 mile radius is an historic indicator/national statistic
18.	We are already paying for this service. If there is a reduction in the quality of service will there be a reduction in taxes?	The City Council only receives 20% of Council Taxes
19.	What is the effect of your proposals on staff morale?	We are consulting with staff and they will have the opportunity to apply for VR. If there are more staff than the model can afford then they will have to go through a selection process and jobs will be lost. I understand that staff will have concerns
20.	You have said you will use agency staff but who are they?	There is budget set aside for extra staff to support the service. The City Council has a contract with 2 agencies. We have to find a

		way to accommodate the peaks and troughs and this has to be the most cost effective method.
21.	In the presentation you mentioned objectives. How will you develop programmes/activities? It is not just about books	We don't have a clear set of objectives for staff. A piece of work is required around cultural change and staff training
22.	Is a reservation fee going to be applied to children's books?	We are not expecting to charge.
23.	Do you have enough money for infrastructure?	I acknowledge that some of the libraries are in need of repair. It is possible for 'Friends of' groups to donate to the upkeep of libraries.
24.	Is there a large spend on foreign language books?	There is currently a book fund of £520k of which only £130k - £140k has been spent this financial year due to saving requirements. Going forward the book fund has been set at £380k
25.	The Library of Birmingham doesn't open until 11am. Combining the service is worrying as paying off the debt may affect community libraries?	We don't want to make any cuts at all, but we do not have any plans to make any further reduction in the Library of Birmingham or community libraries budgets
26.	You have spoken about CATs (Community Asset Transfers) but who are you planning to hand libraries over to?	A CAT is where the Authority transfers a building over to another group without rental payments. However we can be specific regarding the service they provide. There is a process where the opportunity is advertised and people apply. Applicants will be validated.
27.	Why do you plan to introduce additional automatic checkout machines when the existing ones are not reliable?	We have spoken to the contractors who will not receive any new contracts until they resolve existing issues
28.	If you operate with only 3 staff will they be safe?	We will need to undertake risk assessments on all proposals. We have not yet specified what the hours will be but we are open to views
29.	Will part time staff be moved around libraries?	Yes there will be movement, but there are a range of things to take into account
30.	You are looking into ways of increasing revenue through room hire. Can there be an assurance that there will be lower rates for community groups?	There are currently two bands - one for community groups and one for commercial groups. We will continue to operate this system
31.	Does the council receive any funding for the prison library?	Yes
32.	Is there a staff training budget?	No
33.	How do you intend to capture feedback from children?	We have not yet done this, but we have been asked to develop a questionnaire.
34.	How will those people who are home educating feed in?	Councillor Clancy will contact this group of people
35.	People see libraries as a place to go for information. Is it not possible to charge for marketing leaflets? The tourist information service should be reinstated	There is no funding for tourist information but we should be communicating with Marketing Birmingham
36.	Could Selly Oak library be incorporated into the Sainsbury's re-development? Has this been discussed?	There has been a discussion regarding this in the past, but we can look at this again
37.	There is no context to this conversation. How does it fit in with the rest of the City Council	At the beginning of December BCC will consult on the 2017/18 budget. There will have to be

	proposals?	sizeable cuts in a number of areas of council service delivery.
38.	Are there other services that will lose their funding?	Yes, some will lose all of it
39.	Friends of Northfield Library fund activities at the Library	Noted
40.	It would be good to grow the Friends of Northfield Library	Noted
41.	There is a demographic of 20-64 that should be included	Noted
42.	Libraries are not just about books it would be interesting to see the figures for 16/17 year olds using libraries as this is likely to have increased	Noted
43.	Libraries should work with the DWP who send people to local libraries. We should bill them!	Noted
44.	The staff cuts are higher than identified as a number have already left through fear of redundancy.	Noted
45.	If the Library of Birmingham was sold or privatised the money could be used for community libraries.	Noted
46.	Libraries should be staffed by professional librarians who are able to answer in depth questions. Don't sacrifice the service.	Noted
47.	It is necessary to consider who the future users of the library service are and design a service around the digital agenda.	Noted
48.	The Library of Birmingham is a fantastic opportunity. Community Libraries will benefit when services are brought together.	Noted
49.	As there are limited levels of income resource in Northfield there are some reading issues amongst the community. It is important that Libraries continue to provide a service	Noted
50.	It is some achievement that so many libraries are being kept open when so many have been closed nationally. The main concern is the vision which needs to attract young people.	Noted
51.	Springfield Library is a listed building. It could be opened up on Heritage days and a charge made for people to look round it	Noted
52.	Could libraries consider delivering IT qualifications?	Noted
53.	Children need to be encouraged to use libraries.	Noted
54.	The number of children in home education has doubled – these children need library books	Noted
55.	Libraries need to be more user friendly and become one stop shops with longer opening hours	Noted
56.	Funding for libraries should increase otherwise by 2020 the library service could cease	Noted
57.	There are a number of activities currently taking place in libraries but all the rooms need to be	Noted

	utilised. Libraries need to be a part of the community	
58.	There need to be more 'Friends of' groups.	Noted
59.	The Raspberry Pie group that meets at Selly Oak library would like to be involved in the discussions around its future	Noted
60.	Looking at the proposals I do feel you are doing a good job. I expected it to be much worse	Noted
61.	It should be remembered that the current proposals are in addition to the huge cuts to the library service over the last 10 years. Staffing numbers are approximately 1/6 of what they were 10 years ago. It should not be about what we cut but what we do	Noted
62.	There needs to be a staff training budget	Noted

**COMMUNITY LIBRARIES
PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT
8TH NOVEMBER 2016
MERE GREEN COMMUNITY CENTRE**

Numbers in Audience: 30

	Question/Comment	Response
1.	Average cost per visit would be useful on the second budget slide as it appears on the first one. What is the projected visitor figure?	It is assumed that the visits would remain roughly the same.
2.	Have you got footfall figures for various times of the day?	No this isn't available
3.	Can you give examples of organisations interested in working with libraries?	The Pod at Nechells, Witton Lodge Housing Association, Wychall Farm, The Pump, have expressed an interest
4.	Don't understand why Sutton libraries reduced by 50% with staff on minimums and hours reduced compared to Mere Green. Can we have a breakdown as to why it costs £548k to run Sutton?	We can give you a paper handout detailing costs against premises, etc for Sutton and Mere Green Libraries which you can look at now. There is too much detail to respond verbally.
5.	Why when the City Council owns the building is Sutton closing? The library only occupies 1 floor.	The rental for the library applies to the whole building which is why the cost is so high.
6.	Why is the library covering the whole rent? What about Business rates?	The visitor numbers are as outlined on the first slide. As mentioned previously the rent applies to the whole building. The City Council only receives a proportion of business rate income as the rest is reclaimed by the government. Mere Green receives 78,000 visitors costing £2.15 per visit. Sutton has 103,000 costing £5.64 per visit.
7.	Regardless of Government, Birmingham Council drew up its budget and decided where to spend. Would like to see expenses claimed by Councillors and staff and have those cut.	The controlling group for the Council decided to reduce the libraries budget. The council has £800m less money due to government cuts and can no longer deliver services as it has in the past. Regarding expenses, this information is publicly available on the Council's website.

8.	Residents pay a precept to the Town Council for additional services, this is not to be used for services which should be provided by the City Council.	Sutton is receiving more than a fair share of library service per head of population than other parts of the city. It receives 8.8% share of opening hours compared to a population of 8.5%. Mere Green receives 78,000 visitors and issues 122,464 books costing £1.36 per issue whereas Sutton has 103,000 visits, 59,000 issues costing £5.64 per issue. It is not intended that the Town Council would provide a library service but we are engaging with them on the proposals.
9.	Mere Green library doesn't pay rent to the Community Centre so why does Sutton have to pay rent when it's also in a Council building? What are the building costs? Mere Green is not an accessible alternative. Why not find an alternative venue for Sutton which would be cheaper? Extended hours at Mere Green is only a pilot so there's no guarantee these will be retained. Also an element of the provision is non-staffed so not suitable for children nor vulnerable people to visit at those times.	We are piloting technology at Mere Green but are confident it will work. Guaranteed hours are 35 per week which is the same. If the technology is successful the opening hours will increase. We will look into the running costs at Mere Green further.
10.	Are there any remaining Council premises in Sutton from which the library could be run, such as the Town Hall.	It's unlikely. Ownership of the Town Hall is currently being transferred out of the Council.
11.	What's happening to the archives in Sutton?	A solution needs to be identified for the reference and historic collections along with a review of what material is actually owned by Sutton. A work programme to fully catalogue the collections will need to be undertaken.
12.	The City seems to be pushing everything to the Town Council which is not correct. As the City now owns the Red Rose centre can it be honest about its intention to sell off the site?	We are not aware of any proposals to sell the Red Rose site. The local councillors want to regenerate the town centre and the council owning Red Rose should help in this regard. The Town Council is not being seen as a solution to anything but we are seeking their views and any ideas they might have on the library proposals.
13.	It would be outrageous for Sutton centre not to have a library. The council has already removed the courts and now the Town Hall. Users of Sutton library, particularly students, cannot get to Mere Green. I don't believe the impact has been assessed in any depth. The Council is only trying to balance its books due to overspending. Sutton is in danger of becoming a ghost town due to lack of facilities. Last year Sutton retained its Royal status supported by evidence from the Sutton historic collections. The archives cannot be split up without detriment to the collections and future generations who wish to study them.	We have noted concerns and hear that people are not happy with the closure of Sutton. We have tried to keep the maximum number of libraries open given the budget available. All comments will be considered during the consultation and reviewed at the end of the process.
14.	Understand the need for budget reductions and reasons for the cut in hours. However the budget breakdown provided between Mere Green and	We will have another look at the figures and provide an update.

	Sutton is flawed and the figures require further explanation.	
15.	Birmingham has based its reputation on free libraries and education. There are many students in Sutton who benefit from the library. With Sutton's royal status there should be a museum to Benjamin Stone and Bishop Vesey. Such an education centre could be attached to the library. Documents are held in Sutton for Birmingham Warwickshire Battalions and other treasured archives which need to be kept safe.	Noted
16.	Want to voice support for library staff at Aston and Sutton. They do sterling work and are under a great deal of stress currently. Research shows that children who read for pleasure do better academically throughout their life as a result of access to books and reading. The best way for children to find books is via their library, particularly if from a low income family. The current government understands the importance of libraries and has a mission for every child to have access to and enrol in libraries. You need to consider the impact on children if a library is not within a walkable distance.	Fully agree.
17.	What is the timetable for implementation?	A report will be submitted to Cabinet in February and the new model implemented in April.
18.	What is the second phase transformation about?	This is bringing together professionals locally and nationally to discuss the future of libraries and influence government
19.	There is a disagreement between the policy on libraries and costs. Why not put the proposals on hold and make a case for interim funding from the Council until unresolved differences about what is happening are sorted. These won't be resolved by January in time for Cabinet in February.	We will go away and recheck all the figures but the available budget will not change.
20.	<p>CLlr Jenkins feedback comments he had received from constituents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transfer of the Town Hall was not a done deal yet. Funding issues remained to be resolved particularly around running costs and the building has been allowed to fall into disrepair • Sutton is not receiving a fair share of allocated resources • Skepticism on the method employed to calculate figures for Sutton • Libraries are really important to the community and should be viewed as an investment not a cost burden • There are questions about the future of libraries and how to deliver educational benefit in the future 	Noted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is to be a commercial development at Mere Green which will put pressure on parking and increasing opening hours will only make traffic in the area worse • Why build a new library in Birmingham City Centre at great cost and then close Sutton • Agree that the City was right to purchase Red Rose • City Council has to operate within its budget. The Council has decided how to make savings but has had more cuts in funding from government than any other authority 	
21.	Sutton has a huge archive which might be dispersed to other locations. Sutton history should remain in Sutton.	Not all archive materials are up to date in terms of cataloguing and some have covenants on them to remain in Sutton. We are looking for solutions and if it can all stay in Sutton, it will.
22.	What happens on day 1 of Sutton closure? What happens to the cost of rental and business rates to the City Council? What is the true cost saving to the City as it won't make money until it relinquishes the asset.	We will need to look into this as income is borne by a different part of the Council.
23.	Revenue raising – proposal to increase charge for reservations but no information provided. Does this include children? Don't believe this will raise much money as people will just choose not to reserve books. Why not make more efficient use of the bookstock and keep reservations free?	The charge would not be applicable to children. The £1 charge is to cover the cost of delivering books to another branch library for collection.
24.	Libraries are not profit centres and it is not worth implementing a reservation charge	Noted
25.	Sutton closure has been based on footfall but this does not take account of computer use. Sutton pcs are used all the time, many by job seekers who need computers to search for jobs in order to get their allowance. They cannot afford to travel to Mere Green.	We recognise this and are aware of the high computer use at Sutton. We are looking at alternative IT solutions – may be from other providers.
26.	What will happen to book requests for book groups?	Book groups would be exempt from the reservation charge. Reading sets would still be available.
27.	Can you pass any revised figures re costs to Cllr Jenkins and he will provide them to residents?	Agreed
28.	There are 2 options for Sutton – to close or become a tier 4 library. Would you consider an organisation that offers to help deliver a service at tier 2 or 3 level? Tier 4 offers no access to stock in other libraries as in Castle Vale. It is misleading to offer tier 4 provision to Sutton as it won't be a full library service as it is now.	Although Castle Vale is independently run, the library van service does provide book flow so reservations are still available. The Council has provided all of the bookstock there. Tier 3 libraries will receive some staffed support.
29.	Who is providing the bookstock for tier 4 libraries?	This depends on the arrangement made with the provider. Any partnership proposals will be looked at and if tier 2 or 3 is possible this will be reviewed as it will affect the whole model
30.	Why is Sutton ranked 13 th but is being closed?	Cost is a factor. We need to balance library

		provision across the city and if Sutton remains open this would reduce services in other parts of the city
31.	Why are there no rent costs for Mere Green?	The community centre does not charge rent to the library.
32.	Why is Sutton closing due to costs instead of lots of other libraries. Why can't each library be allocated a saving and keep them all open?	The bulk of the £1.9m saving is largely staffing. Premises costs are largely fixed so don't offer scope to make much savings
33.	There is no evidence of that option being looked at?	If we were looking at how many sites to close to keep Sutton open, this would amount to 13
34.	If the costs for Sutton are proved incorrect would Sutton remain open?	We could not commit to that
35.	Are any redundancy and restructuring costs contained within the business plan for the model?	Redundancy costs are met corporately. There is some budget provision in the model for pension strain but we don't know full impact as yet until staff consultation is concluded
36.	Prior to the Sutton refurbishment, the library was on 2 floors, it was then reduced to 1. The building was shared with the neighbourhood office and registrar. Since they left no other tenants have come in. What action has been taken to get the building fully occupied and bring in rental income?	There were previously rigid restrictions on letting the building due to the lease that was in place. Since the Council bought out the lease it has sought to attract other tenants but has not been successful.

**COMMUNITY LIBRARIES
PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT
14th NOVEMBER 2016
SOUTH YARDLEY LIBRARY**

No of attendees – approx. 86

	Question/Comment	Response
1.	You have advised that Glebe Farm will be offered as a Community Asset Transfer (CAT) but how confident are you that this will materialise? Will it close if it doesn't?	We have received an approach from an organisation called Welcome Charity in respect of Glebe Farm Library. If we are unable to match an organisation to a library we will need to look at our options within the remaining budget.
2.	Can't the money that will be used for the purchase and maintenance of the self service equipment be used for additional staffing?	This money will be borrowed and therefore cannot be used for staffing. The cost of repaying the loan will be picked up corporately.
3.	Do you think the elderly will cope with the new technology?	We will support people who are unable to use the technology
4.	You state that people will be available to support. Do you mean volunteers? We should be utilising our own professional staff. Cutting staff will cut attendance at libraries.	We are intending to use volunteers, but this doesn't mean the entire service will be run by them. There will be 88 employed staff across 35 libraries, but there is also a role for volunteers.
5.	Volunteers need to be consistent. What happens if they fail to arrive for their session?	We will still continue to employ staff. The volunteer scheme works well in Manchester and Warwickshire and there is no reason why it shouldn't work well in Birmingham.
6.	If 3 rd sector organisations take on libraries could	The library service is about access to

	they place restrictions on the type of books available to the public if these were in contradiction to their own views?	information and knowledge. We would need to reach an agreement with organisations regarding the service they intend to offer, but we would not allow them to restrict access and information. Tier 3 libraries would also have 15 hours per week library support
7.	What are the 11 criteria used to rate libraries?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Population of library catchment area 2. Total children and young people aged 0-19 in the library catchment area 3. Total adults aged 65+ in the library catchment area 4. Number of libraries within 2 miles of a library 5. Total books and other items issued 6. Average Index of Multiple Deprivation score 7. Total visits 8. Cost per visit 9. PC Usage 10. Total attendance at activities and events 11. Building performance (sites scored better if they had recent investment or were new build)
8.	Did you weight the criteria? How can small libraries with fewer facilities be expected to compete with larger ones?	We did discuss giving weight to the criteria but in the end we decided to equally weight them
9.	Why is there a reduction in opening hours in those libraries that are situated in poorer areas?	The reduction in hours is because of the budget cuts
10.	Will there be further reductions in the budget?	We have had to reduce the library budget by one third, but this is not as severe as the budget reduction in other services. However, there are no further reductions planned
11.	How can we comply with data protection with the introduction of the verification service? There are risks to this.	The verification service will be introduced at 19 tier 1 libraries. There will be protocols that we will need to sign up to, but we would not expect volunteers to undertake this work.
12.	Is there an alternative model? All tier 3 libraries are situated in deprived areas. They cannot compete with those in affluent areas	We are consulting on a 3/4 tier model which we believe will work and provide a service for the future. The budget is fixed at £3.7 million and this will not change
13.	Glebe and Kents Moat libraries have delivered fantastic work over the past years. The deprivation issue needs to be considered as you will not find areas that need libraries more than these, which are both in tier 3. Kents Moat is being demolished and other locations are being looked into, but if there isn't an alternative location for Kents Moat could the support be transferred to Glebe Farm.	The service has to be delivered but we could look at keeping Glebe Farm if there is no suitable alternative location for Kents Moat. We will also look at giving more weight to deprivation
14.	Glebe Farm is well managed and maintained. I don't accept it as being ranked 28 out of 30 buildings. What other ways are there of delivering the service? There is a lack of infrastructure. The area has already lost its community centre and	I have been a long term advocate of the library service and believe the staff do an excellent job and it is far more than a library service, but it is necessary to make the best use if the available budget.

	doctor's surgery. The library is not just a library it is a centre for families. How can you maintain this if it goes to a 3 rd sector organisation?	
15.	If Glebe Farm closes there will be nothing in the area. It is 1.9 miles to the nearest library at Shard End but this requires two bus journeys. Have you considered the demographics?	It is recognised that more specific mapping may need to be undertaken
16.	It is recognised that more specific mapping may need to be undertaken	Birmingham received the largest cut in its spending power in 16/17. We would need to make a case to take to Central Government to get additional funding
17.	What are the proposed new opening hours?	We need to look at the responses from the Be Heard consultation which should give an indication of opening hours
18.	If a library is only open for a reduced number of hours if affects the criteria used. Also the criteria compared to deprivation doesn't stack up.	We will look further into the deprivation issue
19.	Many local schools have become Academies which seem to be affluent. Have they been approached in respect of support?	Not on a global basis, but there have been some conversations. However this is something that should be explored.
20.	What is the criterion for 3 rd sector organisations taking on a library service? What is the long term impact?	There is a process as to how we transfer a building. The opportunity is advertised and then applicants have to meet a set of criteria.
21.	If community libraries are saving money will this go to the Library of Birmingham?	No
22.	Do you think BCC should take responsibility for spending the entire budget on the Library of Birmingham?	This was a decision taken by the previous administration, but at a time when the economic climate was better. The Central Library was in a poor state of repair and required repairs costing in excess of £100m. The cost of completely rebuilding was £180m.
23.	Can you guarantee the security of the staff undertaking the verification process?	A risk assessment will need to be undertaken. The process is likely to bring in an additional 10 people per day, if distribution was equal across the 19 tier 1 libraries.
24.	Do you feel security will be an issue if there are less staff?	This will need to be factored in. and risk assessments done
25.	Last year the Neighbourhood Offices had over 90,000 customers that needed their documents verifying. How will the reduced staffing numbers cope with this?	The process has changed and we are expecting a reduction of 50% in this figure
26.	Will there be a book fund?	The current book fund is £320k, but due to budget pressures we have only been able to spend £140k. However with the new model the available book fund will be £380k
27.	Are your proposals a foregone conclusion?	No it is a consultation and comments have been recorded and will be considered. There are likely to be changes.
28.	Birmingham needs more money to fund its public services. Would a new incoming Labour government reverse the problems?	Hopefully it would be of benefit and there would be a change of approach. The savings targets are too high.
29.	How do cuts in the Midlands compare with London	The London boroughs have not been as hard

	and the South East?	hit as Birmingham. There was a change in the way spending cuts were allocated last year. The County Councils lobbied the government and received transition funding. Birmingham has never received any transition funding.
30.	Could there be tax relief on the land at Kent's Moat and Glebe Farm?	There has already been a substantial amount of land released for housing development but if you have a proposition we will listen
31.	What will happen to next year's budget?	In 17/18 we have to find £103 million but there are currently no further cuts planned to the library service. However we are awaiting the Chancellor's Autumn statement.
32.	Why do you always try to cut services? Isn't Birmingham worth saving?	The priority should be to keep libraries open and well stocked. The Council has four priorities – Jobs and Skills, Housing, Health and Children. The library service meets the children and health priorities
33.	Do you see any benefit in combining the Library of Birmingham budget with the Community Libraries budget? Is there a hidden agenda?	There is no hidden agenda; it is the most sensible thing to do. The resources available at the Library of Birmingham need to be available to the Community Libraries. There will be no cross-subsidy from the Community Library service budget.
34.	There are issues with Castle Vale library which is managed by a tenant's residents association	Noted
35.	Glebe Farm Library is situated in an area of deprivation with a high percentage of elderly and housebound people. There is nothing else in the area. The library changes peoples' lives.	Noted
36.	Affluent areas need libraries more than deprived areas.	Noted
37.	Paid employees are afraid of volunteers taking their jobs.	Noted
38.	It would be useful to have information on the 3 rd sector model for libraries attached to the Be Heard Consultation database	Noted
39.	3 rd sector organisations should be approached regarding renting space in libraries	Noted
40.	'Friends of Glebe Farm Library' have raised over £25k for the library	Noted
41.	An Equality Impact Needs Assessment should be undertaken on the future proposals	Noted
42.	If you reduce library opening hours in areas of deprivation you are increasing deprivation in these areas.	Noted
43.	There is a rapidly growing community of home educators who rely on libraries. Without them this community will be seriously hampered.	Noted

This is the response of the Friends of the Libraries of Birmingham to the consultation on the future of the community libraries.

In earlier statements we have declared our opposition to this £1.9m cut, which comes after a progressive reduction in the resources of the community libraries (and a massive cut to LoB), with job losses and significant damage to services across the 38 libraries. We maintain this view. This current statement, at the conclusion of the consultation period, concerns the specific proposals which BCC will be considering over the next few weeks.

The response is based on our consultations, meetings, visits to all of the community libraries, attendance at the four public meetings and other contacts and communications with users, staff and the public generally.

GENERAL ISSUES

i) Tier 3 (and 4)

- we see libraries in this tier as having a shaky future, dependent on the continuing goodwill, commitment and resources (including accommodation) of partners and volunteers. There is the prospect of calls for rescue to BCC, libraries slipping out of the public sector or folding altogether.

ii) Deprivation & the Ranking Criteria

- this issue was raised frequently during the consultation period, with many feeling that the criterion of deprivation was given insufficient weighting in relation to other factors on which libraries in the more affluent areas were able to score highly. Another consequence of the application of the criteria is an apparent north-south divide, with better provision south of the city centre.

iii) Proximity

- not given enough priority. The 4-mile maximum round trip to and from the nearest library is a high threshold. If you have a buggy, walking difficulty, want to feel it's safe for your children to walk to their library, need to do 20 hours online job-seeking each week or face a two-bus journey, distance is important and not compensated by having a high-tier library outside your neighbourhood.

iv) Benefits Verification by Library Staff

- if BCC is to continue with this, it needs to monitor it closely. The inevitable tension between benefits applicants and anyone involved in processing their applications is likely to be transferred to library staff - which is why they so dislike the idea. If this becomes aggravated, BCC must be prepared to withdraw - indeed it might consider dropping the idea now in the interest of good staff relations. Library staff across the piece have experienced a stressful few years recently, during the long period in which their, and their libraries', future has been under threat, with still the possibility of compulsory redundancy in the offing.

v) Children's Areas

- one of the best features of Birmingham's libraries. There is a risk of these disappearing as libraries - especially Tier 3 - move into smaller spaces or have to share their existing accommodation with others.

vi) **Opening times** - two issues have emerged. Firstly, while there was no call for community libraries to open on Sundays, many volunteered the view that LoB should be open on that day. This includes people who cannot get to a community library in the week and used LoB on Sundays previously (there is also a tourism argument for this proposal).

Secondly, with reduced opening hours, especially in Tier 2, and with many libraries closed for two or more days per week, the closure days should be arranged so that whole areas are not without any service on a given day, and the odd practice of closing almost every library on Wednesdays should be discontinued.

vii) **Professionally Qualified Chief Librarian**

- the development and management of a major city library service is a specialist role, not a general management job, as is recognised across the UK's library services. We need such a post, which should be at senior level within the BCC top management team so that the library service is properly developed and defended as a key element in the city's cultural and educational activity,

INDIVIDUAL LIBRARIES

i) **Sutton Coldfield** - the proposed closure was the big surprise in the package. One of the biggest and best libraries in the city, which qualified for Tier 1 under the criteria used in this exercise and is a key component of the town's culture and community, should be retained. The arguments in favour of this proposition are by now familiar. The Town Council's recent decision to put a substantial sum towards developing a plan for continuation of a library service should enable closure to be avoided.

ii) **Aston** - strong local opposition to closure. The view that designating Birchfield Library at Tier 1 is compensation for closing Aston is rejected by local residents. There is no benefit in providing a 'better' library situated beyond the manageable reach of many Aston residents. The alternative suggested locally, which we support, is to retain Aston and Birchfield at Tier 2.

iii) **Glebe Farm** - classing this library at Tier 3 and moving the Kents Moat service away from its current location would mean a very unsatisfactory service across the area. We support the proposal to designate Glebe Farm as Tier 2, using resource saved by not providing a service in Kings Moat.

iv) **Stirchley** - the plan to move this Tier 2 library into Stirchley Baths is not viable given the scarcity of space on offer. No dedicated library area, books stored on trolleys.

We hope that these views will be taken into account.

Martin Sullivan

Secretary, Friends of The Libraries of Birmingham

Website: <https://birminghamlibrariescampaigns.wordpress.com>

e-mail: friendsoflibraryofbirmingham@gmail.com

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/friendsofthelob>

Twitter: @folob_

FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARIES OF BIRMINGHAM

PUBLIC VIEWS ON BCC's PROPOSED NEW MODEL FOR COMMUNITY LIBRARIES

During the public consultation period so far, we have visited all of the community libraries to obtain the views of users and library staff. In addition we had many inputs to our social media and responses to items on our website and mailing lists. We attended, and contributed to, the four BCC public consultation meetings and some of the briefing sessions in individual libraries. We held a public meeting in October. This note summarises the key points arising from these and other inputs.

We have put these points to the city's 10 District Committees and asked the councillors to consider the proposed cuts at their next meetings.

SECTION A : GENERAL CONCERNS

i) many users were alarmed that **the package represented a significant and irreversible deterioration in the service** provided by the community libraries, both in quality and quantity, with opening hours cut, reduced advice and support from staff (there will be c. 24 redundancies), smaller spaces and fewer books in many libraries, a reduction in children's and other activities. The BCC consultation document refers to the 'excitement' and 'opportunity' of the new model, but the reality is that this is a cuts package.

ii) there is little, if any, support for **self-service machines**. They may fulfil the BCC aim that 'customers should be encouraged to undertake less complicated tasks such as borrowing and returning items', but users fear that the time for staff to provide the highly valued in-depth support to users in book search, research and advice will disappear too. The cost of these machines is £884K. This was seen as excessive. Although this expenditure would not be charged to the library budget, it will still be BCC money and the general view was there were better uses within the library service to which it could be put. There was a similar reaction to the idea of **unstaffed libraries** in a scheme called open+

iii) **Tier 3 libraries are seen as a sort of half-life**, neither quite in nor quite out of the public library service. They are to be run by volunteers and partners with a bit of support from BCC, probably moved into smaller, shared premises. While BCC's view is that this option 'gives communities the opportunity to lead, manage and deliver their library service' it is easy to see these libraries slipping out of the public service and folding altogether as partners run out of volunteers and/or funds, move accommodation or just lose interest.

iv) there was great concern at the potential **loss of the free community rooms** which most libraries provide for a large number of groups. Some libraries will lose these through being moved to smaller premises, but the biggest loss will be from a proposed change of policy to treat these rooms as an income stream, which could mean that many local groups will be priced out.

v) **the proposed charge for reserving books is unpopular**, despite the fact that children and community groups will be exempt

- vi) it was felt that the application of **the criteria used to rank libraries for the purpose of allocation** to tiers was flawed. Treating all of the criteria equally meant that deprivation was given too little weighting and that those libraries which were better resourced at present were able to score more highly on a number of the criteria.
- vii) on a related point, a number of users saw a **north-south divide** in the package, with more and better provision south of the city centre than to the north. Of the 19 Tier 1 libraries (the most highly resourced category) 13 were to the south of the city centre, 6 in the north. Of the 13, seven were in just 2 Districts in the south - Hall Green District with 4, Northfield District with 3. (Birmingham is divided into 10 Districts corresponding to the 10 Parliamentary constituencies. Each District has 4 Wards, each Ward has 3 councillors).
- viii) **proximity has been considerably undervalued**. BCC's aim is that no resident should be more than 2 miles from their nearest library. In terms of round trips, 2 miles = 4 miles and for the many who have to walk to their library, or get a bus (sometimes two buses) this would cause problems. Affected groups would include children, the elderly, disabled people, jobseekers who have to do 20 hpw online jobseeking and others
- ix) there is a concern that the policy of **encouraging/compelling staff to undertake work for other organisations** (inc. partners) will reduce the staff time available for library work to a considerably lower figure than that given in the consultative document
- x) there is one particular item of non-library work which is deeply disliked by library staff. This is the **verification of information submitted by DWP benefit applicants**. Disliked because the applicants will perceive library staff as part of the system which will give or deny them benefits, rather than as helpers and sources of advice –the librarian's traditional role
- xi) **there is scope to vary opening hours, but not to increase them**. So adding, say, 6 evening hours would have to be compensated by cutting 6 daytime hours
- xii) many commented that **the community libraries and LoB should be brought together**. This will now happen. Our proposal that **the library service should be headed by a professionally qualified librarian**, with senior status within the BCC management structure, should be considered. Heading a library service is a specialist, not a general, management role and what we are proposing is standard practice across the UK.
- xiii) a number of people said that they hoped that there would be **some reduction in the scale of the cuts** – otherwise what was the point of the consultation exercise? Others thought that BCC should have made more visible efforts to resist this aspect of the national austerity programme.

SECTION B: CONCERNS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL LIBRARIES

CLOSURES

i) Sutton Coldfield

The closure of Sutton Coldfield library was the most surprising proposal in the package, and the least acceptable. This library could rightly be described as the jewel in the community library crown and it contains a significant collection of records and archives relating to the town which should continue to be located in it. To say that the town is up in arms at the prospect of having its library confiscated would be an understatement.

Much work is being done to prepare an alternative to this proposal to be put to BCC, so that the town can continue to have a library service, not necessarily in the current building. The work is being co-ordinated by a group called The Library Lobby; the town council and many other groups and individuals are involved.

Two points need to be made. Firstly, it will take some time to prepare a proposal. Developing this is work of an entirely different level of magnitude from responding to any of the other proposals in the BCC package and extra time should be allowed. There is no external constraint which makes a rushed decision necessary and BCC should not be pressing for this work to be completed by the end of the consultation period on 27 January. If this causes problems with the planned library budget for 2017-18, bridging funding should be provided. One option would be to top-slice the £884K earmarked for self-service machines in order to provide bridging.

The second point concerns the agreed provision of financial information. The case for this closure was based on figures which showed that, apparently, the costs of running Sutton Coldfield Library were massively greater, on a number of budget heads, than those for running Mere Green Library. Those who use these two libraries regard them as broadly similar in scale and scope. The figures were, frankly, disbelieved by many local residents who attended the consultation meeting at Mere Green. At the conclusion of a long and heated discussion, a BCC commitment was given to provide written comment on these figures. They have not yet been provided. After being pressed, officers provided a minor amendment to the original spreadsheet which did not address the specific points made at the meeting.

After further pressing, we were told that our questions were 'irrelevant' and that we should 'move on'. It is not acceptable for a commitment to be made at a public meeting only to be withheld subsequently. This is not how a local authority public consultation should operate. The work involved in providing the information would be minimal, and it is essential for BCC to demonstrate that the (hotly disputed) financial basis for the proposal is valid.

ii) Aston

The proposal is to close Aston library and to designate Birchfield, which on the basis of the BCC criteria would be a Tier 2 library, as in Tier 1. One of the points made to us frequently during this consultation period is that for many, the location of a community library is as important as the facilities it offers. Aston Library - described

by BCC in its report as 'well used' - is embedded in the community it serves. People can walk to it from their homes, parents are happy to let their children walk to it to browse and do homework, it is not too far for many elderly people and some people with disabilities. This would not be the case if the nearest library was Birchfield. There is no benefit in providing a 'better' library for a community if it is not within manageable reach of many of its residents

A proposal which has emerged during discussions with users and others is that both libraries should remain, with the resources designated for Birchfield at Tier 1 divided between the two libraries designated at Tier 2. This would involve finding new premises at Aston, whose current building is to be sold. This should be pursued

TIER 3 LIBRARIES

i) Bartley Green

It seems likely that Bartley Green will close. Unlike some of the other proposed Tier 3s, no partner had been found at the time of publication of the BCC consultation document, nor had any potential new premises been identified. The library has a number of regular users, not all of whom will want or be able to drive, walk or bus to Weoley Castle Library. Efforts should be made to retain a library service here.

ii) Bloomsbury

For some time (c. 3 years) since the Bloomsbury library building was vacated and subsequently sold, an interim, and inevitably limited, service has been run from a bus in Nechells. This needs to be put on a proper footing, with the negotiations to house it in the POD at Nechells expedited.

iii) & iv) Glebe Farm and Kents Moat

The proposal is to designate both of these libraries as Tier 3, and to move the Kents Moat service to the Pump. Response at the South Yardley public consultation meeting, and campaigning by local users, has shown widespread opposition to these moves. Tier 3 libraries are low resourced and vulnerable, and the Pump is too far from where many Kents Moat users live. Both libraries are in areas of high deprivation where other public services and facilities have been closed. The communities concerned include many older people, disabled people, jobseekers who needed 20 hpw digital access, and others for whom a library is a vital resource which changed people's lives. It also provides a key resource to local schools. The proposals would result in isolation for many.

The ideal solution would be to designate both libraries as Tier 2. If this is not possible, and given that the proposal to transfer the Kents Moat service to the Pump was not supported, then the resource should be used to designate Glebe Farm as Tier 2 and to close Kents Moat.

v) & vi) Selly Oak & Stirchley

The concern is that the area comprising Selly Oak, Selly Park, Stirchley, Cotteridge and Bournbrook will not have a proper library service. Selly Oak library is to be downgraded to Tier 3 in much reduced accommodation and with a very much smaller collection of books. At the same time, Stirchley Library, although formally designated at Tier 2, will be similarly

downgraded by being moved into Stirchley Baths. Because this is a successful community centre there is insufficient space for a dedicated library area and so the books will be stored on trolleys and wheeled out in such space as is available during library areas.

When I visited, the SB manager outlined all the facilities & activities there which would be available to library users - but the latter already have access to them as they are next door to the existing Stirchley library. Some in the five areas will be able to drive to one of the four nearest Tier 1 libraries, but many others will be deprived (see the attached reports of the public consultation meetings). In addition, all Tier 3 libraries are vulnerable and have an uncertain future. These proposals need to be reviewed.

vii) West Heath

The proposal is to designate this library as Tier 3 and to locate it in Oddingley Hall. This is viewed by the West Heath user group as an unsatisfactory outcome to a long saga of unfulfilled promises to rebuild the demolished original building. BCC needs to ensure that a service continues in West Heath and is protected from the vulnerabilities to which Tier 3 libraries are subject.

OTHER LIBRARIES

Castle Vale

Castle Vale is classified as a Tier 4 library in the consultation document, which describes this tier as follows : *'This will be a very localized and specific response, to support new activity around library service provision. BCC will seek to support local communities by way of a one-off grant to deliver library provision from a new community venue.'* Castle Vale Tenants' and Residents Association is running the library under a 3 year contract from BCC. No further Tier 4 initiatives are proposed in the current package.

These libraries are as precarious as those in Tier 3, liable to slip out of the public library service altogether, being dependent on volunteers, free or low cost accommodation and funds when the one-off grant has been spent. Castle Vale is apparently not eligible for any funding in the new model because it has already had a grant. BCC should consider giving some further funding when the initial contract ends. The TRA has, after all, been a useful pilot for BCC which is keen to develop this sort of partnership.

We suggest this not from any enthusiasm for these initiatives, which lead to libraries drifting away from the public sector, but to avoid the risk of imminent closure, in order to leave open the possibility of its return to the public sector at such time as one of Birmingham's priorities is again to have a fully publicly owned and publicly run library service . Closure here would also mean that there was only one library in the Erdington District - which would exacerbate what some users at the public meetings have seen as a north-south divide, with higher library provision in south Birmingham as against the north of the city.

*Martin Sullivan
Friends of the Libraries of Birmingham
30 December 2016*

Branch Chair. Rose Brown
Branch Secretary. Caroline Johnson



the public service union

Birmingham Branch

The McLaren Building
46 The Priory Queensway
Birmingham, B4 7LR

t 0121 200 3331

f 0121 236 3221

w www.Birminghamunison.co.uk

**RE: UNISON RESPONSE TO PROPOSED CUTS TO
COMMUNITY LIBRARIES**

January 13th 2017

Dear Chris

Further to our letter dated 25.11.16. UNISON has the following response to clarify our proposals

- **We do not want a tiered library service.**
We want a single comprehensive service that everyone can access
- **We believe that the priority should be to protect frontline!! staff.**
- **We do not want libraries to be asset transferred to a third party who have no experience of providing a comprehensive library service**
- **We do not believe that these groups can run an unbiased service to all sections of the public and will undermine the professionalism of library staff.**
- **We do not accept the use of volunteers to replace paid, experienced staff who provide a comprehensive service to everyone who want to access the library service**
- **We do not accept the closure of Sutton and Aston Library and the possible closure of libraries in the proposed tier 3.**
- **We do not believe that the investment in self-service and other technology will benefit our members or library users and that the money should be better spent to invest in staff and buildings to provide a comprehensive library service.**

Continuation....

Membership benefits:

Legal Services, Employment Problems, Injury and Accidents at Work, Accidents outside Work, Free initial Legal Advice
Join UNISON today telephone: 0845 355 0845



We do not believe that the standardisation of staffing levels is workable. One size does not fit all.

UNISON therefore proposes:

1. That the 2 CLSU posts are used to fund frontline services which is always been a priority for the Council.

Given the proposed reintegration with the library of Birmingham we believe that Lob could provide the strategic support for community libraries.

We do not believe that volunteers should replace library staff, therefore we do not require a volunteer co-ordinator and during the last restructure of Lob this post was deleted.

We also propose that Library managers fulfil the role of bringing in funding to the service and therefore do not require a separate post to oversee this.

This equates to approx. £78k This money could be used towards saving the GR1 posts, a further £9k from the proposed agency budget could be used to secure the rest of the budget for GR1 staff.

UNISON believes that putting the Saturday assistants back into the structure is important so that other library staff are not required to work every Saturday. Lunch time assistants could be given the opportunity to move to any vacant posts.

2. That the proposed 100k for supply is used to fund additional posts in libraries where the need more than 3 staff for health and safety reasons and provision of the library service. In particular Acocks Green, South Yardley, Yardley Wood, Harborne, Weoley Castle, Sparkhill, Handsworth, Erdington, Mere Green, Perry Common, Northfield and Sutton Library. There needs to be a robust risk assessment process.
3. UNISON is disappointed that despite numerous requests for the risk assessments for all libraries that these have not been provided when the deadline for the end of the consultation is approaching and the proposals include working on 3 staff.

Continuation....

Membership benefits:

Legal Services, Employment Problems, Injury and Accidents at Work, Accidents outside Work, Free initial Legal Advice
Join UNISON today telephone: 0845 355 0845



....Continuation 3

4. We also propose that the agencies providing supply should no longer be used as they have proved to be expensive and unsuccessful. Alternatively each library should have a list of supply pool both internal and external that can be contacted by each library. This could be co-ordinated by the library managers.
5. UNISON is opposed to proposal to outsource the tier 3 libraries, however if the decision is made to implement this UNISON is opposed to the 90 hours of City Council staffing being proposed to support them and that this staffing would be better deployed to support the City Council libraries. In regards to proposals for Glebe Farm library and Kents Moat library UNISON believes that Glebe Farm should be put into tier 2 as there is no tier 2 proposed for this ward and that the resources planned to relocate Kents Moat would be better spent on Glebe Farm, especially as the shopping centre where Kents Moat is situated is due to be demolished and will not be rebuilt for some time.
6. In regard to the proposals for Selly Oak and Stirchley, UNISON proposes that library provision is provided from the current location as it is a proposed tier 2 library and not moved into the swimming baths where the facilities for library provision are not at the same level as the current site, especially as it is proposed that Selly Oak library would be a tier 3 library. In regards to the boiler issues at Stirchley library monies from the £174k could be used to replace this. Should Selly Oak library building be sold monies from this sale could be used to improve Stirchley library's facilities.
7. We propose that the money the Council has found to invest in self-service should be used to fund library staff and library buildings. Self-service machines are already in place in District libraries. We cannot see the justification for spending such a huge amount of money on replacing machines that are already in place. UNISON is concerned about the extra work that the use of self service will create for its members as well as the removal of counters.

Continuation....

Membership benefits:

Legal Services, Employment Problems, Injury and Accidents at Work, Accidents outside Work, Free initial Legal Advice
Join UNISON today telephone: 0845 355 0845



....Continuation 4

8. It is concerned about the health and safety implications for its members who will be working on less staff.

UNISON therefore proposes that the counters remain in libraries even as they provide a safe area for staff and should verification be implemented in libraries, this could be carried out at the counter proving a safe are for staff to work from.

UUNISON would also encourage senior managers to impress on Councillors that the £174k a year investment would be better invested in library staffing and buildings rather than self service

9. We propose that any remaining funds from the money originally allocated to rebuild West Heath should be used to pay the costs of Sutton Library in order to keep it open until a decision is made about the development of the Red Rose Centre and ensure that any future development includes provision of a library service for the community.

If alternative proposals and funds are found to keep Sutton library open UNISON believes it should be staffed by a grade 4, 1 grade 3 and 2 grade 2s.

10. We propose that deprivation factor be given a higher priority weighting to ensure that deprived areas of the city are not disadvantaged as they appear to be in these proposals. This has been emphasised at the recent public consultation meetings that local people have attended. We need an assurance that this will happen.

11. In regards to verification UNISON does not believe that the current or proposed job descriptions allow for staff to carry out this additional responsibility and believe that changes to the job descriptions would need to be made if library staff are required to carry out verification. In addition this additional responsibility does not meet any of the Reading agencies universal offers described in the business case.

Continuation....

Membership benefits:

Legal Services, Employment Problems, Injury and Accidents at Work, Accidents outside Work, Free initial Legal Advice
Join UNISON today telephone: 0845 355 0845



....Continuation 5

UNISON members are opposed to verification but IF this is implemented they believe that all libraries not just tier 1 libraries should be offering this service in order to ease the pressure on the staff in tier 1 libraries.

If library staff are required to take on this additional responsibility UNISON believes that the list of expectations that library staff are supposed to deliver are reviewed as they will not be able to do this level of work and take on the additional work of varication.

12. We also propose that a charge for Netloan should be introduced after 1 free hour a day which we believe should be used to mitigate those posts at risk as well as fund additional posts.

13. We also propose that you explore the possibility of charging for stationary requested by the public as a form of income generation and standardise room hire charges.

I look forward to your response to our proposal and comments.

Yours sincerely

P. Hands

Philippa Hands

UNISON Senior Steward for Place

Membership benefits:

Legal Services, Employment Problems, Injury and Accidents at Work, Accidents outside Work, Free initial Legal Advice
Join UNISON today telephone: 0845 355 0845





**Response of The Library Lobby to
Birmingham City Council's proposals to close
Sutton Coldfield library**

27 January 2017

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Background of Sutton Coldfield library	4
3. Summary of Birmingham City Council's proposals	5
4. Review of ranking criteria	7
5. Review of finances	9
6. Premises	14
7. Our expectations for the Library	16
8. Our proposal	17

1. Introduction

This document sets out the response of The Library Lobby to proposals presented by Birmingham City Council ("BCC") to restructure the library service across Birmingham, specifically in relation to plans to close Sutton Coldfield library ("the Library").

The Library Lobby was formed in November 2016 in response to the consultation launched by BCC in relation to its proposals to reorganise Birmingham's libraries. We are a community campaign group with no political affiliations, made up of engaged local citizens who believe passionately in the value of a local library and who are focused on being constructive and looking to the future. The Library Lobby's stated aims are:

- to raise awareness of BCC's proposed library cuts, with specific reference to the proposed closure of Sutton Coldfield library; and
- to develop a constructive alternative proposal, that would keep a lively, well-resourced, widely-used library in the town centre of Sutton Coldfield, including the town archive, free internet access and support for children and families, staffed by library professionals.

The Library Lobby is not a formally constituted group. It has no funding or resources other than the time of the ordinary residents who comprise it.

2. Background of Sutton Coldfield library

The Library, located in Sutton Coldfield town centre, is one of four BCC community libraries within the Sutton Coldfield District of Birmingham, with the others being located in Boldmere, Mere Green and Walmley.

There has been a public library in the centre of Sutton Coldfield for almost 80 years and it is currently located in the Red Rose Centre. The Library was closed for 3 years from 2010 due to asbestos being found in the building. After a £2.5m refurbishment, it reopened in 2013.

The Library is currently open for 40 hours per week, being closed on Thursdays and Sundays and open from 9am to 5pm on Monday to Wednesday, Friday and Saturday.

In addition to lending books and promoting reading, the Library is used:

- for school and nursery visits;
- for children's story-time sessions and holiday activities;
- by a reading group;
- by a family history group;
- by a local history group;
- by young people, as quiet place for study;
- for research;
- for well-used IT facilities, particularly appreciated by job-seekers, the elderly and young people with no IT facilities at home; and
- to house extensive local history records.

There is strong support for the Library to be kept open, as is evident from the approximately 6,500 petition signatures that have been collected. However, it should also be noted that there have been a number of common concerns raised by local residents regarding the existing Library, including the following:

- The location is not ideal, being somewhat tucked away from the main thoroughfares, such that residents of the town do not necessarily know where the Library is. This is further exacerbated by poor signage. The entrance is also not especially welcoming;
- The opening hours are considered to be too short. Opening at least into the early evening, i.e. to around 7pm, would be preferred to improve availability of the facility for young people and workers;
- It would be ideal for the Library to offer more multi-functional space (e.g. meeting rooms, areas for community activities) and a café;
- The Library does not currently provide a particularly broad range of activities and events and those that are provided are not well-advertised.

In general, it is considered that the Library would be better-used if these issues were addressed.

3. Summary of Birmingham City Council's proposals

The Library is one of 37 community libraries across Birmingham and one of only two that BCC proposes to close as part of its exercise to make savings to the city's library budget. The remaining libraries are allocated into three "Tiers", summarised as follows:

A Tier 1 library is one which:

- would be open for 35 hours per week;
- would be likely to be delivered from the current library building;
- would have other services delivered from the site, such as a benefit verification service; and
- would have investment in self-service equipment.

A Tier 2 library:

- would be open for 21 hours per week, with additional hours possibly being provided by way of a local partnership; and
- would be likely to be delivered from the current library building.

A Tier 3 library is one which would be run by a local community organisation, with support provided by BCC by way of 15 hours per week of staffing support and the provision of books and resources.

BCC's consultation document also refers to the potential for Tier 4 libraries to be established. A Tier 4 library would be run in its entirety by a separate community group, but BCC might provide some initial set-up support.

BCC has ranked the libraries across the city based on 11 criteria, as follows:

- population of the library catchment area;
- total children and young people aged 0-19 in the library catchment area;
- total adults aged 65+ in the library catchment area;
- number of libraries within 2 miles of the library;
- total books and other items issued;
- average Index of Multiple Deprivation score;
- total visits;
- cost per visit;
- PC usage;
- total attendance at activities and events; and
- building performance (sites scored better if had recent investment or were new build).

BCC's assessment of the ranking of each library in each category is included in the supporting materials at the end of this paper. An overall ranking of the libraries was then prepared to give an indication of the relative viability of and need for each library. This is included in the supporting materials at the end of this document.

With the exception of the Library and the other library facing closure (being Aston library), the libraries were designated to Tier 1, 2 or 3 according to their relative scoring, giving 19 Tier 1 libraries, 10 in Tier 2 and 6 in Tier 3.

Of the libraries across the wider Sutton Coldfield district, Mere Green is proposed to be a Tier 1 library. It is further proposed that a trial will be run to increase opening hours to 48 per week or more by way of 'open plus' technology giving out-of-hours access. Boldmere and Walmley are proposed to be operated as Tier 2 libraries.

In respect of the Library, as an alternative to closure BCC has indicated that it is open to considering a Tier 4 offering for the Library, *"particularly those linked to the SCL Digital Universal Offer regarding access to IT and the Heritage Collection."* During our discussions with BCC, it is evident that there is an acceptance by BCC that it is responsible for ensuring appropriate storage for the historical records and for providing some form of access to IT services within Sutton Coldfield town centre. It is our understanding that no specific budget has been set aside at present for either of these.

4. Review of ranking criteria

Referring to BCC's ranking criteria discussed above, it is of note that the Library is ranked 13th overall. It is ranked in the top quartile (1-9) for:

- population of the library catchment area (more people within the local community so higher need);
- total children and young people aged 0-19 in the library catchment area;
- total adults aged 65+ in the library catchment area;
- number of libraries within 2 miles (fewer alternative libraries in the vicinity so higher need);
- PC usage; and
- total library visits.

It is ranked in the bottom quarter (28-37) for:

- cost per visit (i.e. higher cost); and
- average Index of Multiple Deprivation score.

It is evident that, based on BCC's own rankings, with a placing of 13 out of 37, the Library is one of the most viable and most needed in the city. It is therefore unsensical to propose that it be closed.

We further refer to BCC's *"Shopping and Local Centres: Supplementary Planning Document, (March 2012)"*. The document sets out a hierarchy of Birmingham's Town, District and Neighbourhood Centres. Sutton Coldfield is the *only* Town Centre identified in the whole of Birmingham. Mere Green is identified as a District Centre, while Boldmere and Walmley are Neighbourhood Centres. For Birmingham's only Town Centre to be left without a library seems to defy sense. This is a sentiment that has been repeatedly echoed throughout The Library Lobby's campaign over the last few months; from residents who believe that a town centre the size of Sutton Coldfield needs to be served by a well-provisioned, professionally-staffed modern library, to the Sutton Coldfield Business Improvement District ("BID") who see the library as a valuable generator of footfall and business. Indeed, the Sutton Coldfield BID have voiced particular concerns to The Library Lobby that the closure of the Library can only adversely impact footfall to and business within Sutton Coldfield town centre, and at the Red Rose Centre in particular.

BCC has suggested that an increase in hours at Mere Green library should provide some substitute for the closure of the Library. However, this proposal takes no account of the huge discrepancy in accessibility between the two sites, a factor which also seems not to have been taken into account in BCC's assessment criteria.

Sutton Coldfield town centre and, by implication, the Library benefits from excellent transport links. A multi-storey car park is attached to the Red Rose Centre, there are a wide range of bus routes connected to the town centre which terminate by the Red Rose Centre and the railway station is within a quarter of a mile. Other libraries in the area are not nearly so well served. Specifically:

- The Library is adjacent to bus stops linking Sutton Coldfield town centre with outlying areas, with 27 bus stops being within 500m walking distance of the Library; Mere Green is served by only 9 bus stops within the same distance. From our discussions with Library-users, we note that a number of people who currently take one bus into Sutton Coldfield town centre, would require to take a second bus to get to Mere Green. Similarly, those who currently walk to the Library, would be required to take a bus or drive in order to use Mere Green library.

- The Library is 350m from the nearest train station; Mere Green is some 970m away.
- The Library has plentiful car-parking facilities, including an adjacent 513-space car-park; Mere Green library has a 588-space car-park adjacent to it, but this is operated by Sainsbury's and is often busy, a situation likely to be exacerbated by the recent opening of the new Mulberry Walk shopping complex in the immediate vicinity.

Closure of the Library would mean that many users (particularly those reliant on walking and public transport) would not be able to go to alternative facilities with ease and, for car-users, any additional traffic would have a knock-on negative effect.

We note that there have not been many responses to the consultation from library users with disabilities. As we know, it is important to consider additional measures during a consultation to fully engage with users for whom access in any respect is reduced. In discussions held with the local special schools (Langley and Wilson Stuart) it became apparent that there are significant concerns about a local library in Mere Green, due to problems with accessibility.

We would also point out that the Library likely serves an area greater than the Sutton Coldfield area, bearing in mind Sutton Coldfield's status as the only town centre within the Birmingham area and the public transport links referred to above.

Our discussions with BCC, suggest that their rationale for closing the highly-ranked Library is based primarily on the historical cost of running the Library, which we consider in the next section of this paper.

5. Review of finances

We accept that the historical costs of running the Library have been disproportionately high compared to other Birmingham libraries. However, we would expect an appropriate response of BCC to be to identify opportunities to reduce the costs of the Library, rather than simply electing to close it.

We note that BCC's closure decision is based on the 2015/16 financial results for the Library. These results (adjusted to take account of some corrections to the figures made by BCC) are set out below:

	£
Employees - Direct	248, 414
Employees - Indirect	14, 238
Employees	262, 652
Property Repair & Maintenance	56, 742
Energy	42, 280
Rents	80, 346
Rates	82, 903
Water Services	1, 595
Fixtures & Fittings	181
Cleaning & Cleansing	(1, 981)
Premises	262, 066
Transport	423
Materials Purchases	12, 223
Equipment Purchases	851
Printing, Stationary	5, 766
Other Services	16, 235
Postage	2
Communications & Computers	10, 621
Supplies Miscellaneous	20, 680
Supplies & Service	66, 378
Gross Expenditure	591, 519
Fees & Charges	(10, 163)
Rents	(1, 145)
Recharge Income	(5, 123)
Gross Income	(16, 430)
Net Expenditure	575, 089

Our review of these figures has raised a number of concerns and questions regarding their reliability, as noted below.

Employees - Direct

This 2015/16 figure is based on 10.28 full-time-equivalent (“FTE”) staff in the Library. However, the number of staff in the Library currently is now much lower, being 5.9 FTE staff. As such, the saving made on salaries from closure of the Library would not be £248,414, but a significantly smaller amount (perhaps nearer £145,000 on a pro rata basis).

Employees - Indirect

We are advised that the £14,238 cost attributable to the Library relates to Pension Strain Costs incurred as a result of staff leaving the service by way of voluntary redundancy. These costs would continue after closure of the Library, so they do not represent a saving. Indeed, we anticipate there could be further redundancy costs incurred as a result of the closure.

Property Repair and Maintenance

We have been informed that “*The library service retains responsibility for the whole building and therefore picks up costs on matters relating to the whole building.*” On this basis, we suspect that this is the cost for the entire building and it seems wholly unreasonable for the library to be charged the full costs for the building, rather than just a proportion for the area it occupies.

Further, if the Library shunts, some of these costs will presumably remain in order to keep the building in reasonable condition.

Energy

As with the Repair and Maintenance costs, it is not clear if this is energy for the whole building or just the Library area. The former seems likely and, if that is the case, it seems unreasonable for the Library to be charged the full costs for the building, rather than just a proportion for the area it occupies.

Again, we consider that there may be some residual energy costs incurred in the building subsequent to closure of the Library.

Rents

As the rent the Library pays goes directly to BCC, this does not represent an overall saving should the Library close. Whilst money will be saved in the Library budget, the property income will be lost elsewhere in BCC's budget, at least until any such time that BCC may be able to rent the space to an alternative tenant. As it stands, this money is simply passing from one part of BCC to another.

We do however acknowledge that, for the size of the space occupied by the Library, the level of rent paid is reasonable.

Rates

Noting that an increasing proportion of business rates will be payable directly to BCC from 2017/18, the same principle applies as in respect of the rent, i.e. this cost to the Library represents income for another part of BCC and there is no overall net saving. As with the rent, this applies until any letting of the property to another organisation.

Further, similarly to the maintenance and energy costs, it is not clear to us whether the Library is paying the Rates for the entire building, or only the space which it occupies.

Water Services

Again, we question whether the Library is responsible for the water charges for the entire building or solely the area it occupies. Assuming this is the cost for the building as a whole, unless the water is turned off if the Library is closed, this may not be a saving to BCC.

Materials Purchases

The figure of over £12,000 seems disproportionately high, noting that the equivalent figure for Mere Green library is only around £4,500. The reasons for this discrepancy are unclear.

We are informed that some of this cost is due to services provided by Initial Washroom and Rentokil for the whole building, not specifically for the Library. Again, it is unreasonable that the Library should be bearing the costs of the entire building when it only occupies a part of it.

Some of this cost is for purchase of books, CDs and DVDs, although the breakdown has not been provided. A detailed breakdown would be helpful in order to explore accurately what savings could be made in this area. We are advised that for 2017/18, the intention is that any budget for book purchases and similar will be borne centrally by Birmingham's library service, rather than being the responsibility of individual libraries.

Printing, Stationery

It is our understanding that the majority of the printing costs at the Library relate to use by the public of the Library's printing service to print their own documents. This cost would therefore be substantially covered by the payments the public make to print documents.

Where the corresponding income appears is unclear. It seems probable that it is included in "Fees & Charges".

Other services

It is not at all clear what this cost relates to. We note that the figure is very high in comparison to Mere Green library, which has a charge of only £385 in relation to this heading. We therefore consider that a detailed breakdown of this figure is required in order to understand what it relates to and consider whether savings can be made in this area. The description of this figure is a worrying "catch all" and this lack of transparency is a concern.

Communications and Computers

BCC has indicated in our discussions with them that they are committed to ensuring free internet access remains available in Sutton Coldfield town centre. The implication of this is that BCC would fund it. If so, this figure may not represent any sort of saving should the Library close, as it refers to the cost of the IT services provided in the Library.

Supplies Miscellaneous

We are advised that these costs “reflect the residual revenue funding that has to be provided to finance the capital improvements at the Library i.e. Refurbishment costs”. Notwithstanding that we consider the description of this figure to be misleading, this would not be a saving should the Library close.

Further to this analysis, which raises a number of issues in relation to the above figures, it is relevant to consider what actual savings will be made by BCC in closing the Library. This will not be the £575,000 presented above, being the net expenditure on the Library in 2015/16.

This is particularly relevant to us because we are interested in understanding what level of additional income would need to be generated by the Library in order to balance the books, assuming that BCC will only accept any counterproposal that goes a significant way to ensuring keeping the Library does not cost them more than they have budgeted for (i.e. £0).

Whilst it is unsatisfactory, we refer to the most recently known costs for the Library (i.e. the 2015/16 results) as the basis for estimating the actual savings that could be made if the Library were to shut. As noted above, we query many aspects of these figures and this should therefore be considered as only an indicative calculation.

We have identified in our analysis above, a number of items which would not provide BCC with an immediate saving/cashflow benefit upon closure of the Library on 1 April 2017. These are summarised as follows:

- Employees – Direct: £103,000 – being the difference between the 2015/16 staff costs of £248,000 and our approximation of the current annual staff costs based on a reduced number of staff, i.e. £145,000;
- Employees – Indirect: £14,000 – the Pension Strain Costs will still be incurred by BCC;
- Rent: £80,000 – since the rent is being paid by the Library to BCC's property team, there is no net saving to BCC as a whole;
- Rates: £83,000 – as above, the rates will be paid directly to BCC from April 2017; and
- Supplies Miscellaneous: £21,000 – this is essentially a re-charge to the Library from BCC in relation to the costs of the refurbishment in 2010 to 2013 and does not represent an actual cost, as the refurbishment costs have already been incurred.

Deducting these amounts from the 2015/16 net expenditure of the Library of £575,000 leaves a potential actual cost saving of £274,000. In addition, we question whether the following property expenditure would be saved in full, on the basis that we presume there would be certain residual costs of running the property:

- Property Repair & Maintenance: £57,000;
- Energy: £42,00; and
- Water Services: £2,000.

These total £101,000.

Further, Communications and Computers costs (£11,000) will also not be saved to the extent that BCC is committed to providing certain free IT services in the centre of Sutton Coldfield (for the use of job-seekers for example) even if the Library is closed. In addition, we would anticipate that the ongoing provision of these services outside of the Library would require relocation and other transitional costs, further reducing the savings to be made. There will also be some premises costs associated with the requirement to relocate and store the local history materials.

We understand that considering the immediate savings that are potentially available to BCC from the closure of the Library is not the same as considering the costs of retaining the Library. Recent discussions with BCC, suggest that the annual on-going cost of maintaining the Library would be £360,000. However, there may be opportunity to make some cost savings to reduce that figure.

Turning to the issue of funding of the Library, it is relevant to have regard to the costs of funding all the libraries across Sutton Coldfield, i.e. including the Mere Green, Boldmere and Walmley libraries, as well as the Library itself. An overriding principle must be that Sutton Coldfield as a whole should get its 'fair share' of the funding for libraries across Birmingham. We have been informed that 8.5% of the population of Birmingham lives in Sutton Coldfield and it is therefore fair and reasonable for the Sutton Coldfield libraries to receive 8.5% of the total library funding. In the context of a total library budget of £3.724m, this equates to approximately £316,500. We are advised that the current budget for the Sutton Coldfield libraries is around £300,000.

We understand that, on average, the annual cost of a Tier 1 library in Birmingham in 2015/16 was £170,000 and that the typical cost for a Tier 1 offering in 2016/17 will be £107,000. If a Tier 1 library in the centre of Sutton Coldfield were to be run for that average amount, in addition to the other three libraries in the wider Sutton Coldfield district, a total amount of £407,000 would therefore be required, meaning that a further £107,000 would require to be raised over and above the allocated budget from BCC. We consider that such funding could be sourced from a combination of:

- a contribution from Sutton Coldfield Town Council ("the Town Council");
- grants and similar funding sources; and
- income-generating activities.

6. Premises

As we have noted, the Library is located within the Red Rose Centre. The centre was recently acquired by BCC, at a cost of £10.4m.

The building in which the Library resides (on the first floor) includes other space which is currently unoccupied. The second floor provides the largest additional space, consisting of:

- public toilets;
- staff toilets;
- a staff room for Library staff;
- three meeting rooms;
- a suite of three small offices;
- a larger office space, currently divided into two, and including a small kitchen area;
- a further large office space, set up with desks; and
- a small store room.

There are some problems with water leaks in two areas of the building; one is understood to be due to a leaking roof, while the reason for the other is unclear and may be due to a problem with internal pipe-work. Otherwise, however, the condition and specification of the space is very good.

We note that the second floor is currently advertised for rent by BCC, for a sum of £180,000 per annum (an inclusive rate, covering rates, utilities, cleaning, etc.). The size is stated as 9,850 square feet.¹ From our meetings with BCC, our understanding is that their preference is to rent out the entire space to one lessee, rather than for it to be subdivided. We further understand that some potential lessees would be put off by the fact that the entrance to the premises is shared with the public. However, it is extremely disappointing that, since acquiring the building, BCC has consistently failed to find any suitable occupiers of this space.

In addition, the third floor of the building houses the former caretaker's flat. This area has not been refurbished and, as far as we understand, no attempts have been made by BCC to let this space.

The third floor area, as well as some of the space on the second floor, is currently used to store some of the Library's local history and archive material. We are informed that this is in the process of being catalogued in order to establish what is contained therein.

We understand that the Library staff are responsible for managing the public conveniences on the second floor of the building. They are also being required to deal with 'management' aspects of the whole building, such as dealing with contractors undertaking repairs. This distracts from their primary responsibilities in running the Library.

We have researched alternative venues for a library in the centre of Sutton Coldfield but have been unable to identify any suitable alternative sites that could house a Tier 1 library. We attach in the supporting materials at the end of this document examples of properties currently available to let in Sutton Coldfield town centre. Notwithstanding the cost of these sites, it is difficult to envisage how any of them would be suitable for a town library of any description.

¹<http://property.birmingham.gov.uk/to-let-second-floor-45-lower-parade-sutton-coldfield-b72-1xx/>

There is common expectation locally that, in the longer-term, the Red Rose Centre will be redeveloped. It is understood from discussions with BCC's Planning Department that the managing agents have been appointed for only two years (with an option on another one year), suggesting that the intention is for the whole site to be sold to a developer.

One further significant point that has come to our attention is that, in the event of redevelopment, funding for a site for the Library may be included as a condition imposed on the developers. This has been referred to a "section 106" matter, or a Community Infrastructure Levy (Planning Practice Guidance amendments 2015). In any event, we understand that such a condition would only be available if the Library is situated in the centre at the time of any redevelopment.

Notwithstanding this, we consider that a purpose-built community space, including the Library, within any redeveloped area would be an attractive option for the future of our Library.

We must point out that, against this backdrop, the proposal to close the Library is widely viewed locally as an indication that BCC wishes to maximise its return on investment by offering any developer or other new owner vacant possession of the whole building, free of "section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy" or similar obligations. We would regard any such factors as improper considerations in the context of the present consultation. Should the Library be closed, BCC's actions with regard to the Red Rose Centre will invariably become the subject of intense local scrutiny including, but not limited to, appropriate Freedom of Information requests being submitted in reasonably short order.

7. Our principles for the Library

The Society of Chief Librarians has identified five key areas of service as essential to a 21st century library service. They are reading, information, digital, health, and learning.

Our principles for what we would expect of the library service in Sutton Coldfield town centre are as follows:

- A single building that is identifiable as a library;
- Key library services to continue to be provided are: books and services for children; books and services for older people; computer facilities; and the local history collection;
- Other services should be provided from the building but these need to be compatible with the library service. These could include: town council and/or BCC offices; job/career support; museum services; a café; tourist information; meeting rooms for hire; and art gallery space;
- The space within the building should be designed to be as flexible as possible to maximise its use;
- Staffing should be arranged to be as flexible as possible, so that as many staff as possible are able to provide a basic level of service in as many areas as possible; and
- Some new services could be developed to operate from the building. Examples might be:
 - Library outreach - to build library services within Sutton Coldfield; to strengthen community ties; to bring in more footfall; to co-ordinate an ongoing programme of public events, some of which could be income generating;
 - IT training and support, for people who wish to use the computer facilities;
 - Grant funding applications support, to both the Town Council and local groups; and
 - Tourism development, incorporating promotion of local attractions and local history, as well as the organisation of local events.

8. Our proposal

Our vision

Our proposal would see the Library retained as a Tier 1 library within its current premises, supported and augmented by a variety of services provided by a community hnb located in the currently vacant 2nd floor space. This is well-aligned with our principles for the Library, as outlined in section 7 above, and reflects well the feedback that has been received from the community within and around Sutton Coldfield town centre.

Finances

As indicated on page 13 above, we consider that sufficient funding for a Tier 1 library could be sourced from a combination of:

- a contribution from the Town Council;
- grants and similar funding sources; and
- income-generating activities.

On Tuesday 24th January 2017, the Town Council moved to set aside up to £150,000 from its unallocated budget to support the continued provision of a library service in the town centre after 1 April 2017. Our proposal would see the Town Council use that sum to lease the 2nd floor of the Red Rose Centre, to be used as a community hnb providing a variety of services and amenities.. This sum is broadly in line with the currently advertised rate for the space, noting that no “sweeteners” or inducements are being requested (e.g. a prospective commercial tenant is likely to ask for such incentives or bonuses as parking spaces and a number of months rent-free). The Town Council would, however, require BCC to make the building water tight and deal with all the issues of ingress of water that currently face the building (which costs BCC would have to incur in any event before any tenant would reasonably take up occupancy).

This income of **£150,000** is more than the typical running cost for a Tier 1 library under the proposed 2016/17 budget (i.e. £107,000). It is expected that BCC can provide a full Tier 1 service within the Red Rose Centre by ring-fencing that income to fund the running of the Library. Should BCC feel that it cannot operate a Tier 1 library within a building that it owns for this sum, we expect that all of the relevant departments within BCC will be able to work together to see the library retained at the site.

A successful application for Local Innovation Fund monies (totalling up to **£48,000** for Trinity Ward where the library is located) and/or other grants and funding would finance the running of a community hub (staffing, equipment and materials) by or on behalf of the Town Council within the 2nd floor space. Discussions with John Mole from Birmingham City Council about this have been initiated.

A range of activities would be provided via the community hub, many of which are capable of being income-generating. It is hoped that a combination of external funding and these revenue streams would ensure that any ongoing funding by the Town Council would be minimised.

Details

We propose that **the floor above the library in the Red Rose Centre is rented by Town Council**, and is then used by the Town Council to add value and to showcase the additional facilities and

services that local residents have expressed their desire to see, at least some of which are capable of being income-generating. In this way, the Town Council would be using funds from the Sutton precept as it is intended to be used, i.e. to provide additional services over and above BCC's service provision, rather than purely subsidising or paying for services which are within BCC's remit.

The rental income would be ring-fenced by BCC to facilitate the ongoing presence of a Tier 1 library in central Sutton Coldfield. We acknowledge that this arrangement, to ring fence rental income, would have to be agreed by BCC, but the idea of in principle ringfencing a particular income stream is not an especially unusual one and we believe it has been used elsewhere in BCC.

We accept, the use by the Town Council to fund or subsidise BCC's provision of library services out of the precept monies paid by Sutton Coldfield residents is not regarded as a sustainable or long-term solution.

The activities to be run by or on behalf of the Town Council via the community hub on the second floor of the Red Rose Building would include **a variety of revenue-raising initiatives**, including:

- a café, possibly one that is especially family friendly (this element was lost to the town with the closure of BHS);
- pop-up (or more long-term) arts and cultural events and exhibitions, including evening events;
- a Sutton Coldfield Museum (in conjunction with other Birmingham museums wishing to reach new audiences and/or partly drawn from and showcasing the local archives held at the library). First steps have already been taken to consult with BMAG on hosting an exhibition in this space;
- a shop selling postcards and calendars created from local history photographs;
- working and meeting space for local home-workers/entrepreneurs;
- opportunities for existing community organisations to grow into a new and more central position;
- opportunities to work with local educational establishments to provide independent study spaces and education hubs, including independent living skills teaching for students with additional needs; and
- opportunities for dispossessed voluntary groups to use and work from the space, perhaps on a rotational basis.

These are among the most frequently-raised suggestions from Sutton Coldfield residents and library-users. These activities would be developed alongside and may be supported by a programme of grant and funding applications.

A café is perhaps the most universally requested added amenity. The Library Lobby has, on a confidential basis, received extremely encouraging data showing the positive impact of a café on library footfall and utilisation. We are also aware of anecdotal evidence of the positive impact of café offerings within libraries as part of a modernisation programme carried out by The London Borough of Hillingdon over the last decade.

Crowdfunding from the community may also factor as a partial solution for some initiatives or projects. Appropriately targeted and executed crowdfunding may also contribute to greater community engagement with the Library and these added services overall.

Such sources of external funding will assist to support activities in the short to medium term, while revenue streams establish themselves. Ultimately, the goal would be for this “community hub” to be sustained through its own revenue-raising activities and through such external sources of funding as can be identified and secured; this combination of funds would continue to pay the rental of the space to BCC, providing the BCC with ongoing funding for a Tier 1 library. This will assist in minimising the Town Council’s financial commitment to paying for the rental of the space using funds raised from the precept charged to Sutton Coldfield residents.

To ensure maximum effectiveness, this new **“community hub” would be managed by a new member of staff**. Exploratory discussions have begun to investigate how funding (including from BCC’s Local Innovation Fund) could meet this cost. This paid member of staff (employed by the Town Council) would have the support and oversight of a newly formed Friends of Sutton Coldfield Library board; a group of volunteers including representatives from the local business community, charities and campaign groups, and of course staff from the Library who would jointly plan a year-round programme of activities, and provide strategic support).

This proposal has been discussed with the working party which was set up by the Town Council. Initial indications from several councillors have suggested that they would welcome the Library Lobby putting forward this proposal. Unfortunately due to circumstances beyond the control of the Library Lobby, no formal collaboration on this proposal was possible before the closure of the consultation period.

Advantages of this proposal

This proposal ensures the **continued presence of a Tier 1 library** in the *only* town centre in the whole of Birmingham (per BCC’s own reckoning²). Given Sutton Coldfield’s town centre status, and the fact that the Library is uniquely served by public transport, it is highly likely that the Library serves a user-base beyond Sutton Coldfield residents. Against that backdrop, it is imperative that any retained library in the town centre should be a full-service, Tier 1 library.

The proposal sets out means **to generate income from the earliest possible opportunity for BCC** in circumstances in which BCC has publicly noted the difficulty it has encountered in letting out the second floor of the Red Rose Centre, including prospective tenants for a space of that size requiring a private entrance. By turning this space into a community hub, we create a tenant who positively benefits from sharing a public entrance with the library; under this proposal the Library is seen as the asset it is, rather than as a stumbling block to rental income.

Our proposal **offers possibilities to reduce staffing costs** in the Library; a community hub manager would be able to relieve Library staff of non-library duties which currently take up a significant amount of their time, e.g. dealing with issues in the public toilets, spending time with contractors visiting the building to carry out repairs. This may enable a reduction in permanent staffing costs for the Library.

This approach **avoids the need to find alternative premises for the Library**. By keeping the Library in the Red Rose Centre for the immediate future, all stakeholders avoid the problems raised by the lack of alternative venues. BCC has not indicated publicly that it has any particular plans for the Red Rose Centre. As such, the community within and around Sutton Coldfield town centre have a legitimate expectation that proposals which enable the Library to remain within the Red Rose Centre ought to be acceptable to BCC.

2 “Shopping and Local Centres: Supplementary Planning Document, (March 2012)”

This proposal is **borne out of genuine community interests and concerns**, and as such is likely to serve Sutton Coldfield residents well.

This proposal **does not impact on the budget/proposals for the rest of Sutton Coldfield library service** i.e. Mere Green, Walmley and Boldmere libraries.

Supporting Materials

Need Analysis: Libraries ranked on key indicators

Community Library	Population of library catchment area	No. of children and young people 0-19 in library catchment area	No. of people aged 65+ in library catchment area	Number of libraries within 2 miles of library	Total items issued	PC usage (in hours)	Total library visitors
EDGBASTON							
Bartley Green	29	29	26	9	32	36	35
Harborne *	11	18	7	19	3	8	11
Quinton	14	14	10	9	7	19	18
ERDINGTON							
Castle Vale **							
Erdington	2	4	5	1	10	10	12
HALL GREEN							
Balsall Heath	15	9	24	9	12	7	7
Hall Green	7	5	6	19	4	29	6
Kings Heath	5	6	4	19	2	11	2
Sparkhill	4	3	16	19	5	9	4
HODGE HILL							
Shard End	26	23	23	19	27	15	19
Ward End	1	1	8	1	8	12	15
LADYWOOD							
Aston	21	15	28	19	29	22	27
Birchfield	20	16	29	19	22	14	24
Bloomsbury	33	31	36	9	37	37	37
Small Heath	3	2	15	9	9	6	3
Spring Hill	34	34	34	19	31	13	23
NORTHFIELD							
Frankley	35	35	33	1	35	33	25
Kings Norton***	18	20	14	1	15	28	17
Northfield	9	10	3	1	6	3	10
Weoley Castle	16	17	11	19	18	18	13

Sheet1

West Heath*****	30	32	27	0	24	17	28
PERRY BARR							
Handsworth	13	11	20	19	21	2	16
Kingstanding	24	21	19	9	23	25	21
Perry Common	28	27	30	9	25	16	22
Tower Hill	25	25	22	1	26	23	32
SELLY OAK							
Druids Heath*****	32	33	31	9	30	24	26
Selly Oak	36	37	35	19	33	31	34
Stirchley	22	24	21	19	19	27	30
Yardley Wood	17	19	18	19	16	26	9
SUTTON COLDFIELD							
Boldmere	19	22	9	9	20	35	31
Mere Green	8	13	2	1	1	21	14
Sutton Coldfield	6	8	1	9	11	3	5
Walmley	23	26	17	1	17	32	20
YARDLEY							
Acocks Green	10	7	12	19	14	5	8
Glebe Farm	31	30	32	19	34	33	29
Kents Moat	37	36	37	19	36	30	36
Sheldon	27	28	25	19	28	20	33
South Yardley	12	12	13	19	13	1	1
Ranking Description	Rank 1 = high number means more people within the local community so higher need	Rank 1 = high number means a higher proportion of C & YP in the area so higher need	Rank 1 = high number means a higher proportion of older people in the area so higher need	Rank 1 = low number means fewer alternative libraries in the vicinity so higher need	Rank 1 = high number of items borrowed from the library	Rank 1 = high number of hours PC usage means higher need	Rank 1 = high number of library visitors means higher viability

Harborne* closed for 5 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 weeks as per mo

Castle Vale** no longer run by BCC therefore data not included

Kings Norton*** closed for 14 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week mo

Druids Heath**** closed for 2 week during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week mo

West Heath***** data from 2012/13 the last full year that West Heath was open

Methodology

Each library has been ranked (out of 37 community libraries) in order on a range of indicators - some ran depending on the viability need criteria. The needs analysis captures data from a variety of sources to re
 * Demographic data: resident population, proportion of children and young people 0-19 living in the catchment profiles for further detail).

*Indices of multiple deprivation

* Library performance data: visits, active users, PC usage, participation in events and learning activities

* Library financial data: cost per visit (calculation based on the out turn budget figure for each site divided

*Building quality rank dependent on level of investment received in the last 10 years and the level of inve

A high ranking suggests there is a lower level of need/viability for a library based on a particular indicator a library will have a low score because there is more need for its services. Libraries that have good perfo

Sheet1

attendance at events and activities will have low scores because there is evidence of viability and need to operate or require investment through refurbishment will have higher scores for this indicator.

All rankings have been combined to give an overall score, which indicates how well libraries are aligned to the longer term viability of the building.

The table above shows the viability/need in relation to the current estate of 37 community libraries (excluding Tenants and Residents Alliance).

Cost per visit	Average IMD score for the library catchment area	Participation in events and educational sessions	Building Performance	Combined score
34	22	16	28	296
7	32	11	10	137
12	25	19	20	167
21	16	8	28	117
11	2	6	20	122
8	29	3	20	136
3	28	10	1	91
1	14	7	28	110
2	9	5	1	169
13	11	12	10	92
22	3	29	1	216
33	12	26	1	216
36	1	32	38	327
10	4	25	9	95
29	7	27	10	261
18	10	9	20	254
5	24	18	1	161
16	27	13	10	108
15	21	23	10	181

20	26	34	38	276
23	8	21	9	163
25	17	37	10	231
26	15	15	20	233
24	30	36	20	264
27	13	35	1	261
37	33	31	35	361
30	31	20	28	271
17	19	4	20	184
32	35	28	10	250
9	37	22	10	138
31	34	17	20	145
4	36	33	10	219
6	18	1	1	101
19	5	24	28	284
35	6	30	35	337
28	23	14	28	273
14	20	2	1	108
Rank 1 = low cost means higher viability	Rank 1 = highest level of deprivation	Rank 1 = high volume of participation in sessions means higher need	Rank 1 = low score means that building has had high level of refurbishment/new build so higher viability as less work required	Low ranking number = increased viability/need. High ranking number = lower level of need viability
del.				
del				
del				

king highest to lowest and others from lowest to highest
 flect a sources to reflect the criteria around need/viability.
 hment area of the library (see Library Catchment

l by the number of visits)
 stment needed in the next 10 years

. Where a catchment area has a high level of deprivation
 rmance in terms of visits, issues, IT usage, membership,

Sheet1

through the uptake of services. Buildings that are costly
to meeting the needs of the local community and library users,
ding Castle Vale which is now managed by the Castle Vale

Overall Viability/Need

Community Library	Combined score	Ranking 1 = highest need/viability
Kings Heath	91	1
Ward End	92	2
Small Heath	95	3
Acocks Green	101	4
Northfield	108	5=
South Yardley	108	5=
Sparkhill	110	7
Erdington	117	8
Balsall Heath	122	9
Hall Green	136	10
Harborne	137	11
Mere Green	138	12
Sutton Coldfield	145	13
Kings Norton	161	14
Handsworth	163	15
Quinton	167	16
Shard End	169	17
Weoley Castle	181	18
Yardley Wood	184	19
Aston	216	20=
Birchfield	216	20=
Walmley	219	22
Kingstanding	231	23
Perry Common	233	24
Boldmere	250	25
Frankley	254	26
Spring Hill	261	27=
Druids Heath	261	27=
Tower Hill	264	29
Stirchley	271	30
Sheldon	273	31
West Heath	276	32
Glebe Farm	284	33
Bartley Green	296	34
Bloomsbury	327	35
Kents Moat	337	36

Sheet1

Selly Oak	361	37
-----------	-----	----



Retail Property Advisors

On the Instructions of



RETAIL UNIT TO LET

UNIT 114, KINGS COURT GRACECHURCH CENTRE, SUTTON COLDFIELD



LOCATION

Sutton Coldfield is an affluent town located 8 miles to the North East of central Birmingham. Sutton Coldfield has a total resident population of 294,500 (Source: CACI) within a 20 minute contour. The centre is approx 553,000 sq ft and benefits from footfall in excess of 150,000 per week.

The centre is anchored by **Marks & Spencer, House of Fraser, BHS** and **Boots** and benefits from an 970 space car park which links directly into the main mall.

The unit is located overlooking the busy Kings Court. Retailers in proximity include **EE, H&M, House of Fraser** and **3 Store**.

ACCOMMODATION

The approximate floor areas are as follows:-

Ground Floor	152.17 m ²	1,638 ft ²
First Floor	65.59 m ²	706 ft ²

LEASE TERMS

The premises are available by way of a new effectively FRI lease for a term to be agreed, subject to 5 yearly upward only rent reviews.

RENT

£65,000 per annum exclusive.

RATES

Rateable Value	£83,500
Rates Payable	£41,166 (2015/16)

Interested parties are advised to make their own enquiries via the local authority.

SERVICE CHARGE

£13,714 (2015).

LEGAL COSTS

Each party is to be responsible for their own legal costs incurred in the transaction.

EPC



CONTACT

Will Thomas 020 7317 3717 wthomas@klmproperty.co.uk	Ben Oliver 020 7317 3723 boliver@klmproperty.co.uk
---	--

Or alternatively, contact our joint agents:


Cushman & Wakefield – Doug Tweedie / Chris Baker
0121 232 4900

**SUBJECT TO CONTRACT
& VACANT POSSESSION**

+44 (0)20 7317 3700 | +44 (0)20 7317 3701 | www.klmproperty.co.uk

Langham House, 302-308 Regent Street, London, W1B 3AT

IMPORTANT: These Particulars are believed to be correct but their accuracy is not guaranteed and they do not form part of any contract



Experian Goad Plan Created: 01/09/2015
Created By: Kitchen LaFrenais Morgan

For more information on our products and services:
www.experian.co.uk/goad | goad.sales@uk.experian.com | 0845 601 6011



Copyright and confidentiality Experian, 2015. © Crown copyright and database rights 2015.
Ordnance Survey 100019885

+44 (0)20 7317 3700 | +44 (0)20 7317 3701 | www.klmproperty.co.uk

Langham House, 302-308 Regent Street, London, W1B 3AT

IMPORTANT: These Particulars are believed to be correct but their accuracy is not guaranteed and they do not form part of any contract

Andrew Grant Commercial

**113 The Parade, Sutton
Coldfield, West Midlands,
B72 1PU**

£35,000 per annum

Rental:

TO LET: PROMINENT SHOP PREMISES



LOCATION

The premises are well located within Sutton town centre, directly opposite Ask and close to major occupiers including Aldi, Scrivens, West Bromwich Building Society, Nando's, etc.

ACCOMMODATION

Approximate internal dimensions and areas are detailed below:

GROUND FLOOR		
Average Internal Width	20ft 8in	6.30m
Shop Depth	65ft 2in	19.90m
GF Net Sales Area	1,305 Sq ft	121 Sq m
FIRST FLOOR		
Staff/Storage	950 Sq ft	88 Sq m
SECOND FLOOR		
Male & Female Toilets		

LEASE

The property is offered on the basis of a new fully repairing and insuring lease, for a term of years to be agreed upon, in multiples of 5 years.

RATING ASSESSMENT

We understand that rating assessment is as follows:

Rateable Value of £37,500

General Rates Payable of £18,637.50

Interested parties are advised to make their own enquiries directly with the local authority.

ENERGY PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATE

The property has a rating of 90 (Band D). A copy of the Energy Performance Certificate is available upon request.

LEGAL COSTS

Each party are to be responsible for their own legal costs incurred in this transaction.

REFERENCES

The successful applicant for a tenancy will need to provide a satisfactory bank, accountants, solicitors, landlord and two satisfactory trade references for submission to the Landlord. In respect of a limited company the last three years audited trading accounts.

VAT

We understand that VAT is payable on the rental price. However, interest parties are required to make their own enquiries..

MONEY LAUNDERING

In accordance with Anti-Money Laundering Regulations, two forms of identity and confirmation of the source of funding will be required from the successful Tenant.

VIEWINGS

Strictly by prior appointment with Andrew Grant Commercial on 0330 024 3000.

Midlands Office
485 Birmingham Road,
Bromsgrove, B61 0HZ


London Office
40 St James's Place
London, SW1A 1NS

T. 0330 024 3000
E. commercial@andrew-grant.co.uk
andrew-grant.co.uk

Andrew Grant LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership incorporated in England under OC399403. Regulated by RICS. A list of members is open to inspection at the registered office which is at Carrick House, Lyplatt Road, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL50 2QJ. Telephone 01242 234421



These particulars are not to form part of a sale/letting contract and may be subject to errors and/or omissions therefore prospective purchasers/tenants must satisfy themselves by inspection or otherwise as to their correctness. All fixtures, fittings, chattels and other items not mentioned are specifically excluded unless otherwise agreed within the sale/letting contract documentation or left in situ and gratis upon completion. The Agents have not formally verified any part of the property's officially authorised planning use, structural integrity, tenure or availability/operation of services and/or appliances. Therefore, prospective purchasers/tenants are instructed to seek validation of all such matters prior to expressing any formal intent to purchase/lease. The property is sold/let subject to any rights of way, easements, wayleaves, covenants, any other issues or planning matters which may affect the legal title. Consequently, prospective purchasers/tenants are advised to seek validation of all above matters, prior to expressing any formal intent to purchase/lease.




50 metres

Experian Goad Plan Created: 22/11/2016
Created By: Andrew Grant



Copyright and confidentiality Experian, 2016. © Crown
copyright and database rights 2016. OS 100019885

For more information on our products and services:
www.experian.co.uk/goad | goad.sales@uk.experian.com | 0845 601 6011



Location

Sutton Coldfield is an affluent town located 8 miles to the north east of Birmingham. The centre is approximately 550,000 sq ft with weekly footfall in excess of 130,000.

The centre is anchored by Marks & Spencer, House of Fraser and H&M. Recent lettings in the scheme have included Tiger, Office, Swarovski, Lakeland and Fat Face. The unit is in a prominent position facing onto The Parade adjacent to Beaverbrooks and opposite Waterstones.

Accommodation

Ground Floor	1,270 sq ft	118.03 sq m
Basement	578 sq ft	53.72 sq m
First Floor	1,277 sq ft	118.68 sq m
Total	3,125 sq ft	290.43 sq m

Lease Term

The premises are available by way of a new effectively FRI lease for a term to be agreed, subject to 5 yearly upward only rent reviews.

Rent

£75,000 per annum exclusive.

Rates

Rateable Value	£77,000
Rates Payable (2016/17)	£38,269

Interested parties are advised to make their own enquiries via the Local Authority to confirm this information.

Service Charge

£12,647 (2016).

Energy Performance Certificate

Available upon request.

Costs

Each party is responsible for their own legal costs incurred in this transaction.


Contact

Will Thomas
+44 (0)20 7317 3717
wthomas@klmretail.com

Ben Oliver
+44 (0)20 7317 3723
boliver@klmretail.com

Or through our joint agents

Cushman & Wakefield
0121 232 4921



50 metres

Experian Goad Plan Created: 18/08/2016
Created By: Kitchen LaFrenais Morgan



Copyright and confidentiality Experian, 2016. © Crown
copyright and database rights 2016. OS 100019885

For more information on our products and services:
www.experian.co.uk/goad | goad.sales@uk.experian.com | 0845 601 6011

BURLEY BROWNE

www.burleybrowne.co.uk

RETAIL UNIT

TO LET

**57 BIRMINGHAM ROAD
SUTTON COLDFIELD
BIRMINGHAM
B72 1QF**



**GROUND FLOOR SALES AREA 108.88m²/1,172 sq ft or thereabouts
Ancillary Storage – 103.4 m²/1,113 sq ft or thereabouts**

**Neighbouring occupiers include Black Sheep Hair, Save the Children,
Comfort Beds and Tesco Express**

0121 321 3441

57 Birmingham Road, Sutton Coldfield

LOCATION

The premises are prominently situated to the south of Sutton Coldfield Parade and The Mall Shopping Centre with neighbouring retailers to include Black Sheep Hair, Save the Children, Comfort Beds and Tesco Express.

DESCRIPTION

The premises comprise an inner terraced retail unit providing ground floor sales together with ancillary storage at basement, first and second floors.

The accommodation comprises the following approximate floor areas and dimensions*:

Internal width	6.35m / 20'10"
Shop depth	25.42m / 83'5"

Ground floor sales: 108.88m²/1,172 sq ft

First floor storage	23.5m ² /253 sq ft
Second floor storage	56.2m ² /605 sq ft
Basement storage	23.7m ² /255 sq ft

LEASE

The premises are available by way of a new lease on effectively full repairing and insuring terms, for a maximum term of 2 years.

RENT

£30,000 per annum exclusive.

BUSINESS RATES

Rateable Value £22,750 obtained from the Valuation Office Rating List.

Rates payable 2016/2017 £11,306.75 prior to any transitional arrangements.

Interested parties are advised to make their own enquiries with the Local Authority (Birmingham) for verification purposes.

LEGAL COSTS

Each party will be responsible for their own legal costs incurred in the granting of the new lease.

ENERGY PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATE

Energy Performance Asset Rating Band C - 74.

VAT

All figures quoted are exclusive of VAT, which may be payable.

VIEWING

Strictly by appointment with the sole letting agent:

Burley Browne on 0121 321 3441.




For the latest news, [follow us on twitter](#)

TERMS STATED ARE SUBJECT TO CONTRACT, AND ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE CONDITIONS PRINTED ON THE LAST PAGE.

8217

201016

You should be aware that the Code of Practice on Commercial Leases in England and Wales strongly recommends you seek professional advice from a qualified surveyor, solicitor or licensed conveyancer before agreeing or signing a business tenancy agreement. The Code is available through professional institutions and trade associations or through the website www.commercialleasecode.co.uk



Expertise Goal Plan Created: 12/10/2016
Created By: Blaise Evans



Copyright and confidentiality Expert, 2015. © Crown
copyright and database rights 2015. OS 100019885

For more information on our products and services:
www.experian.co.uk/good | good.sales@uk.experian.com | 0845 601 6011

Energy Performance Certificate

Non-Domestic Building

00000000000000000000

Abey Lighting
17 Newington Road
BUTTON CHISELDE
S16 1JL

Certificate Reference Number:
0436-3051-0283-0705-591

This certificate shows the energy using of this building. It includes the energy efficiency of the building and how it is heating, ventilating, cooling and lighting systems. The rating is compared to how benchmarks for this type of building are expected to be so the building and energy are compared for the building's building. There is more advice on how to interpret the information on the Government's website www.nonsustainable.gov.uk/guide.

Energy Performance Asset Rating

More energy efficient

A

A 25

B

B 25-50

C

C 50-60

D

D 60-70

E

E 70-80

F

F 80-90

G Over 150

Less energy efficient

74

This is the energy efficiency
of the building

Technical Information

Main heating fuel:

Grid supplied Electricity

Building type and features:

Industrial and business building

Total floor area (m²):

213

Building complexity:

3

Benchmarks

On the scale from 1 to 100
the lowest energy efficiency is 100

25 50 75 100

25 50 75 100

25 50 75 100

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THESE PARTICULARS ARE ISSUED

Burley Browne Ltd for themselves and for the vendors or lessors of this property, whose agents they are, give notice that these particulars are for guidance only and do not constitute any part of an offer or contract.

All descriptions, dimensions, references to condition and any necessary permissions for use and occupation together with all other details are given in good faith and are believed to be correct. However, any intending purchasers or tenants should not rely upon them as statements or representations of fact and must satisfy themselves by inspection or otherwise as to the correctness of each of them.

No person in the employment of Burley Browne has any authority to make or give any representation or warranty whatsoever in relation to this property.

Fixtures, Fittings and Services

Reference to any gas, electrical or other fixtures, fittings, appliances or services have not been tested and no warranty is given or implied as to their availability, adequacy, condition or effectiveness.

VAT

Unless otherwise stated all prices and rentals quoted are exclusive of any Value Added Tax to which they may be subject.

Tenure

Burley Browne have not had the opportunity to inspect any title documentation and intending purchasers or tenants should verify information through their legal advisor.

Rates / Water Rates

Verbal enquiries only have been made and interested parties are advised to verify figures direct with the appropriate authority.

Environmental / Asbestos

No environmental audit or investigation has been carried out on the property and no Environmental Report has been inspected. We have not carried out an inspection for asbestos and no Asbestos Register has been viewed. Potential purchasers/tenants should satisfy themselves on the above matters through enquiries of their Surveyor/Solicitor.

Burley Browne Chartered Surveyors is the trading name of Burley Browne Ltd
Registered in England No. 5488324
Registered Office: 1A Mitre Court, 38 Lichfield Road, Sutton Coldfield, B74 2LZ

Community Libraries - Revised Medium Term Financial Plans 2017/18 to 2019/20

	Estimated Cost of FOM (October 16)	Adjustments	Pre-consultation Estimated Cost of FOM (Feb 2017)	Impact of Consultation	Provision for Transitional Costs	Post Consultation Estimated Cost of FOM (Feb 2017)		
	2017/18 £'000	£'000	2017/18 £'000	£'000	£'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000
Employees	2,527	114	2,641	281	0	2,922	2,922	2,922
Agency	100	5	105	(105)	0	0	0	0
Employee Pension Strain - One-Off Costs	50	0	50	135	0	185	185	185
Premises	906	0	906	136	0	1,042	1,042	1,042
Transport	7	0	7	0	0	7	7	7
Bookfund	380	0	380	0	0	380	380	380
Other Supplies & Services	242	0	242	57	0	299	299	299
Prudential Borrowing for Self Service	0	174	174	0	0	174	174	174
Capital Financing Costs	1,343	(164)	1,179	0	0	1,179	1,179	1,179
Recharge Expenditure	58	0	58	0	0	58	58	58
Provision for Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0	292	292	0	0
Gross Expenditure FOM	5,613	128	5,741	504	292	6,538	6,246	6,246
Capital Financing Adjustment	(1,169)	(10)	(1,179)	0	0	(1,179)	(1,179)	(1,179)
Other Income (Sutton Rental/Partners/Community Dev)	0	0	0	(413)	0	(413)	(413)	(413)
Fees and Charges (Note 2)	(546)	0	(546)	50	0	(496)	(496)	(496)
Gross Income	(1,715)	(10)	(1,725)	(363)	0	(2,088)	(2,088)	(2,088)
Net Expenditure FOM	3,898	118	4,016	141	292	4,450	4,158	4,158
Provisional Cash Limit (Note 1)	3,724	726	4,450			4,450	4,062	4,062
Net Position	174		(434)			(0)	96	96
Mitigations to be Identified						0	(96)	(96)
Overall Net Position	174	0	(434)			(0)	(0)	(0)
Estimated Staffing Numbers (FTE)	88		88	12		100	100	100

Note 1	2017/18 £'000
	3,724
Deferring the existing saving to 2018/19	388
Funding for prudential borrowing self serve	174
Funding for 1% pay award and superannuation increase	178
Other	(14)
Net Increase	726
Updated Cash Limit	4,450

Note 2 - already assumes additional income of £250k from hire of facilities, reservations and verification benefit work



Equality Analysis

Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

EA Name	Birmingham Library Service Tiered Delivery Model For Community Libraries
Directorate	Place
Service Area	Homes And Neighbourhood - Place
Type	Amended Function
EA Summary	The Community Library service are consulting on introducing a tiered Library service which will incorporate greater community support. This is aligned to the budget allocation set in 2014/15.
Reference Number	EA001361
Task Group Manager	liz.parkes@birmingham.gov.uk
Task Group Member	sarah.chinnock@birmingham.gov.uk
Date Approved	2017-02-03 00:00:00 +0000
Senior Officer	chris.jordan@birmingham.gov.uk
Quality Control Officer	placeequalitycontrol@birmingham.gov.uk

Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

Initial Assessment

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

Relevant Protected Characteristics

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

1 Activity Type

The activity has been identified as a Amended Function.

2 Initial Assessment

2.1 Purpose and Link to Strategic Themes

What is the purpose of this Function and expected outcomes?

Deliver a city wide community library service through a tiered system, based around the Society of Chief Librarians universal offers : learning, digital, reading, information, and health. The proposed tiered model proposes to co-deliver Libraries rated as Tier 3 libraries. The Tier 3 libraries that are being consulted on are, Bartley Green, Bloomsbury, Glebe Farm, Kents Moat, Selly Oak and West Heath Library. These libraries will be supported by 15 hours of BCC library staffing working alongside partners and stakeholders. This still ensure accessibility of the library service to almost all of Birmingham residents who will still be within 2 miles of a library service. The consultation proposes the closure of Sutton Coldfield and Aston Libraries.

For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.

Children: A Safe And Secure City In Which To Learn And Grow	Yes
---	-----

Comment:

Children have been consulted through the use of two questionnaires. It was import that we capture the views of the future generation and provide a library service that will meet there needs.

Health: Helping People Become More Physically Active And Well	Yes
---	-----

Comment:

Health is one of the Society of Chief Librarians universal offers. Libraries provide access to health information both online and through selected book stock.

Housing : To Meet The Needs Of All Current And Future Citizens	No
Jobs And Skills: For An Enterprising, Innovative And Green City	Yes

2.2 Individuals affected by the policy

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	Yes

Comment:

It is acknowledged that the proposed changes are likely to have an impact on staff. Through the consultation process the council will follow policy and procedures, these will include briefings, meetings with managers, one to one consultation, email, written communications and Trade Union consultation. The proposed new Community Library service model indicated a staffing reduction of an estimated 13 fte from a total workforce of 112 fte. Data is held regarding the workforce profile in relation to age, pregnancy and maternity, race, gender and disability, though not in relation to other protected characteristics.

It is important to ensure that the process of implementing the new organisational design does not adversely affect individuals with one or more protected characteristics. A range of staff and Trade Union consultations will help to inform the decision-making process to determine the development of the savings programme.

Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes
--	-----

Comment:

It is acknowledged that the new model will have a greater impact on the users of the two libraries proposed for closure. A set of principles have been used throughout the model: this will see an

enhancement of service at Mere Green Library if Sutton Coldfield closes, and Birchfield will be moved to a tier 1 library if Aston Library closes.

2.3 Relevance Test

Protected Characteristics	Relevant	Full Assessment Required
Age	Relevant	Yes
Disability	Relevant	Yes
Gender	Relevant	Yes
Gender Reassignment	Relevant	Yes
Marriage Civil Partnership	Relevant	Yes
Pregnancy And Maternity	Relevant	Yes
Race	Relevant	Yes
Religion or Belief	Relevant	Yes
Sexual Orientation	Relevant	Yes

2.4 Analysis on Initial Assessment

The budget review process identified savings to the community library service in 2014 of £1.8 million to be achieved by 2017/18. This is following savings of £3.5 million already delivered since 2012. The library service in Birmingham needs to design a service for the 21st Century which is financially sustainable and is underpinned by transformational change to deliver on a modern set of outcomes. To deliver the type of change required will take time and the city council will need to work with and listen to partners at a national level and with organisations and individuals from local communities. It is clear that Birmingham Community Library Service cannot continue to operate as it has done in the past. The majority of the Library budget covers staff and premises costs, the principle way to achieve the significant reductions that are required is to reduce the opening hours across the service and to reduce the number of staff working for the service. The authority continues to prefer to retain a library service, even though this may mean reduced hours of operation, as opposed to wholesale closures. It recognises that this is not possible in all cases due to budgetary constraints, operational effectiveness, and premises related issues.

A number of options have been explored during this time including reducing the number of libraries that BCC runs to 24 libraries, and the remaining 13 libraries being run through 3rd sector organisations and partnerships, this was explored in EA000352. A staff led mutual and a in-house model have also been explored. Alternative delivery models for Hall Green Library, Spring Hill Library and West Heath Library were explored in EA000379. The delivery of West Heath Library relocated into a preferred option Oddingley Hall was explored in EA 001193.

The savings target for community libraries was set in 2015/16. It was a three year target growing each year with a final cumulative figure to be achieved of £1.8m in 2017/18. During this period a number of different approaches to delivering the savings have been considered.

Closure of the lowest priority sites, whilst maintaining the level of budget, service provision and opening hours at all other sites. This approach would have closed 13 sites as many of the lower priority sites are already the least costly and therefore a considerable amount of sites would have closed. Accessibility to the service would have been significantly reduced under this model.

Delivering the service via a staff led mutual. This option was considered as it has the potential to deliver cost reductions and increase income and therefore retain larger numbers of libraries. Cost reductions can be achieved in a number of ways but a significant element is the ability to achieve a reduction in business rates. The income increases were projected through charitable donations, increased income through coffee/vending sales and new fees such as reservations. Alongside further options around building repairs and maintenance and suppliers. The model reviewed at the time fell short of the budget requirements due to the business rate strain. The model also required the city council to invest in self service before the service was transferred, which it was unable to do at the time.

Using open plus to deliver libraries in unstaffed mode. This option would require significant investment and internal layout remodelling, but other local authorities such as Peterborough City Council has used this technology to reduce the hours in which libraries are open with staff but by operating in unstaffed mode the amount of hours libraries are actual open to the public is maintained or increased. This option also considered some of the libraries being operated through a new charitable organisation.

Following on from these options, a refined tiered offer has been designed that will be consulted on during October

2016. We aim to invest in our Libraries and make them more responsive and flexible to our customer's needs. We are proposing to reshape the delivery of Birmingham Library Services into Tiers. The main Library offer will be delivered through the Library of Birmingham and Tier 1 and Tier 2 libraries which will be managed and delivered by Birmingham City Council.

Tier 3 Libraries these Libraries will be professionally supported by BCC but led by local communities and volunteers. The council will be looking to work in partnership with local communities or other organisations in the city to provide library services in these locations. As part of the partnership the council will offer 15 hours of professional staff support per week.

Tier 4 Libraries this will be a very localised and specific response, to support new activity around library service provision. BCC will seek to support local communities by way of a one off grant to deliver library provision from a new community venue. This may be a community wanting to deliver something that supports the existing delivered service or one or more of the five society of chief librarians universal offers. The closure of Sutton Coldfield Library and Aston Library are also considered through the consultation process.

The proposal also details an investment in self service and supporting volunteers with a training package.

o Tier 1: Main Library - these would be open for 35 hours, more likely to be delivered from the current library building and have other services delivered from the site such as the benefit verification service. All will have investment in installing self service equipment. The proposal is for 19 sites to be in this category.

o Tier 2: Community Library - these would be open for 21 hours, likely to be delivered from the current library building although options may exist to increase hours of operation by working with partners. The proposal is for 10 sites in this category.

o Tier 3: Supported Community Library - these would be run by a community organisation, from either their own premises or via a transferred facility. The City Council's library service will work in partnership to support the organisation through a 15 hour worker and through the provision of books and investment in self service equipment. The proposal is for 6 sites to be in this category.

o Tier 4: Community Initiated Library Services - the proposal under Tier 4 is to ensure that any local schemes put forward that increase access to one of the universal offers (Digital, Learning, Information, Reading and Health) are considered for support through a one-off pump priming grant. I.e. this could be organisations wanting to loan books or providing free internet access etc. There is no proposed number for the local offer this will be dependent on the ideas that come forward and the number that can be supported through the £20,000 small grant budget available. One site already falls into this category.

A needs assessment has been conducted learning from best practice as evidenced in the Chateris review following the local enquiry into the public library service provided by the Wirral Metropolitan Borough

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-local-inquiry-into-the-public-library-service-provided-by-wirral-metropolitan-borough-council>

The starting point for the model has been to carry out an assessment and prioritise the 37 community libraries. The prioritisation excludes the Library of Birmingham and also Castle Vale as this is no longer directly run by the City Council.

The assessment was undertaken using data from 11 indicators which represented considerations suggested in the Charteris Report and this was a similar approach to work done by other local authorities when assessing need. Libraries were then ranked from 1 to 37 (excluding Castle Vale and LoB but including West Heath and Bloomsbury) on each of these indicators which then led to a combined score to demonstrate their viability for service provision going forward.

The 11 criteria listed below were used to rank the community libraries.

1. Population of library catchment area
2. Total children and young people aged 0-19 in the library catchment area
3. Total adults aged 65+ in the library catchment area
4. Number of libraries within 2 miles of a library
5. Total books and other items issued

6. Average IMD score
7. Total visits
8. Cost per visit
9. PC Usage
10. Total attendance at activities and events
11. Building performance (sites scored better if had recent investment or were new build)

The needs analysis captures data from a variety of sources to reflect the criteria around need/viability.

All the criteria had an equal weighting and each library was ranked 1 to 37 depending on where they scored on the criteria.

Demographic data includes resident population, proportion of children and young people 0-19 living in the catchment area of the library.

The Index of multiple deprivation includes income deprivation; employment deprivation; health deprivation and disability; education deprivation; crime deprivation; barriers to housing and services deprivation; and living environment deprivation.

Access to other libraries includes the number of other libraries within a 2 miles radius of the library. Walking distance according to Google Maps.

Library performance data captures visits, active users, PC usage, participation in events and learning activity.

Library financial data is a cost per visit (calculation based on the out turn budget figure for each site divided by the number of visits).

Building Quality rank is dependent on level of investment received in the last 10 years and the level of investment needed in the next 10 years.

A high ranking suggests there is a lower level of need/viability for a library based on a particular indicator. Where a catchment area has a high level of deprivation a library will have a low score because there is more need for its services. Libraries that have good performance in terms of visits, issues, IT usage, membership, attendance at events and activities will have low scores because there is evidence of viability and need through the uptake of services. Buildings that are costly to operate or require investment through refurbishment will have higher scores for this indicator.

As libraries often draw their catchment from across ward and city boundaries, the catchment areas were created by including any Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where a defined percentage of the resident population (3%) used the library in the past 12 months. They have an average of roughly 1,700 residents and 650 households. Measures of proximity (to give a reasonably compact shape) and social homogeneity (to encourage areas of similar social background) are also included. The catchment area data reflects actual users of the library.

All rankings have been combined to give an overall score, which indicates how well libraries are aligned to meeting the needs of the local community and library users, and the longer term viability of the building.

The individual library and catchment area profiles give detailed demographic data on age, gender, BME population and disability. Data on economic activity, educational attainment, was also included as well as identifying those LSOAs ranked as the most deprived in the (national) Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). All major bus/train routes serving the library catchment areas were identified and plotted.

It is acknowledged that this is an initial assessment and that it will progress to a full assessment once citywide consultation has taken place.

3 Full Assessment

The assessment questions below are completed for all characteristics identified for full assessment in the initial assessment phase.

3.1 Age - Assessment Questions

3.1.1 Age - Relevance

Age	Relevant
-----	----------

3.1.2 Age - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals of different ages?

The Library service will continue to be delivered from sites across the city. Therefore this allows access for all age groups to the library service. It is intended that volunteers will support the delivery of tier 3 and tier 4 libraries. The proposal is to reduce opening hours in Tier 1 Libraries to opening for 35 hours per week, Tier 2 Libraries opening for 21 hours per week and Tier 3 Libraries open for 15 hours per week with the option for longer opening hours when supported by volunteers. The impact of change in opening hours may be greater for library users in older age groups who may also have disabilities, as it may be more difficult for these groups to access alternative library sites.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.1.3 Age - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals of different ages on the impact of the Function?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

The public consultation ran from October 25th 2016 to January 27th 2017, and the results from the questionnaire have now been analysed. This was alongside 4 public meetings and 33 briefing sessions held at all libraries across the city. In addition 6 focus groups were facilitated by the Strategic Research team these sessions engaged with 41 Birmingham citizens.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals of different ages?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Stakeholder meetings have taken place throughout the period of the consultation. Staff have been fully consulted with and the Trade Unions involved.

Comment:

Staff age ranges with data provided by HR

Age range	pre service redesign	post service redesign
20-29	4%	3%
30-39	17%	18%

40-49	21%	24%
50-59	48%	45%
60-69	10%	10%

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.1.4 Age - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals of different ages being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their age?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.2 Disability - Assessment Questions

3.2.1 Disability - Relevance

Disability	Relevant
------------	----------

3.2.2 Disability - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals with a disability?

Community Libraries are designed to be accessible for residents with physical and visual disabilities. The impact of reduced opening hours may be greater for disabled users due to additional difficulty in accessing alternative library locations or a more limited library service.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

No data on library users is recorded through the Library Management system although the IMD data takes into account health deprivation. The consultation questionnaire recorded if participants considered themselves to have a disability. A focus group session looked at the impacts on the proposed model with disabled residents. One participant rents the community room in a community library. The workshops offer a mixture of advice and practical sessions, all based around employment support and health & wellbeing (e.g. CV writing and IT classes). Around 30 clients with disabilities come to the workshops every week.

. Many clients cannot afford their own computers or have internet at home, so the library is their source of access to the Internet, for activities such as looking for jobs (which is important as DWP/ job centre do not have time to help them).

. One participant uses internet to search for a book across the BCC library network and has it delivered to the local library - this saves him having to travel, and pay for travel, across different libraries.

. Being able to go to the library and use the resources help people with disabilities to be independent.

. One participant uses his local library to hold meetings / talk to people with disabilities as part of his voluntary role - this is free as he uses a corner of the library rather than renting a room."

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.2.3 Disability - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals with a disability on the impact of the Function?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16, Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals with a disability?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16, Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups. Staff and Trade Unions have also been consulted

Comment:

Staff data pre and post service design

Disability

Yes 7% 8%

No 91% 91%

Not assigned 2% 1%

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.2.4 Disability - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals with a disability being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their disability?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No
Do you think that the Function will take account of disabilities even if it means treating Individuals with a disability more favourably?	Yes
Do you think that the Function could assist Individuals with a disability to participate more?	No
Do you think that the Function could assist in promoting positive attitudes to Individuals with a disability?	No

3.3 Religion or Belief - Assessment Questions

3.3.1 Religion or Belief - Relevance

Religion or Belief	Relevant
--------------------	----------

3.3.2 Religion or Belief - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals of different religions or beliefs?

Community libraries are a statutory service under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums act. Local authorities must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to those wishing to may use thereof.

The community library service provides a service to the whole population and therefore there is no positive or negative impact as a result of a citizens religion or beliefs.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Needs analysis 2015/16 , performance data, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.3.3 Religion or Belief - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals of different religions or beliefs on the impact of the Function?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Needs analysis 2015/16 , performance data, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals of different religions or beliefs?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Needs analysis 2015/16 , performance data, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.3.4 Religion or Belief - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
---	----

Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals of different religions or beliefs being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their religion or belief?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.4 Gender - Assessment Questions

3.4.1 Gender - Relevance

Gender	Relevant
--------	----------

3.4.2 Gender - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Men and women?

The community library service provides a service to the whole population and therefore no disadvantage is applied to either men or women.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.4.3 Gender - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Men and women on the impact of the Function?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Men and women?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Meetings have been held across the city with interested parties and stakeholders. Staff and Trade Unions have been consulted throughout the process.

Comment:

Pre-service redesign post service redesign

Gender

Female 81% 81%

Male 19% 19%

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.4.4 Gender - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
---	----

Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Men and women being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their gender?

No

3.5 Gender Reassignment - Assessment Questions

3.5.1 Gender Reassignment - Relevance

Gender Reassignment	Relevant
---------------------	----------

3.5.2 Gender Reassignment - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals who have undergone or are intending to undergo gender reassignment?

Community libraries are a statutory service under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums act. Local authorities must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to those wishing to may use thereof. The closure of a library may impact on service users and this may be more significant for citizens with some protected characteristics . i.e elderly/disabled/undergoing gender reassignment/ pregnant women and children as they may find it difficult to access an alternative library which may be further away.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Needs analysis 2015/16 , performance data, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.5.3 Gender Reassignment - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals who have undergone or are intending to undergo gender reassignment on the impact of the Function?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Needs analysis 2015/16 , performance data, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals who have undergone or are intending to undergo gender reassignment?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Needs analysis 2015/16 , performance data, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.5.4 Gender Reassignment - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals who have undergone or are intending to undergo gender reassignment being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their gender reassignment?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.6 Marriage Civil Partnership - Assessment Questions

3.6.1 Marriage Civil Partnership - Relevance

Marriage & Civil Partnership.	Relevant
-------------------------------	----------

3.6.2 Marriage Civil Partnership - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals who are married or in civil partnerships?

Community libraries are a statutory service under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums act. Local authorities must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to those wishing to may use thereof. Therefore there is no positive or negative impact as a result of a persons marital or civil partnership status.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.6.3 Marriage Civil Partnership - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals who are married or in civil partnerships on the impact of the Function?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals who are married or in civil partnerships?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.6.4 Marriage Civil Partnership - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
---	----

Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals who are married or in civil partnerships being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their marriage civil partnership?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.7 Pregnancy And Maternity - Assessment Questions

3.7.1 Pregnancy And Maternity - Relevance

Pregnancy & Maternity	Relevant
-----------------------	----------

3.7.2 Pregnancy And Maternity - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Pregnant women or those who are on maternity leave?

Community libraries are a statutory service under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums act. Local authorities must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to those wishing to may use thereof. The closure of a library may impact on service users and this may be more significant for citizens with some protected characteristics . i.e pregnant women as they may find it difficult to access an alternative library which may be further away.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	No
Do you plan to collect any evidence?	No
You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Not applicable

3.7.3 Pregnancy And Maternity - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Pregnant women or those who are on maternity leave on the impact of the Function?	No
If not, why not?	No relevant individuals identified
Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Pregnant women or those who are on maternity leave?	No
If not, why not?	No relevant stakeholders identified
Is a further action plan required?	No

3.7.4 Pregnancy And Maternity - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Pregnant women or those who are on maternity leave being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their pregnancy and maternity?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.8 Race - Assessment Questions

3.8.1 Race - Relevance

Race	Relevant
------	----------

3.8.2 Race - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds?

Community libraries are a statutory service under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums act. Local authorities must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to those wishing to may use thereof.

The community library service provides a service to the whole population and therefore there is no positive or negative impact as a result of a citizens race.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.8.3 Race - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds on the impact of the Function?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups. Staff and Trade Unions have also been consulted.

Comment:

Staff data pre and post redesign

Ethnicity

African	1%	1%
British	39%	51%
Caribbean	6%	6%
Indian	9%	9%
Irish	1%	1%

Kashmiri 1% 1%
 Pakistani 7% 7%
 White/Asian 1% 1%
 White/Black Caribbean 1% 1%
 Other 19% 16%
 Not assigned 9% 2%
 Prefer not to say 1% 1%
 Bangladeshi 2% 2%
 Unknown 3% 1%

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.8.4 Race - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their ethnicity?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.9 Sexual Orientation - Assessment Questions

3.9.1 Sexual Orientation - Relevance

Sexual Orientation	Relevant
--------------------	----------

3.9.2 Sexual Orientation - Impact

Describe how the Function meets the needs of Individuals of different sexual orientations?

Community libraries are a statutory service under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums act. Local authorities must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to those wishing to may use thereof.

The community library service provides a service to the whole population and therefore there is no positive or negative impact as a result of a citizens sexual orientation.

Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
---	-----

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
--	-----

3.9.3 Sexual Orientation - Consultation

Have you obtained the views of Individuals of different sexual orientations on the impact of the Function?	Yes
--	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Function on Individuals of different sexual orientations?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?

Community Libraries Needs analysis 2015/16 , Individual Library and catchment area profiles 2016, results from public consultation that ran from October 25th 2016 - January 27th 2016. 4 public meetings were held alongside 33 briefing sessions plus additional meetings with interested parties and stakeholders. 6 specific focus groups also detailed the impact on protected groups.

Is a further action plan required?	No
------------------------------------	----

3.9.4 Sexual Orientation - Additional Work

Do you need any more information or to do any more work to complete the assessment?	No
---	----

Do you think that the Function has a role in preventing Individuals of different sexual orientations being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their sexual orientation?	No
Do you think that the Function could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

3.10 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment

The proposed future operating model for community libraries which we have consulted on has the potential to impact negatively on citizens with protected characteristics in particular children, the elderly and disabled citizens. This impact may be more noticeable for children and elderly citizens as they have to travel further to access the library service, as hours are reduced across the service. However the consultation and engagement process has informed the process so that appropriate changes have been considered and implemented to mitigate any adverse impacts. Through this process it is acknowledged that Kents Moat and Glebe Farm libraries are in areas of high deprivation, the needs assessment has been adjusted so that deprivation has a higher weighting than the other criteria. Therefore following consultation it has been proposed to channel the resource allocated for Kents Moat Library which is due to close shortly due to redevelopment in the area, to Glebe Farm Library to enhance services for the community. Sutton Coldfield Library will remain open temporarily as a tier 1 Library. Therefore this removes the impact on the elderly, the young and pregnant women of travelling further to access the library service. This will be reassessed as and when proposals around the future of Sutton Library are finalised. A reduced service will continue to be provided from Aston Library as it is acknowledged that children make good use of the local community library and that this would not be the case if the service closed and was provided from Birchfield Library which is not as accessible to the Aston community. Through the consultation it has been demonstrated that proximity to a community library is greatly valued, this is evident through the Be Heard consultation results and the 1675 completed children's surveys. By maintaining provision in Sutton Coldfield and Aston Library all Birmingham residents will be within 2 miles of a library service.

There has been no evidence that the service wide reduction in opening hours of 155 hours (14%) has a disproportionate effect on any group with a protected characteristic. The model was generated from 11 criteria which included a weighted figure for deprivation.

Impact of staffing reductions

The impact of staffing reductions does not disproportionately affect any particular group. However, following implementation of the service redesign monitoring and review of any trends in changes in employment patterns will be undertaken.

Mitigation

It is highly unlikely that a selection process will be required following a VR process which was undertaken within the legal framework and Birmingham City Council policy. If any selection process is undertaken, appropriate action will be undertaken to ensure a fair and transparent process. The outcome of any selection process if required will be monitored and reviewed.

Please see EA appendix 5A for detailed report.

4 Review Date

02/02/17

5 Action Plan

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.

Community Libraries Equality Assessment

The public consultation ran from the 25th October 2016 until the 27th January 2017. During this time 4 public meetings were attended by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Ian Ward there were 248 members of the public in attendance.

There were also 33 public briefing sessions alongside 6 focus group sessions that looked at the impact of the proposed changes on groups with protected characteristics as well as groups focusing on the impact of the proposed closure of Aston and Sutton Coldfield Libraries.

This document outlines the analysis of the questionnaire that was held on Be Heard and also the more simplistic questionnaire that was made available to children. The equality information including equality specific information derived from the consultation questionnaires as well as comments made at the public meetings and briefings are considered throughout this Equality assessment. Actions taken as a result of the implementation of a tiered library model will be subject to an ongoing regular review for each protected characteristic.

The consultation questionnaire was made available through Birmingham City Councils consultation portal “Be Heard” as well as in all community libraries. A simpler survey was also made available through Birmingham Primary Schools, community libraries as well as been advertised on social media.

The questionnaires were open to all sections of the community, including potential partner organisations as well as BCC staff including library staff.

BCC consultation portal Be Heard hosted all of the consultation documents this included 17 appendices. This included the full cabinet report; the data needs analysis and individual library profiles to enable citizens to make informed decisions when answering a series of questions about the proposed changes. Hard copies of the all consultation material plus the full questionnaire and children’s questionnaires were also made available at all libraries; specialist formats e.g alternative languages were available on request. The consultation was launched with a media day organised by BCC press office. This involved news coverage on local television and radio. There was also coverage via press releases and social media, as well as signposting citizens to the consultation through BCC web pages.

Focus groups

45 citizens were recruited to take part in the 6 focus group sessions. The sessions were facilitated by the strategic research team and the sessions focussed on the impact of the closure of Sutton Coldfield Library, the impact of the closure of Aston Library, the impact of the proposed model on disabled citizens and three sessions discussing the proposed model with citizens broadly reflecting the demographics of Birmingham. While participants recruited to two of the four focus groups were recruited via community libraries, and therefore were library users, participants attending the remaining four were a mixture of library users and non-library users.

- All participants gave informed consent prior to taking part in the focus group discussions.
- Focus groups were conducted either at community libraries (i.e. Aston, Erdington and Sutton Coldfield) or at the Council House and lasted approximately one and a half hours to two hours.

- Between two to four researchers attended each focus group, one taking on the role of lead facilitator, one as co-facilitator and the remaining take notes.
- The semi structured discussions touched upon many areas, including:
 - current usage,
 - impacts of proposed changes, and,
 - views on the approach to proposals (e.g. approach and tiers and any ideas or suggestions to help achieve savings).
- All sessions were audio recorded to aid accuracy. The audio recording was then transcribed by a professional transcription company.
- All participants were given £30 shopping vouchers to thank them for taking part in the research.

Analysis:

- All transcripts were analysed by the lead researcher, Kamaljit Caulton.
- While analysis included thematic coding of qualitative data, due to time restrictions as a result of existing tight deadlines transcripts were not analysed using IT package Nvivo.

The demographic breakdown of the focus groups were as follows:

- **Age:** 18-24yrs = 5; 25-34yrs = 6; 35-44yrs = 6; 45-54yrs = 7; 55-64yrs = 11; 65+yrs = 9; Prefer not to say = 1
- **Disability:** Yes = 7; No = 37; Prefer not to say = 1.
- **Ethnicity:** White = 27; Asian/Asian British = 11; Black African/Caribbean/Black British = 6; Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups = 0; Other = 1.
- **Religion or belief:** Christian = 18; Hindu = 1; Jewish = 1; Muslim = 10; Sikh = 2; No religion or belief = 13
- **Sex:** Female = 26; Male = 18; Prefer not to say = 1.
- **Sexual Orientation:** Bisexual = 0; Gay or lesbian = 1; Heterosexual or straight = 14; Other = 1 Prefer not to say = 4; No data = 25.

A short presentation (the same one presented at some of the public meetings) was given to the group prior to discussions to help inform the participants of the proposed changes.

The focus group discussions were based on current usage, impacts of proposed changes, views on the approach to proposals (e.g. approach and tiers and any ideas or suggestions to help achieve savings).

Following this format, the analysis and reporting reflects key high level themes and appropriate sub-themes.

The most popular reasons for using library services that were identified in the focus groups included: borrowing books , computer and internet access , a place to access information , using the library as a social meeting place , attending organised activities at the libraries e.g. story time and access to a quiet place to study or do homework. This suggests that the library is not just perceived as a source of information, but rather a place that enables learning, social interaction and inclusivity.

QUOTES

“And people are going, “Well, I can't afford internet. I can't afford a computer. I can't afford a tablet. I can't even probably afford a smartphone. Where do I search for a job?” And that’s what we do here. We do the job search. Once they're confident, we say to them, “There are another nine hours [a week worth of computer time] that you could use at your local library”

“So, all the clients that we see here are based in the local area. So, if it wasn’t for this Library, they wouldn't be able to access our services...we work closely with the Disability Employment Advisors in the Job Centre, because they can't always offer that one-hour sit-down time with them to do all that.”

Few participants spoke about reasons for not using the libraries. However, some participants identified the following reasons for not using community libraries: libraries not being conveniently located or accessible and academic books available in community libraries being out of date. Generally, the view seemed to be that while some do not use library services as they are able to get those services from elsewhere, it is very important to those that do currently use them. Participants seemed concerned about the impact it would have on groups and individuals that used and relied on the service.

Groups likely to be impacted – reduction or cuts in services

- Children
- Older people
- Job seekers
- Transient community
- Parents
- People with disabilities
- Children with additional support needs
- People from deprived households
- People who do not have sufficient access to IT and internet at home
- People who struggle with using IT and online services
- Community (including transient community)
- Students (including mature students)

Potential impact of proposals – reduction or cuts in services

- Reduction in places for people to use where people feel safe:
 - Children
 - Women
 - Parents and carers
- Reduction in a public place where community gather and interact socially
 - General community
 - Children and families
 - Older people
 - People with disabilities

- Fewer reasons to leave the house for some individuals and groups:
 - Older people
 - People with disabilities
 - Mothers and carers

Proposal to close Sutton Coldfield and Aston library

There were some points that were made in both Aston and Sutton Coldfield focus groups about the proposal to close these libraries:

- Key part of the community that generations have used and enjoyed
- Provisions are superior to alternative libraries concerns about capacity of the alternative libraries to meet the needs and demands of the community e.g. access to computers, space, books, staff
- Current locations are convenient and more accessible than alternative libraries
- Current locations are safer
- Skilled, knowledgeable and helpful staff that meet the needs of users and are an essential part of the library experience
- valued community asset will be lost
- Proposed alternative provisions are not going to be able to meet the demand and needs of their existing users and additional users of the libraries proposed to be closed, e.g. access to computers, space, books, staff
- Location of proposed alternative libraries will not be convenient and will be less accessible, which is likely to impact particular groups and reduce library usage
- Concerns about alternative libraries not being as safe e.g. children have to travel further and cross more busy roads to get to Birchfield, easier for children to run out of the library at Mere Green, than it is at Sutton Coldfield
- Loss of skilled, knowledgeable and helpful staff will have an impact on the library experience all service users, but particularly people with disabilities, older people and children.

Other concerns are similar to impacts identified generally by all of the focus groups. The key difference is that the perceived impact on the Aston and Sutton Coldfield community would be sharper and more permanent, due to the proposed closure of the libraries.

Comments on opening hours expressed at focus groups

- Positive comment about increasing opening hours for some libraries, particularly Stirchley library
- Reducing hours could have a negative impact e.g. confusing and may discourage people from using the library (e.g. not being open when they visit or changes difficult to cope with for people who suffer from anxiety and stress)

Public Meetings

Four public meetings led by Chris Jordan Service Integration Head and the Deputy Leader Councillor Ian Ward and two Library Managers took place during November 2016. One meeting was held during the day and three meetings were held during the evening. The meetings were held at the Library of Birmingham, Northfield, Mere Green Community Centre and South Yardley Library to ensure there was a spread across the city, 248 members of the public attended. The meetings were advertised on Birmingham City Council's Be Heard website as well as in all Community Libraries along with the date for the Library Briefing across the remaining 33 sites. Following feedback received at the 4 Public meetings a simplified children's survey was also produced to engage children and gather their views on the proposal for the future of the community library service. 248 members of the public attending the meetings of these 50 residents filled in the equalities data form which enabled demographic information to be captured.

48 postcodes provided

2 postcodes could not be coded

Ward	Total Count	% Total Count
BOURNVILLE	8	17.8%
STECHFORD AND YARDLEY NORTH	6	13.3%
SOUTH YARDLEY	5	11.1%
WEOLEY	4	8.9%
NORTHFIELD	3	6.7%
ACOCKS GREEN	3	6.7%
SHELDON	2	4.4%
SHARD END	2	4.4%
BARTLEY GREEN	2	4.4%
KINGS NORTON	2	4.4%
BORDESLEY GREEN	1	2.2%
SUTTON VESEY	1	2.2%
SUTTON TRINITY	1	2.2%
LONGBRIDGE	1	2.2%
WASHWOOD HEATH	1	2.2%
LADYWOOD	1	2.2%
SUTTON FOUR OAKS	1	2.2%
SELLY OAK	1	2.2%
Grand Total	45	100.0%

Members of the public attending a public meeting and filling in Equality data

Age Group	No. of attendees	% of total attendees
Under 17	2	4.0%
18-19	0	0.0%
20-24	0	0.0%
25-29	0	0.0%
30-34	2	4.0%
35-39	3	6.0%
40-44	2	4.0%
45-49	2	4.0%
50-54	4	8.0%
55-59	3	6.0%
60-64	6	12.0%
65-69	6	12.0%
70-74	7	14.0%
75-79	8	16.0%
80-84	5	10.0%
85+	0	0.0%
Total attendees	49	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 1

Sex/Gender	No. of attendees	% of total attendees	% Census 2011 BCC
Female	30	61.2%	49.2%
Male	19	38.8%	50.8%
Total Respondents	49	100.0%	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 1

Sexual Orientation	No. of attendees	% of total attendees
Heterosexual or Straight	37	92.5%
Bisexual	0	0.0%
Gay or Lesbian	3	7.5%
Other	0	0.0%

Total Respondents	40	100%
--------------------------	-----------	-------------

Religion	No. of attendees	% of total attendees	% Census 2011 BCC
Christian (including church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and all other Christian denominators)	34	72.0%	49.3%
No Religion	12	25.5%	0.5%
Muslim	0	0.0%	2.2%
Sikh	0	0.0%	0.2%
Any other religion	0	0.0%	23.4%
Jewish	0	0.0%	3.2%
Buddhists	1	2.5%	0.6%
Hindu	0	0.0%	20.6%
Total Respondents	47	100.0%	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 3

Ethnic Group	No. of attendees	% of total attendees	% Census 2011 BCC
White (Total)	48	97.9%	57.9%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British (Total)	1	2.1%	9.0%
<i>No response / prefer not to say = 1</i>	49	100.0%	

Additional Meetings

We also received requests to attend further District Committee, Ward meetings and Sutton Coldfield Town Council meetings. Alongside these, meetings also took place to brief Councillors, stakeholders and potential partner agencies.

An email address communitylibraries@birmingham.gov.uk was used to deal with all consultation enquiries and comments. All emails were logged and acknowledged and dealt with centrally to ensure that they were captured in the consultation process. The Friends of The Library of Birmingham attended all of the Public meeting sessions alongside a number of the individual Library Briefings and submitted a summary report of the meetings with their findings. These were considered as part of the consultation process. Proposals to help deliver the Library service were received from: Sense to support Selly Oak Library, Witton Lodge to support Perry Common Library, The POD to support a Library in Nechells, Friends of Glebe Farm Library to support Glebe Farm Library, Stirchley Friends to support Stirchley Library, Library Lobby and Sutton Town Council to support Sutton Coldfield Library.

Library Review Consultation analysis

There were a total of 1947 responses to the Library questionnaire on the Birmingham City Council Be Heard website. In addition to this 1574 children took part in the children's survey. A summary of the key characteristics can be found in the Analysis of Birmingham Libraries Consultation –Children's survey.

Key respondent characteristics

Where comparisons can be made to the demographics of Birmingham overall, these have been provided.

Percentages are based on those who provided a response, i.e excludes those who didn't respond to that question or stated 'prefer not to say'

- The majority of respondents are residents of Birmingham (92%) and use a library (92%).
- BCC library staff accounted for 3%.
- 67% are age under 65yrs, with 33% age 65+. More than twice the proportion of people age 55-84yrs responded compared to the Birmingham resident population.
- Around two-thirds of respondents are female.
- 87% are of White ethnic background, much higher than the Birmingham resident population (58%). All other broad ethnic groups are underrepresented.
- 18% stated they have a physical or mental health condition lasting 12mths or more, and the majority of these respondents have mobility issues.
- 41% have a form of a caring role.
- 8% are BCC employees.
- Bournville ward had the most respondents (12%).
- Sutton Coldfield district had the most respondents (21%). In the top 11 wards, six of the wards are all located next to each other in the south of the city (Selly Oak, Bournville, Brandwood, Billesley, Hall Green and Moseley & Kings Heath), accounting for 31% of responses with a postcode

Age Group	No. of respondents	% of total respondents	ONS 2015 estimates BCC
Under 18	25	1.0%	25.5%
18-24	40	2.2%	12.3%
25-34	183	9.8%	15.3%
35-44	378	21.5%	12.7%
45-54	272	15.0%	12.0%
55-64	330	17.8%	9.0%
65-74	374	20.9%	6.7%
75-84	164	8.6%	4.5%
85+	50	3.1%	1.9%
Total Respondents	1,816	100.0%	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 131

A simplified children's survey has been used to capture the views of children .This gives a broader view of children living in the city.

Sex/Gender	No. of respondents	% of total respondents	ONS 2015 estimates BCC
Female	1,145	67.9%	50.6%
Male	541	32.1%	49.4%
Total Respondents	1,686	100.0%	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 261

Sexual Orientation	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Heterosexual or Straight	1,241	94.7%
Bisexual	31	2.4%
Gay or Lesbian	25	1.9%
Other	13	1.0%
Total Respondents	1,310	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 637

Religion	No. of respondents	% of total respondents	% Census 2011 BCC
Christian (including church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and all other Christian denominators)	877	55.5%	49.3%
No Religion	525	33.2%	0.5%
Muslim	106	6.7%	2.2%
Sikh	21	1.3%	0.2%
Any other religion	17	1.1%	23.4%
Jewish	12	0.8%	3.2%
Buddhists	12	0.8%	0.6%
Hindu	11	0.7%	20.6%
Total Respondents	1,581	100.0%	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 366

Ethnic Group	No. of respondents	% of total respondents	% Census 2011 BCC
White (Total)	1,441	86.7%	57.9%
English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	1,325	79.7%	
Other White European (including Mixed European)	40	2.4%	
Irish	35	2.1%	
Any other White background	25	1.5%	
Jewish	7	0.4%	
Polish	6	0.4%	
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	3	0.2%	
Asian/Asian British (Total)	143	8.6%	26.6%
Pakistani	42	2.5%	
Bangladeshi	19	1.1%	
Indian Sikh	17	1.0%	
British Asian	17	1.0%	
Indian Other	17	1.0%	

Chinese	12	0.7%	
Kashmiri	12	0.7%	
Afghani	2	0.1%	
Sri Lankan	2	0.1%	
Any other Asian background	2	0.1%	
Filipino	1	0.1%	
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British (Total)	71	4.3%	9.0%
Black British	33	2.0%	
Caribbean	16	1.0%	
African	16	1.0%	
Any other Black/African/Caribbean background	3	0.2%	
Somali	3	0.2%	
Mixed/Multiple (Total)	47	2.8%	4.4%
White and Black Caribbean/African	25	1.5%	
White and Asian	14	0.8%	
Any other mixed background	8	0.5%	
Other Ethnic Group (Total)	8	0.5%	3.0%
Any other ethnic group	4	0.2%	
Arab	3	0.2%	
Kurdish	1	0.1%	
Total Respondents	1,663	100.0%	

No response / prefer not to say

284

Physical or mental health condition/illness lasting 12mths+	No. of respondents	% of total respondents	% Census 2011 BCC*
No	1,362	82.1%	81.6%
Yes	297	17.9%	18.4%
Total Respondents	1,659	100.0%	100.0%

No response / prefer not to say = 288

*based on question of long term limiting illness.

If yes, do any of these conditions or illnesses affect you in any of the following areas? (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Mobility (e.g. walking short distances or climbing stairs)	144	34.2%
Stamina or breathing or fatigue	72	17.1%
Mental Health	70	16.6%
Hearing (e.g. deafness or partial hearing)	70	16.6%
Dexterity (e.g. lifting and carrying and carrying objects, using a keyboard)	48	11.4%
Vision (e.g. blindness or partial sight)	41	9.7%
Learning or understanding or concentrating	24	5.7%
Memory	22	5.2%
Other (please specify)	21	5.0%
Socially or behaviourally (e.g. associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome)	9	2.1%
Total Respondents	421	

No response / prefer not to say

1,526

Survey Questions 1-7

How do you use your Library? How often do you visit a Birmingham library or use the Library Service at home? Which Birmingham libraries and Birmingham library services do you use most often? How do you normally travel to the Library? How far do you travel to your preferred library? When do you normally visit the library? How often do you visit a library to do one or more of the following?

Majority of respondents use a Birmingham library service several times a month, at 56%.

Most walk to use the services, and travel 2 miles or less.

Stirchley had the highest proportion ranking it as 'Most Often' (11% of responses for that ranking). This was closely followed by Sutton Coldfield (9%) and Yardley Wood (7%)

Library of Birmingham had the highest total number of respondents who included it somewhere in the rankings (16% of total responses). Most of this library's responses (85%) was due to second and third placed rankings.

Morning and afternoons are the most popular times for using a service. Saturdays are the most popular days.

Q4. Method of transport (can choose more than one)	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Bicycle	95	5.0%
Bus	516	27.3%
Car/Motorbike	732	38.7%
Train	131	6.9%
Walk	1,195	63.1%
Other	15	0.8%
Total respondents	1,893	

No response

54

Q5. How far travel to a library	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Less than one mile	872	47.2%
1-2 miles	720	38.9%
More than 2 miles	257	13.9%
Total respondents	1,849	100.0%

No response

98

The majority of respondents 63.1% walk to their community library and travel less than one mile 47.2%. Comments also collected at the public meetings and briefing sessions indicated that residents would find it difficult to access a library service if it was 2 miles away as the journey would therefore total 4 miles and this would be prohibitive to children, the elderly and disabled citizens. This is also shown in the survey respondents as 34.2% expressed mobility issues when disclosing a disability.

Survey Questions 8-11

Q8. Important functions of a library (can choose more than one)


Q10. Reasons not use a library past 12mths (can choose more than one)

Q11. What would encourage more use of libraries (can choose more than one)

Thursday is the most popular day overall, and the most popular day for evenings. Sunday is the least popular day.

Mornings are overall the most popular time of day.

68% of citizens filling in the survey ticked half or more of the options available, with 5% ticking all options.



The survey allowed respondents to choose up to 28 opening hour's slots each.

Evenings and weekends were the most popular options, with people wanting later opening times to accommodate those who cannot make it during the day. Opening times should focus on being accessible for those who work and for families (school children, students, working families).

Many of those who mentioned evenings **did not have a specific day in mind**, as long as there were evening openings some of the time.

"I think there needs to be some evening and weekend service for those people who work in the day time. If hours were to be reduced, I would rather see libraries open late afternoon and evening than daytime-only."

"Maybe on some days libraries should to open later in the mornings, 10 or even 11 a.m., but stay open later in the afternoon, as indicated, until 6, or 7?"

In terms of **weekends**, **Saturday was the most popular day to be open**, with those who mentioned Sundays having differing views.

There were many who wanted libraries to be open every day or for as long as possible, with no specific days mentioned.

Some suggested that library opening times/days should be flexible depending on local need - e.g. based upon specific local usage or nearby libraries staggering their opening times/days:

"Libraries should be open on a range of days and times so that users have options on which libraries to use when they want to visit a library."

"option to open late nights and weekends across a district rather than individual libraries."

Changes to library opening hours:

Many were against library opening hours being reduced and therefore being less accessible for particular groups (depending on when the library is being closed). This particularly included the reduction in Boldmere and Walmley as there was concern over the impact of the proposed closure of Sutton Coldfield would have on these sites. Alternatively, a few suggested that it's preferable to reduce hours in libraries over closing any branches.

However, there were also a number of respondents who thought failing libraries should be closed and their **staff and resources consolidated to larger, 'super' libraries** throughout Birmingham.

Question 16 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following aspects of the proposal to shape the future of Birmingham Libraries

Q.16 Agreement with aspects of the proposal - PERCENTAGE	Total Agree	Total Disagree
Grouping into four tiers with different levels of service	28.5%	47.4%
Libraries selected for each tier	20.1%	45.0%
How it was decided	15.6%	43.0%
Proposed changes to opening hours	17.4%	61.7%
Proposal overall	16.2%	63.1%

Response by physical/mental health condition or illness	No	Yes	All respondents
Agree total	17.8%	14.8%	16.6%
Disagree total	61.9%	61.5%	63.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	14.8%	16.4%	14.7%
Don't know	5.5%	7.4%	5.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Sexual Orientation	Bisexual	Gay or Lesbian	Heterosexual or Straight	Other	All respondents
Agree total	20.0%	21.1%	18.2%	16.7%	16.6%
Disagree total	64.0%	52.6%	61.1%	58.3%	63.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	12.0%	15.8%	15.3%	25.0%	14.7%
Don't know	4.0%	10.5%	5.3%	0.0%	5.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other	White	All respondents
Agree total	25.0%	25.5%	28.9%	28.6%	16.6%	16.6%
Disagree total	57.0%	41.8%	57.9%	57.1%	62.7%	63.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	11.0%	21.8%	5.3%	14.3%	15.1%	14.7%
Don't know	7.0%	10.9%	7.9%	0.0%	5.6%	5.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

63% of respondents disagreed with the overall proposal, whilst a smaller proportion 58.6% of over 65 year olds disagreed with the overall proposal. 61.5% of disabled citizens who responded did not agree with the proposal. 64% of Bisexual respondents disagreed with the proposal this is slightly higher than the overall disagree response of 63%. 28.9% of mixed race respondents did agree with the proposal this is higher than the overall respondent rate of 16.6%.

Question 17 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements

Q17. Agreement with statements - PERCENTAGE	Total Agree	Total Disagree
Reading; Learning; Health; Digital and Information as main focus	69.5%	5.8%
Better to keep library open with reduced opening hours, than to close it	87.4%	6.3%
If a library is to close then the service at a neighbouring library should be enhanced	80.9%	7.4%
Community groups wanting to work in partnership with libraries should receive staff support, books and IT	73.7%	8.7%
Customers should be encouraged to use the self-service kiosks so that staff can concentrate on dealing with enquiries, delivering sessions for children and adults and outreach work	51.1%	27.0%
Library services do not have to be delivered from the current library building if a better property solution exists	37.8%	36.2%
Small one-off grants that enable the community to work in partnership should be made available for service proposals in Tier 4	49.3%	16.2%

Library services do not have to be delivered from the current library building if a better property solution exists

Within the consultation it has been proposed that Aston Library and Sutton Coldfield Libraries will close. Under the model Sutton Coldfield library which is the most expensive site in the city being 2.5 times more expensive than the next most expensive site, with investment being made to increase opening hours at Mere Green. Aston Library is 0.7 miles from Birchfield Library these are the two closest libraries in the city. Following the consultation feedback it is

now proposed that Kents Moat Library is closed as the area is due to be redeveloped. This would allow the budget allocated for Kents Moat Library to be redirected to enhance the service offer at Glebe Farm Library. Following support from Sutton Town Council resources have been allocated to temporarily keep Sutton Coldfield Library open for 35 hours per week whilst a further solution for a library service in Sutton Coldfield is explored.

Response by District	Ladywood	Sutton Coldfield	Yardley	All respondents
Agree total	45.2%	44.4%	27.3%	37.9%
Disagree total	27.4%	31.9%	51.5%	36.5%
Neither agree nor disagree	17.7%	20.4%	17.2%	20.8%
Don't know	9.7%	3.3%	4.0%	4.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The response rates from citizens living in Ladywood where Aston Library is situated and Sutton Coldfield where Sutton Coldfield town centre library is located are 45.2% and 44.4% in agreement with the library service been delivered from an alternative location if a better property solution exists. This is higher than the 37.9% all respondents agree rate.

Question 18 To what extent will the proposed opening hours for your most visited library, affect your ability to use the library service?

Q18. Extent the proposed opening times affects ability to use library service	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
A great deal	780	43.7%
A little	544	30.5%
Don't know	220	12.3%
Not at all	241	13.5%
Total respondents	1,785	100.0%

No response

162

Q18. Extent the proposed opening times affects ability to use library service

Response by Age	Under 18	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+	All respondents
A great deal	57.1%	50.5%	51.3%	41.0%	34.8%	43.7%
A little	23.8%	23.6%	27.2%	30.5%	38.4%	30.9%
Not at all	0.0%	9.3%	8.4%	13.6%	20.4%	13.5%
Don't know	19.0%	16.5%	13.1%	14.9%	6.4%	11.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Gender	Female	Male	All respondents
A great deal	43.5%	40.7%	43.7%
A little	31.2%	33.3%	30.9%
Not at all	12.6%	15.5%	13.5%
Don't know	12.6%	10.6%	11.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Sexual Orientation	Bisexual	Gay or Lesbian	Heterosexual or Straight	Other	All respondents
A great deal	46.2%	55.0%	41.0%	23.1%	43.7%
A little	42.3%	15.0%	32.7%	38.5%	30.9%
Not at all	7.7%	15.0%	14.5%	15.4%	13.5%
Don't know	3.8%	15.0%	11.8%	23.1%	11.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other	White	All respondents
A great deal	56.7%	61.2%	43.6%	50.0%	40.2%	43.7%
A little	17.3%	24.5%	25.6%	33.3%	34.0%	30.9%
Not at all	12.5%	4.1%	12.8%	0.0%	14.1%	13.5%
Don't know	13.5%	10.2%	17.9%	16.7%	11.6%	11.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by physical/mental health condition or illness	No	Yes	All respondents
A great deal	42.9%	45.1%	43.7%
A little	31.5%	31.2%	30.9%
Not at all	13.8%	10.7%	13.5%
Don't know	11.8%	13.0%	11.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by District	Ladywood	Sutton Coldfield	All respondents
A great deal	48.5%	59.9%	43.7%
A little	24.2%	26.5%	30.9%
Not at all	10.6%	7.8%	13.5%
Don't know	16.7%	5.8%	11.8%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In areas where a library closure is proposed a higher number of respondents 48.5% in Ladywood district and 59.9% in Sutton Coldfield district indicated that their ability to use the library service would be affected a great deal. Overall this was higher than the overall all respondents rate of 43.7%. 57.1% of under 18's (although the under 18 participant rate on the full survey is very small at 1%)indicated that the proposed changes to opening hours would affect them a great deal. 45.1% of citizens declaring a disability expressed that changes to the opening hours would affect them a great deal. The majority of respondents in each protected characteristic group said it would affect their ability to use the library service a great deal.

Sutton Library's closure has much opposition:

This was the most frequently mentioned library in the consultation (18% of respondents mentioned it, with 15% explicitly against closure). This is a popular library, regarded as centrally located and easily accessible by its proponents.

There was concern over Boldmere and Walmley having hours reduced when Sutton Library's being closed; instead, respondents felt their hours should be increased. Mere Green was often mentioned negatively, in terms of accessibility compared to Sutton Coldfield.

Question 20 In order to maximise the number of libraries remaining open in Birmingham we are proposing to introduce a charge of £1.00 to reserve items. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal.

Q20. Agreement to £1 reservations charge	No. of respondents	% of total respondents
Total Agree	734	39.3%
Total Disagree	841	45.0%

No response

80

Q20. Agreement to £1 reservation charge

Response by Age	Under 18	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+	All respondents
Agree total	22.7%	32.8%	33.8%	38.6%	48.5%	39.4%
Disagree total	63.6%	51.6%	49.3%	48.4%	36.3%	45.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	13.6%	12.5%	15.5%	11.8%	13.4%	13.7%
Don't know	0.0%	3.1%	1.4%	1.2%	1.7%	1.6%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Gender	Female	Male	All respondents
Agree total	39.3%	42.7%	39.4%
Disagree total	46.1%	41.6%	45.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	12.7%	14.4%	13.7%
Don't know	1.9%	1.3%	1.6%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Sexual Orientation	Bisexual	Gay or Lesbian	Heterosexual or Straight	Other	All respondents
Agree total	37.0%	55.0%	41.6%	23.1%	39.4%
Disagree total	59.3%	40.0%	43.6%	76.9%	45.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	3.7%	5.0%	13.9%	0.0%	13.7%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.6%

Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Response by Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other	White	All respondents
Agree total	37.0%	31.4%	52.6%	42.9%	41.3%	39.4%
Disagree total	51.9%	51.0%	39.5%	42.9%	44.0%	45.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	10.2%	15.7%	7.9%	14.3%	13.2%	13.7%
Don't know	0.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Response by physical/mental health condition or illness	No	Yes	All respondents			
Agree total	41.7%	35.5%	39.4%			
Disagree total	43.4%	49.5%	45.3%			
Neither agree nor disagree	13.5%	14.2%	13.7%			
Don't know	1.4%	0.7%	1.6%			
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

63.6% of under 18 year olds disagree with charging £1 for reserving books. Although 48.5% of over 65 year olds agree with the proposal. 42.7% of men agree with charging £1 compared to 39.3% females. 52.6% of mixed race citizens agree with the proposal, 51.9% Asian citizens disagree and 49.5 % disabled citizens disagree with the charge.

Question 27 To what extent do you or agree or disagree that the tiered proposals will protect a future for Birmingham's Community Library Service?

Response by Age	Under 18	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+	All respondents
Agree total	31.8%	22.7%	18.4%	22.3%	31.7%	24.2%
Disagree total	40.9%	45.3%	52.1%	42.5%	33.1%	43.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	13.6%	16.6%	17.9%	21.3%	21.7%	19.6%
Don't know	13.6%	15.5%	11.6%	14.0%	13.5%	13.1%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Gender	Female	Male	All respondents
Agree total	23.2%	27.1%	24.2%
Disagree total	40.8%	44.7%	43.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	21.2%	17.6%	19.6%
Don't know	14.8%	10.7%	13.1%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Sexual Orientation	Bisexual	Gay or Lesbian	Heterosexual or Straight	Other	All respondents
Agree total	23.1%	30.0%	24.3%	16.7%	24.2%
Disagree total	50.0%	50.0%	40.7%	58.3%	43.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	19.2%	5.0%	21.3%	8.3%	19.6%
Don't know	7.7%	15.0%	13.8%	16.7%	13.1%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other	White	All respondents
Agree total	25.2%	36.5%	28.2%	42.9%	24.6%	24.2%
Disagree total	45.6%	28.8%	46.2%	42.9%	41.7%	43.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	14.6%	23.1%	12.8%	14.3%	20.7%	19.6%
Don't know	14.6%	11.5%	12.8%		13.0%	13.1%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Response by physical/mental health condition or illness	No	Yes	All respondents
Agree total	25.5%	22.9%	24.2%
Disagree total	41.1%	47.8%	43.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	20.7%	15.3%	19.6%
Don't know	12.8%	14.1%	13.1%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Overall the proposal 43.2% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to protect the future of the Library service although 24.2% of all respondents agree with the proposal and 19.6% neither agree nor disagree and 13.1% don't know. Across the protected characteristics 43.2% of respondents disagreed that the overall proposal will protect the community library service.

Open comments from the consultation questionnaire

The proposals, and further cuts and closures in the future, will impact certain people and vulnerable groups in particular.

Children and young persons

Libraries are essential for providing free books and resources for children, especially for those who do not have access to these resources at home.

'How do children whose parents are short of cash access books, the internet, homework help and reading groups?'

In particular, there is anxiety over losing the *educational* function of library services, which will affect children in particular. Libraries play an important role in education, by encouraging children to read from a young age, by providing a space for children to complete their homework, and by holding school visits where staff can engage with school children. Thus, there is a concern that future generations are going to miss out without a substantial library service which encourages learning and reading from a young age.

Deprived Groups

Many argue that the council are undermining their role in providing a substantial service which is *equally* accessible to all. Many respondents feel that the tiers are divisive, by providing an uneven and inconsistent service which will leave the most deprived members of the community without access to vital resources.

'I fear that people will lose their jobs, and those who live in the more deprived areas of the city who need access to library services the most will be at a disadvantage, especially the young and the elderly.'

In particular, the proposal to implement a £1 reservation charge will discourage library users from accessing books.

'Whilst I could afford to pay a pound for reservations, not everyone can and this proposal will disproportionately affect those who are less well off'

Overwhelming opposition to community library cuts:

Cuts undermine the important role of library in the local communities in terms of social cohesion and education, with respondents concerned for vulnerable groups (children, elderly, deprived households) not having adequate access to a library. There were strong feelings that libraries should be invested in, rather than cut, and that the Council had a 'duty' to run a fully funded library service. There were only a very small handful of respondents who explicitly agreed with the cuts.

Concluding statement on Full Assessment

The proposed future operating model for community libraries which we have consulted on has the potential to impact negatively on citizens with protected characteristics in particular children, the elderly and disabled citizens. This impact may be more noticeable for children and elderly citizens as they have to travel further to access the library service, as hours are reduced across the service. However the consultation and engagement process has informed the process so that appropriate changes have been considered and implemented to mitigate any adverse impacts. Through this process it is acknowledged that Kents Moat and Glebe Farm libraries are in areas of high deprivation, the needs assessment has been adjusted so that deprivation has a higher weighting than the other criteria. Therefore following consultation it has been proposed to channel the resource allocated for Kents Moat Library which is due to close shortly due to redevelopment in the area, to Glebe Farm Library to enhance services for the community.

Sutton Coldfield Library will remain open temporarily as a tier 1 Library. Therefore this removes the impact on the elderly, the young and pregnant women of travelling further to access the library service. This will be reassessed as and when proposals around the future of Sutton Library are finalised. A reduced service will continue to be provided from Aston Library as it is acknowledged that children make good use of the local community library and that this would not be the case if the service closed and was provided from Birchfield Library which is not as accessible to the Aston community. Through the consultation it has been demonstrated that proximity to a community library is greatly valued, this is evident through the Be Heard consultation results and the children's survey. By maintaining provision in Sutton Coldfield and Aston Library all Birmingham residents will be within 1? mile of a library service.

There has been no evidence that the service wide reduction in opening hours of 155 hours (14%) has a disproportionate effect on any group with a protected characteristic. The model was generated from 11 criteria which included a weighted figure for deprivation

Need Analysis: Libraries ranked on key indicators

Community Library	Population of library catchment area	No. of children and young people 0-19 in library catchment area	No. of people aged 65+ in library catchment area	Number of libraries within 2 miles of library	Total items issued	PC usage (in hours)	Total library visitors	Cost per visit	Average IMD score for the library catchment area plus 50% additional weighting	Participation in events and educational sessions	Building Performance	Combined score
EDGBASTON												
Bartley Green	29	29	26	9	32	36	35	34	33	16	28	307
Harborne *	11	18	7	19	3	8	11	7	48	11	10	153
Quinton	14	14	10	9	7	19	18	12	37.5	19	20	179.5
ERDINGTON												
Castle Vale **												
Erdington	2	4	5	1	10	10	12	21	24	8	28	125
HALL GREEN												
Balsall Heath	15	9	24	9	12	7	7	11	3	6	20	123
Hall Green	7	5	6	19	4	29	6	8	43.5	3	20	150.5
Kings Heath	5	6	4	19	2	11	2	3	42	10	1	105
Sparkhill	4	3	16	19	5	9	4	1	21	7	28	117
HODGE HILL												
Shard End	26	23	23	19	27	15	19	2	13.5	5	1	173.5
Ward End	1	1	8	1	8	12	15	13	16.5	12	10	97.5
LADYWOOD												
Aston	21	15	28	19	29	22	27	22	4.5	29	1	217.5
Birchfield	20	16	29	19	22	14	24	33	18	26	1	222
Bloomsbury	33	31	36	9	37	37	37	36	1.5	32	38	327.5
Small Heath	3	2	15	9	9	6	3	10	6	25	9	97
Spring Hill	34	34	34	19	31	13	23	29	10.5	27	10	264.5
NORTHFIELD												
Frankley	35	35	33	1	35	33	25	18	15	9	20	259
Kings Norton***	18	20	14	1	15	28	17	5	36	18	1	173
Northfield	9	10	3	1	6	3	10	16	40.5	13	10	121.5
Weoley Castle	16	17	11	19	18	18	13	15	31.5	23	10	191.5
West Heath*****	30	32	27	0	24	17	28	20	39	34	38	289
PERRY BARR												
Handsworth	13	11	20	19	21	2	16	23	12	21	9	167
Kingstanding	24	21	19	9	23	25	21	25	25.5	37	10	239.5
Perry Common	28	27	30	9	25	16	22	26	22.5	15	20	240.5
Tower Hill	25	25	22	1	26	23	32	24	45	36	20	279
SELLY OAK												
Druids Heath*****	32	33	31	9	30	24	26	27	19.5	35	1	267.5
Selly Oak	36	37	35	19	33	31	34	37	49.5	31	35	377.5
Stirchley	22	24	21	19	19	27	30	30	46.5	20	28	286.5
Yardley Wood	17	19	18	19	16	26	9	17	28.5	4	20	193.5
SUTTON COLDFIELD												
Boldmere	19	22	9	9	20	35	31	32	52.5	28	10	267.5
Mere Green	8	13	2	1	1	21	14	9	55.5	22	10	156.5
Sutton Coldfield	6	8	1	9	11	3	5	31	51	17	20	162
Walmley	23	26	17	1	17	32	20	4	54	33	10	237
YARDLEY												
Acocks Green	10	7	12	19	14	5	8	6	27	1	1	110
Glebe Farm	31	30	32	19	34	33	29	19	7.5	24	28	286.5
Kents Moat	37	36	37	19	36	30	36	35	9	30	35	340
Sheldon	27	28	25	19	28	20	33	28	34.5	14	28	284.5
South Yardley	12	12	13	19	13	1	1	14	30	2	1	118

Ranking Description	Rank 1 = high number means more people within the local community so higher need	Rank 1 = high number means a higher proportion of C & YP in the area so higher need	Rank 1 = high number means a higher proportion of older people in the area so higher need	Rank 1 = low number means fewer alternative libraries in the vicinity so higher need	Rank 1 = high number of items borrowed from the library	Rank 1= high number of hours PC usage means higher need	Rank 1 = high number of library visitors means higher viability	Rank 1 = low cost means higher viability	Rank 1 = highest level of deprivation	Rank 1 = high volume of participation in sessions means higher need	Rank 1 = low score means that building has had high level of refurbishment/new build so higher viability as less work required	Low ranking number = increased viability/need. High ranking number = lower level of need viability
---------------------	--	---	---	--	---	---	---	--	---------------------------------------	---	--	--

Harborne* closed for 5 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 weeks as per model.

Castle Vale** no longer run by BCC therefore data not included

Kings Norton*** closed for 14 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week model

Druids Heath **** closed for 2 week during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week model

West Heath***** data from 2012/13 the last full year that West Heath was open

Methodology

Each library has been ranked (out of 37 community libraries) in order on a range of indicators - some ranking highest to lowest and others from lowest to highest depending on the viability need criteria. The needs analysis captures data from a variety of sources to reflect a sources to reflect the criteria around need/viability.

* Demographic data: resident population, proportion of children and young people 0-19 living in the catchment area of the library (see Library Catchment profiles for further detail).

*Indices of multiple deprivation

* Library performance data: visits, active users, PC usage, participation in events and learning activities

* Library financial data: cost per visit (calculation based on the out turn budget figure for each site divided by the number of visits)

*Building quality rank dependent on level of investment received in the last 10 years and the level of investment needed in the next 10 years

A high ranking suggests there is a lower level of need/viability for a library based on a particulalr indicator. Where a catchment area has a high level of deprivation a library will have a low score because there is more need for its services. Libraries that have good performance in terms of visits, issues, IT usage, membership, attendance at events and activities will have low scores because there is evidence of viability and need through the uptake of services. Buildings that are costly to operate or require investment through refurbishment will have higher scores for this indicator.

All rankings have been combined to give an overall score, which indicates how well libraries are aligned to meeting the needs of the local community and library users, and the longer term viability of the building.

The table above shows the viability/need in relation to the current estate of 37 community libraries (excluding Castle Vale which is now managed by the Castle Vale Tenants and Residents Alliance).

Overall Viability/Need

Community Library	Combined score	Ranking 1 = highest need/viability
Small Heath	97	1
Ward End	97.5	2
Kings Heath	105	3
Acocks Green	110	4
Sparkhill	117	5
South Yardley	118	6
Northfield	121.5	7
Balsall Heath	123	8
Erdington	125	9
Hall Green	150.5	10
Harborne	153	11
Mere Green	156.5	12
Sutton Coldfield	162	13
Handsworth	167	14
Kings Norton	173	15
Shard End	173.5	16
Quinton	179.5	17
Weoley Castle	191.5	18
Yardley Wood	193.5	19
Aston	217.5	20
Birchfield	222	21
Walmley	237	22
Kingstanding	239.5	23
Perry Common	240.5	24
Frankley	259	25
Spring Hill	264.5	26
Boldmere	267.5	27=
Druids Heath	267.5	27=
Tower Hill	279	29
Sheldon	284.5	30
Glebe Farm	286.5	31=
Stirchley	286.5	31=
West Heath	289	33
Bartley Green	307	34
Bloomsbury	327.5	35
Kents Moat	340	36
Selly Oak	377.5	37

Birmingham Community Libraries Key Performance Information - 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016

Community Library	Weekly opening Hours 2015/16	Annual opening hours in 2015/16 (x50 weeks)	Final Budget 2015/16	Budget 2015/16 (outturn figures)	Registered Users	Total issues 2015/16	Issues per hour 2015/16	Cost per issue 2015/16	Total visits 2015/16	Visits per hour 2015/16	Cost per visit 2015/16	Total PN hours 2015/16	PN sessions per hour 2015/16	Cost per PN session 2015/16	Total attendance at activities 2015/16	Children & young people aged 0-19 in catchment area	People aged 65+ in catchment area	Population catchment area	Average Index of Multiple Deprivation Score
EDGBASTON																			
Bartley Green	26	1300	£96,069	£64,843	4738	15446	11.88	£4.20	9650	7.42	£6.72	1342	1.03	£48.32	3797	2810	1864	10860	35.99
Harborne*	40	2000	£137,059	£175,164	20811	87623	43.81	£2.00	84333	42.17	£2.08	13906	6.95	£12.60	4875	6007	4805	28766	17.58
Quinton	39	2000	£162,266	£147,690	16363	73122	36.56	£2.02	62750	31.38	£2.35	9034	4.52	£16.35	3308	6928	4080		31.81
TOTAL	105	5300	£395,394	£387,697	41912	167429	31.59	£2.32	148300	27.98	£2.61	22892	4.32	£16.94	11,980	15,745	10,749	39626	
ERDINGTON																			
Castle Vale **	28	0	£0	£0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	£0.00	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	0	0	45.43
Erdington	40	2000	£296,122	£266,375	31549	61625	30.81	£4.32	83700	41.85	£3.18	13074	6.54	£20.37	6625	12552	6268	47631	42.38
TOTAL	68	2000	£296,122	£266,375	31549	74517	37.26	£3.57	83700	41.85	£3.18	13074	6.54	£20.37	6625	12552	6268	47631	
HALL GREEN																			
Balsall Heath	40	2000	£186,892	£221,711	16535	59113	29.56	£3.75	98900	49.45	£2.24	15064	7.53	£14.72	9401	8733	2137	24834	60.38
Hall Green	40	2000	£207,255	£211,646	17418	87180	43.59	£2.43	99250	49.63	£2.13	5,526	2.76	£38.30	12,346	10656	5444	36336	24.52
Kings Heath	40	2000	£160,408	£205,992	28215	94736	47.37	£2.17	109200	54.60	£1.89	12850	6.43	£16.03	4902	10527	6357	42710	25.85
Sparkhill	40	2000	£186,839	£137,384	27589	73963	36.98	£1.86	105000	52.50	£1.31	13236	6.62	£10.38	9282	15882	3481	43460	46.57
TOTAL	160	8000	£741,394	£776,733	89757	314992	39.37	£2.47	412350	51.54	£1.88	46676	5.83	£16.64	35931	45798	17419	147340	
HODGE HILL																			
Shard End	40	2000	£146,000	£87,942	11545	23715	11.86	£3.71	60550	30.28	£1.45	10279	5.14	£8.56	10014	3961	2238	13962	50.04
Ward End	35	1750	£258,443	£177,697	30376	67209	38.41	£2.64	75450	43.11	£2.36	11159	6.38	£15.92	4645	20105	4426	51301	49.43
TOTAL	75	3750	£404,443	£265,639	41921	90924	24.25	£2.92	136000	36.27	£1.95	21438	5.72	£12.39	14659	24066	6664	65263	
LADYWOOD																			
Aston	23	1150	£0	£91,081	16389	22449	19.52	£4.06	27700	24.09	£3.29	4582	3.98	£19.88	1788	6400	1493	17314	56.21
Birchfield	29	1450	£234,053	£184,144	11919	29278	20.19	£6.29	30720	21.19	£5.99	7610	5.25	£24.20	2387	6364	1460	18458	48.63
Bloomsbury	26	1300	£42,521	£45,277	5792	4436	3.41	£10.21	6550	5.04	£6.91	0	0.00	#DIV/0!	1417	2656	520	6739	61.82
Small Heath	40	2000	£186,197	£231,991	31506	65874	32.94	£3.52	107350	53.68	£2.16	15138	7.57	£15.33	2447	18405	3518	45809	53.58
Spring Hill	26	1300	£158,851	£167,069	8308	16760	12.89	£9.97	31800	24.46	£5.25	6912	5.32	£24.17	2269	1914	623	6580	51.06
TOTAL	144	7200	£621,622	£719,562	73914	138797	19.28	£5.18	204120	28.35	£3.53	34242	4.76	£21.01	10308	35739	7614	94900	
NORTHFIELD																			
Frankley	33.5	1675	£81,548	£90,367	6185	8369	5.00	£10.80	30450	18.18	£2.97	2908	1.74	£31.08	6176	1601	790	5436	49.71
Kings Norton***	33	1650	£71,675	£137,606	14108	50462	30.58	£2.73	69722	42.26	£1.97	4623	2.80	£29.77	3578	5482	3556	20903	34.86
Northfield	39	1950	£178,956	£232,900	27683	73135	37.51	£3.18	90050	46.18	£2.59	17393	8.92	£13.39	4,600	8383	6439	33885	28.02
Weoley Castle	40	2000	£161,433	£202,495	16220	41138	20.57	£4.92	79750	39.88	£2.54	9133	4.57	£22.17	2846	6102	3914	22963	36.28
West Heath****	26	1300	£84,941	£84,902	6265	27927	21.48	£3.04	27150	20.88	£3.13	6019	4.63	£14.11	1054	2571	1784	10043	30.82
TOTAL	171.5	8575	£564,605	£673,596	70461	158975	18.54	£4.24	250450	29.21	£2.69	36854	4.30	£18.28	18254	24139	16483	93230	
PERRY BARR																			
Handsworth	31	1550	£226,144	£244,082	26198	34173	22.05	£7.14	71200	45.94	£3.43	18429	11.89	£13.24	3057	8317	2347	25838	50.64
Kingsstanding	26	1300	£92,757	£126,813	16685	29076	22.37	£4.36	35850	27.58	£3.54	4590	3.53	£27.63	347	4782	2429	16441	41.88
Perry Common	27	1350	£135,666	£123,670	11590	27486	20.36	£4.50	32350	23.96	£3.82	6635	4.91	£18.64	4279	3503	1414	10896	45.28
Tower Hill	24	1200	£80,157	£80,764	12391	26518	22.10	£3.05	22950	19.13	£3.52	4473	3.73	£18.06	527	3812	2267	14270	22.34
TOTAL	108	5400	£534,724	£575,327	66864	117253	21.71	£4.91	162350	30.06	£3.54	34127	6.32	£16.86	8210	20414	8457	67445	
SELLY OAK																			
Druids Heath*****	24	1200	£116,960	£130,022	8851	19935	16.61	£6.52	30208	25.17	£4.30	4254	3.55	£30.56	1030	2050	1250	7531	47.19
Selly Oak	20	1000	£94,550	£100,322	9303	14680	14.68	£6.83	13100	13.10	£7.66	2391	2.39	£41.96	1422	640	544	3444	16.65
Stirchley	26	1300	£130,283	£134,939	9401	39825	30.63	£3.39	24750	19.04	£5.45	3964	3.05	£34.04	3177	3907	2309	16735	22.06
Yardley Wood	34	1700	£234,476	£247,316	12182	48330	28.43	£5.12	93950	55.26	£2.63	5717	3.36	£43.26	12177	5834	3272	20905	38.47
TOTAL	104	5200	£576,269	£612,599	39737	121973	23.46	£5.02	160800	30.92	£3.81	16153	3.11	£37.92	17806	12431	7375	48615	
SUTTON COLDFIELD																			
Boldmere	26	1300	£93,194	£132,402	8976	34561	26.59	£3.83	23400	18.00	£5.66	2123	1.63	£62.37	1927	4120	4255	19058	11.83
Mere Green	35	1750	£113,598	£183,645	21306	122464	69.98	£1.50	77650	44.37	£2.37	7244	4.14	£25.35	2936	8043	8544	35226	8.63
Sutton Coldfield	40	2000	£527,027	£575,089	29625	59225	29.61	£9.71	102750	51.38	£5.60	17843	8.92	£32.23	3751	8849	8596	39721	12.41
Walmley	26	1300	£38,099	£78,474	8358	47436	36.49	£1.65	45550	35.04	£1.72	2670	2.05	£29.39	1222	3644	3425	16554	9.25
TOTAL	127	6350	£771,918	£957,585	68265	263686	41.53	£3.63	245200	38.61	£3.91	29880	4.71	£32.05	9836	24656	24820	110559	
YARDLEY																			
Acocks Green	40	2000	£186,209	£190,916	31199	51520	25.76	£3.71	94400	47.20	£2.02	17044	8.52	£11.20	19071	9377	3736	31171	41.54
Glebe Farm	26	1300	£79,016	£83,863	7779	12409	9.55	£6.76	27100	20.85	£3.09	2267	1.74	£36.99	2539	2773	905	8137	53.08
Kents Moat	26	1300	£75,182	£54,173	6763	7607	5.85	£7.12	8000	6.15	£6.77	3182	2.45	£17.02	1448	1134	387	3216	52.52
Sheldon	26	1300	£134,196	£113,895	11012	22613	17.39	£5.04	22700	17.46	£5.02	5461	4.20	£20.86	4599	2899	2065	11309	35.05
South Yardley	40	2000	£210,538	£263,110	19140	54359	27.18	£4.84	109300	54.65	£2.41	24353	12.18	£10.80	14505	8163	3591	27126	36.42
TOTAL	158	7900	£685,141	£705,957	75893	148508	18.80	£4.75	261500	33.10	£2.70	52307	6.62	£13.50	42162	24346	10684	80959	
Citywide total		59675	£5,641,991	£6,004,879	600273	1597054		#DIV/0!	2064770		£161.33	309632		£19.39	172204				

Harborne* closed for 5 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 weeks as per model.

Castle Vale** no longer run by BCC therefore data not included

Kings Norton*** closed for 14 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week model

Druids Heath ***** closed for 2 weeks during 15/16 therefore data apportioned to represent 50 week model

West Heath***** data from 2012/13 the last full year that West Heath was open

under budget

over budget

Ranked by Total issues

Community Library	No. of issues 2015/16	Ranked 1 = most items borrowed
Mere Green	122464	1
Kings Heath	94736	2
Harborne	87623	3
Hall Green	87180	4
Sparkhill	73963	5
Northfield	73135	6
Quinton	73122	7
Ward End	67209	8
Small Heath	65874	9
Erdington	61625	10
Sutton Coldfield	59225	11
Balsall Heath	59113	12
South Yardley	54359	13
Acocks Green	51520	14
Kings Norton	50462	15
Yardley Wood	48330	16
Walmley	47436	17
Weoley Castle	41138	18
Stirchley	39825	19
Boldmere	34561	20
Handsworth	34173	21
Birchfield	29278	22
Kingstanding	29076	23
West Heath	27927	24
Perry Common	27486	25
Tower Hill	26518	26
Shard End	23715	27
Sheldon	22613	28
Aston	22449	29
Druids Heath	19935	30
Spring Hill	16760	31
Bartley Green	15446	32
Selly Oak	14680	33
Glebe Farm	12409	34
Frankley	8369	35

Kents Moat	7607	36
Bloomsbury	4436	37

Ranked by issues per hour

Community Library	Issues per hour 2015/16	Ranked by issues per hour
Mere Green	69.98	1
Kings Heath	47.37	2
Harborne	43.81	3
Hall Green	43.59	4
Ward End	38.41	5
Northfield	37.51	6
Sparkhill	36.98	7
Quinton	36.56	8
Walmley	36.49	9
Small Heath	32.94	10
Erdington	30.81	11
Stirchley	30.63	12
Kings Norton	30.58	13
Sutton Coldfield	29.61	14
Balsall Heath	29.56	15
Yardley Wood	28.43	16
South Yardley	27.18	17
Boldmere	26.59	18
Acocks Green**	25.76	19
Kingstanding	22.37	20
Tower Hill	22.10	21
Handsworth	22.05	22
West Heath	21.48	23
Weoley Castle	20.57	24
Perry Common	20.36	25
Birchfield	20.19	26
Aston	19.52	27
Sheldon	17.39	28
Druids Heath	16.61	29
Selly Oak	14.68	30
Spring Hill	12.89	31
Bartley Green	11.88	32
Shard End	11.86	33
Glebe Farm	9.55	34
Kents Moat	5.85	35
Frankley	5.00	36
Bloomsbury	3.41	37

Ranked by cost per issue (cheapest first)

Community Library	Cost per issue 2015/16	Ranked by cost per issues
Mere Green	£1.36	1
Walmley	£1.65	2
Sparkhill	£1.86	3
Harborne	£2.00	4
Quinton	£2.02	5
Kings Heath	£2.17	6
Hall Green	£2.43	7
Ward End	£2.64	8
Kings Norton	£2.73	9
West Heath	£3.04	10
Tower Hill	£3.05	11
Northfield	£3.18	12
Stirchley	£3.39	13
Small Heath	£3.52	14
Acocks Green	£3.71	15
Shard End	£3.71	15
Balsall Heath	£3.75	17
Boldmere	£3.83	18
Aston	£4.06	19
Bartley Green	£4.20	20
Erdington	£4.32	21
Kingstanding	£4.36	22
Perry Common	£4.50	23
South Yardley	£4.84	24
Weoley Castle	£4.92	25
Sheldon	£5.04	26
Yardley Wood	£5.12	27
Birchfield	£6.29	28
Druids Heath	£6.52	29
Glebe Farm	£6.76	30
Selly Oak	£6.83	31
Kents Moat	£7.12	32
Handsworth	£7.14	33
Sutton Coldfield	£9.79	34
Spring Hill	£9.97	35
Bloomsbury	£10.21	36
Frankley	£10.80	37

Ranked by total visits

Community Library	Total visits 2015/16	Ranking
South Yardley	109300	1
Kings Heath	109200	2
Small Heath	107350	3
Sparkhill	105000	4
Sutton Coldfield	102750	5
Hall Green	99250	6
Balsall Heath	98900	7
Acocks Green	94400	8
Yardley Wood	93950	9
Northfield	90050	10
Harborne	84333	11
Erdington	83700	12
Weoley Castle	79750	13
Mere Green	77650	14
Ward End	75450	15
Handsworth	71200	16
Kings Norton	69722	17
Quinton	62750	18
Shard End	60550	19
Walmley	45550	20
Kingstanding	35850	21
Perry Common	32350	22
Spring Hill	31800	23
Birchfield	30720	24
Frankley	30450	25
Druids Heath	30208	26
Aston	27700	27
West Heath	27150	28
Glebe Farm	27100	29
Stirchley	24750	30
Boldmere	23400	31
Tower Hill	22950	32
Sheldon	22700	33
Selly Oak	13100	34
Bartley Green	9650	35
Kents Moat	8000	36
Bloomsbury	6550	37

Community Library	Visits per hour 2015/16	Ranked by visits per hour 2013/14
Yardley Wood	55.26	1
South Yardley	54.65	2
Kings Heath	54.60	3
Small Heath	53.68	4
Sparkhill	52.50	5
Sutton Coldfield*	51.38	6
Hall Green	49.63	7
Balsall Heath	49.45	8
Acocks Green	47.20	9
Northfield	46.18	10
Handsworth	45.94	11
Mere Green	44.37	12
Ward End	43.11	13
Kings Norton	42.26	14
Harborne	42.17	15
Erdington	41.85	16
Weoley Castle	39.88	17
Walmley	35.04	18
Quinton	31.38	19
Shard End	30.28	20
Kingstanding	27.58	21
Druids Heath	25.17	22
Spring Hill	24.46	23
Aston	24.09	24
Perry Common	23.96	25
Birchfield	21.19	26
West Heath	20.88	27
Glebe Farm	20.85	28
Tower Hill	19.13	29
Stirchley	19.04	30
Frankley	18.18	31
Boldmere	18.00	32
Sheldon	17.46	33
Selly Oak	13.10	34
Bartley Green	7.42	35
Kents Moat	6.15	36

Bloomsbury	5.04	37

Ranked by Cost per Visit (cheapest first)

Community Library	Cost per visit 2015/16	Ranked by cost per visit
Sparkhill	£1.31	1
Shard End	£1.45	2
Kings Heath	£1.89	3
Walmley	£1.72	4
Kings Norton	£1.97	5
Acocks Green	£2.02	6
Harborne	£2.08	7
Hall Green	£2.13	8
Mere Green	£2.15	9
Small Heath	£2.16	10
Balsall Heath	£2.24	11
Quinton	£2.35	12
Ward End	£2.36	13
South Yardley	£2.41	14
Weoley Castle	£2.54	15
Northfield	£2.59	16
Yardley Wood	£2.63	17
Frankley	£2.97	18
Glebe Farm	£3.09	19
West Heath	£3.13	20
Erdington	£3.18	21
Aston	£3.29	22
Handsworth	£3.43	23
Tower Hill	£3.52	24
Kingstanding	£3.54	25
Perry Common	£3.82	26
Druids Heath	£4.30	27
Sheldon	£5.02	28
Spring Hill	£5.25	29
Stirchley	£5.45	30
Sutton Coldfield	£5.64	31
Boldmere	£5.66	32
Birchfield	£5.99	33
Bartley Green	£6.72	34
Kents Moat	£6.77	35
Bloomsbury	£6.91	36
Selly Oak	£7.66	37

Ranked by total PN usage

Community Library	Total PN sessions 2015/16	Ranked by PN Usage
South Yardley	24353	1
Handsworth	18429	2
Sutton Coldfield	17843	3
Northfield	17393	4
Acocks Green	17044	5
Small Heath	15138	6
Balsall Heath	15064	7
Harborne	13906	8
Sparkhill	13236	9
Erdington	13074	10
Kings Heath	12850	11
Weoley Castle	11616	12
Ward End	11159	13
Shard End	10279	14
Quinton	9034	15
Birchfield	7610	16
Mere Green	7244	17
Spring Hill	6912	18
Perry Common	6635	19
West Heath	6019	20
Yardley Wood	5717	21
Hall Green	5526	22
Sheldon	5461	23
Kings Norton	4623	24
Kingstanding	4590	25
Aston	4582	26
Tower Hill	4473	27
Druids Heath	4254	28
Stirchley	3964	29
Kents Moat	3182	30
Frankley	2908	31
Walmley	2670	32
Selly Oak	2391	33
Glebe Farm	2267	34
Boldmere	2123	35
Bartley Green	1342	36
Bloomsbury	0	37

Ranked by PN sessions per hour

Community Library	PN Sessions per hour	Ranked by PN usage per hour
South Yardley	12.18	1
Handsworth	11.89	2
Northfield	8.92	3
Sutton Coldfield*	8.92	3
Acocks Green	8.52	5
Small Heath	7.57	6
Balsall Heath	7.53	7
Harborne	6.95	8
Sparkhill	6.62	9
Erdington	6.54	10
Kings Heath	6.43	11
Ward End	6.38	12
Spring Hill	5.32	13
Birchfield	5.25	14
Shard End	5.14	15
Perry Common	4.91	16
West Heath	4.63	17
Weoley Castle	4.57	18
Quinton	4.52	19
Sheldon	4.20	20
Mere Green	4.14	21
Aston	3.98	22
Tower Hill	3.73	23
Druids Heath	3.55	24
Kingstanding	3.53	25
Yardley Wood	3.36	26
Stirchley	3.05	27
Kings Norton	2.80	28
Hall Green	2.76	29
Kents Moat	2.45	30
Selly Oak	2.39	31
Walmley	2.05	32
Glebe Farm	1.74	33
Frankley	1.74	33
Boldmere	1.63	35
Bartley Green	1.03	36
Bloomsbury	0.00	37

Ranked by cost per PN session (cheapest first)


Community Library	Cost per PN session 2015/16	Ranked by cost per PN session
Shard End	£8.56	1
Sparkhill	£10.38	2
South Yardley	£10.80	3
Acocks Green	£11.20	4
Harborne	£12.60	5
Handsworth	£13.24	6
Northfield	£13.39	7
West Heath	£14.11	8
Balsall Heath	£14.72	9
Small Heath	£15.33	10
Ward End	£15.92	11
Kings Heath	£16.03	12
Quinton	£16.35	13
Kents Moat	£17.02	14
Tower Hill	£18.06	15
Perry Common	£18.64	16
Aston	£19.88	17
Erdington	£20.37	18
Sheldon	£20.86	19
Weoley Castle	£22.17	20
Mere Green	£23.04	21
Spring Hill	£24.17	22
Birchfield	£24.20	23
Kingstanding	£27.63	24
Walmley	£29.39	25
Kings Norton	£29.77	26
Druids Heath	£30.56	27
Frankley	£31.08	28
Sutton Coldfield	£32.50	29
Stirchley	£34.04	30
Glebe Farm	£36.99	31
Hall Green	£38.30	32
Selly Oak	£41.96	33
Yardley Wood	£43.26	34
Bartley Green	£48.34	35
Boldmere	£62.37	36
Bloomsbury	£0.00	37

Community Library	Total attendance at activities 2015/16	Ranked by attendance at events
Acocks Green	19071	1
South Yardley	14505	2
Hall Green	12346	3
Yardley Wood	12177	4
Shard End	10014	5
Balsall Heath	9401	6
Sparkhill	9282	7
Erdington	6625	8
Frankley	6176	9
Kings Heath	4902	10
Harborne	4875	11
Ward End	4645	12
Northfield	4600	13
Sheldon	4599	14
Perry Common	4279	15
Bartley Green	3797	16
Sutton Coldfield	3751	17
Kings Norton	3578	18
Quinton	3308	19
Stirchley	3177	20
Handsworth	3057	21
Mere Green	2936	22
Weoley Castle	2846	23
Glebe Farm	2539	24
Small Heath	2447	25
Birchfield	2387	26
Spring Hill	2269	27
Boldmere	1927	28
Aston	1788	29
Kents Moat	1448	30
Selly Oak	1422	31
Bloomsbury	1417	32
Walmley	1222	33
West Heath	1054	34
Druids Heath	1030	35
Tower Hill	527	36

Kingstanding	347	37

Ranked by total cost (Cheapest first)

Community Library	Budget 2015/16 (outturn figures)	Ranked by cost
Bloomsbury	£45,277	1
Kents Moat	£54,173	2
Bartley Green	£64,843	3
Walmley	£78,474	4
Tower Hill	£80,764	5
Glebe Farm	£83,863	6
West Heath	£84,902	7
Shard End	£87,942	8
Frankley	£90,367	9
Aston	£91,081	10
Selly Oak	£100,322	11
Sheldon	£113,895	12
Perry Common	£123,670	13
Kingstanding	£126,811	14
Druids Heath	£130,022	15
Boldmere	£132,402	16
Stirchley	£134,939	17
Sparkhill	£137,384	18
Kings Norton	£137,606	19
Quinton	£147,690	20
Mere Green	£166,865	21
Spring Hill	£167,069	22
Harborne	£175,164	23
Ward End	£177,697	24
Birchfield	£184,144	25
Acocks Green	£190,916	26
Weoley Castle	£202,495	27
Kings Heath	£205,992	28
Hall Green	£211,646	29
Balsall Heath	£221,711	30
Small Heath	£231,991	31
Northfield	£232,900	32
Handsworth	£244,082	33
Yardley Wood	£247,316	34
South Yardley	£263,110	35
Erdington	£266,375	36
Sutton Coldfield	£579,814	37



Community Library	Nearest Library	Distance in miles plotted walking with Google maps	Next nearest Library	Distance in miles	Number of libraries within a 2 mile radius
EDGBASTON					
Bartley Green	Weoley Castle	1.7	Quinton	2.3	1
Harborne	Quinton	1.6	Selly Oak	1.8	2
Quinton	Harborne	1.6	Bartley Green	2.3	1
ERDINGTON					
Erdington	Perry Common	2.1	Walmley	2.2	0
HALL GREEN					
Balsall Heath	Sparkhill	1.3	Small Heath	2	1
Hall Green	Yardley Wood	1.4	Acocks Green	1.5	2
Kings Heath	Stirchley	1.8	Sparkhill	1.8	2
Sparkhill	Balsall Heath	1.3	Small Heath	1.7	2
HODGE HILL					
Shard End	Glebe Farm	1.1	Kents Moat	1.7	2
Ward End	Bloomsbury	2	Glebe Farm	2.1	0
LADYWOOD					
Aston	Birchfield	0.7	Handsworth	1.7	2
Birchfield	Aston	0.7	Handsworth	1.4	2
Bloomsbury	Aston	1.3	Ward End	2	1
Small Heath	Sparkhill	1.7	Balsall Heath	2	1
Spring Hill	Library of Birmingham	0.8	Handsworth	1.5	2
NORTHFIELD					
Frankley	Northfield	2.5	Bartley Green	3	0
Kings Norton	Northfield	2	Druids Heath	2	0
Northfield	Kings Norton	2	Frankley	2.5	0
Weoley Castle	Bartley Green	1.7	Selly Oak	1.8	2
PERRY BARR					
Handsworth	Birchfield	1.4	Spring Hill	1.5	2
Kingstanding	Perry Common	1.4	Tower Hill	2.3	1
Perry Common	Kingstanding	1.4	Tower Hill	2	1
Tower Hill	Perry Common	2	Kingstanding	2.3	0
SELLY OAK					
Druids Heath	Yardley Wood	1.8	Kings Norton	2	1
Selly Oak	Stirchley	1.3	Weoley Castle	1.8	2
Stirchley	Selly Oak	1.3	Kings Heath	1.8	2
Yardley Wood	Hall Green	1.4	Druids Heath	1.8	2
SUTTON COLDFIELD					
Boldmere	Sutton Coldfield	1.5	Walmley	2.2	1
Mere Green	Sutton Coldfield	2	Boldmere	3.5	0
Sutton Coldfield	Boldmere	1.5	Walmley	2	1
Walmley	Sutton Coldfield	2	Boldmere	2.2	0
YARDLEY					
Acocks Green	South Yardley	1.2	Hall Green	1.5	2
Glebe Farm	Shard End	1.1	Kents Moat	1.3	2
Kents Moat	Glebe Farm	1.3	Sheldon	1.5	2
Sheldon	Kents Moat	1.5	South Yardley	1.7	2
South Yardley	Acocks Green	1.2	Sheldon	1.7	2

Distance in metres to the nearest public transport

Community Library	Distance in metres to the nearest bus stop	Distance in metres to the nearest train station	Number of bus stops in a 500m radius
EDGBASTON			
Bartley Green	20	5230	20
Harborne	20	2070	20
Quinton	20	4170	15
ERDINGTON			
Erdington	76	455	33
HALL GREEN			
Balsall Heath	12	1870	12
Hall Green	60	349	18
Kings Heath	10	3890	8
Sparkhill	50	1310	24
HODGE HILL			
Shard End	190	2250	18
Ward End	30	2450	10
LADYWOOD			
Aston	130	1390	16
Birchfield**	204	1140	10
Bloomsbury *****	74	830	28
Small Heath	70	850	16
Spring Hill	100	820	18
NORTHFIELD			
Frankley	137	3320	14
Kings Norton	60	860	12
Northfield	20	920	22
Weoley Castle	60	3010	23
PERRY BARR			
Handsworth	30	2230	23
Kingstanding	40	4320	21
Perry Common	20	2840	16
Tower Hill	60	1000	11
SELLY OAK			
Druids Heath	32	3570	13

Selly Oak	60	244	23
Stirchley	50	310	18
Yardley Wood	70	590	18
SUTTON COLDFIELD			
Boldmere	14	960	10
Mere Green	120	970	12
Sutton Coldfield	10	350	30
Walmley	120	2840	11
YARDLEY			
Acocks Green**	10	830	26
Glebe Farm	180	1340	17
Kents Moat	30	840	22
Sheldon	20	2830	18
South Yardley	10	1350	17

Ranked by distance to nearest bus stop

Community Library	Distance in metres to the nearest bus stop	Ranked by distance to nearest bus stop
Kings Heath	10	1
Sutton Coldfield	10	1
Acocks Green	10	1
South Yardley	10	1
Balsall Heath	12	5
Boldmere	14	6
Sheldon	20	7
Harborne	20	7
Quinton	20	7
Northfield	20	7
Bartley Green	20	7
Perry Common	20	7
Ward End	30	13
Kents Moat	30	13
Handsworth	30	13
Druids Heath	32	16
Kingstanding	40	17
Stirchley	50	18
Sparkhill	50	18
Tower Hill	60	20
Weoley Castle	60	20
Selly Oak	60	20
Kings Norton	60	20
Hall Green	60	20
Small Heath	70	25
Yardley Wood	70	25
Erdington	76	27
Spring Hill	100	28
Mere Green	120	29
Walmley	120	29
Aston	130	31
Frankley	137	32
Glebe Farm	180	33

Shard End	190	34
Birchfield	204	35

Community Library	Children & young people aged 0-19 in catchment area	Ranking 1 - highest number of C & YP in catchment area
Ward End	20105	1
Small Heath	18405	2
Sparkhill	15882	3
Erdington	12552	4
Hall Green	10656	5
Kings Heath	10527	6
Acocks Green	9377	7
Sutton Coldfield	8849	8
Balsall Heath	8733	9
Northfield	8383	10
Handsworth	8317	11
South Yardley	8163	12
Mere Green	8043	13
Quinton	6928	14
Aston	6400	15
Birchfield	6364	16
Weoley Castle	6102	17
Harborne	6007	18
Yardley Wood	5834	19
Kings Norton	5482	20
Kingstanding	4782	21
Boldmere	4120	22
Shard End	3961	23
Stirchley	3907	24
Tower Hill	3812	25
Walmley	3644	26
Perry Common	3503	27
Sheldon	2899	28
Bartley Green	2810	29
Glebe Farm	2773	30
Bloomsbury	2656	31

West Heath	2571	32
Druids Heath	2050	33
Spring Hill	1914	34
Frankley	1601	35
Kents Moat	1134	36
Selly Oak	640	37

Community Library	People aged 65+ in catchment area	Ranking 1 = largest number of 65+ in catchment area
Sutton Coldfield	8596	1
Mere Green	8544	2
Northfield	6439	3
Kings Heath	6357	4
Erdington	6268	5
Hall Green	5444	6
Harborne	4805	7
Ward End	4426	8
Boldmere	4255	9
Quinton	4080	10
Weoley Castle	3914	11
Acocks Green	3736	12
South Yardley	3591	13
Kings Norton	3556	14
Small Heath	3518	15
Sparkhill	3481	16
Walmley	3425	17
Yardley Wood	3272	18
Kingstanding	2429	19
Handsworth	2347	20
Stirchley	2309	21
Tower Hill	2267	22
Shard End	2238	23
Balsall Heath	2137	24
Sheldon	2065	25
Bartley Green	1864	26
West Heath	1784	27
Aston	1493	28
Birchfield	1460	29
Perry Common	1414	30
Druids Heath	1250	31
Glebe Farm	905	32

Frankley	790	33
Spring Hill	623	34
Selly Oak	544	35
Bloomsbury	520	36
Kents Moat	387	37

Community Library	Population catchment area	Ranking 1 = highest number of people
Ward End	51301	1
Erdington	47631	2
Small Heath	45809	3
Sparkhill	43460	4
Kings Heath	42710	5
Sutton Coldfield	39721	6
Hall Green	36336	7
Mere Green	35226	8
Northfield	33885	9
Acocks Green	31171	10
Harborne	28766	11
South Yardley	27126	12
Handsworth	25838	13
Quinton	25282	14
Balsall Heath	24834	15
Weoley Castle	22963	16
Yardley Wood	20905	17
Kings Norton	20903	18
Boldmere	19058	19
Birchfield	18458	20
Aston	17314	21
Stirchley	16735	22
Walmley	16554	23
Kingstanding	16441	24
Tower Hill	14270	25
Shard End	13962	26
Sheldon	11309	27
Perry Common	10896	28
Bartley Green	10860	29
West Heath	10043	30
Glebe Farm	8137	31
Druids Heath	7531	32
Bloomsbury	6739	33
Spring Hill	6580	34
Frankley	5436	35
Selly Oak	3444	36
Kents Moat	3216	37

Community Library	Average Index of Multiple Deprivation Score	Ranking 1 = High level of deprivation
Bloomsbury	61.82	1
Balsall Heath	60.38	2
Aston	56.21	3
Small Heath	53.58	4
Glebe Farm	53.08	5
Kents Moat	52.52	6
Spring Hill	51.06	7
Handsworth	50.64	8
Shard End	50.04	9
Frankley	49.71	10
Ward End	49.43	11
Birchfield	48.63	12
Druids Heath	47.19	13
Sparkhill	46.57	14
Perry Common	45.28	15
Erdington	42.38	16
Kingstanding	41.88	17
Acocks Green	41.54	18
Yardley Wood	38.47	19
South Yardley	36.42	20
Weoley Castle	36.28	21
Bartley Green	35.99	22
Sheldon	35.05	23
Kings Norton	34.86	24
Quinton	31.81	25
West Heath	30.82	26
Northfield	28.02	27
Kings Heath	25.85	28
Hall Green	24.52	29
Tower Hill	22.34	30
Stirchley	22.06	31
Harborne	17.58	32
Selly Oak	16.65	33
Sutton Coldfield	12.41	34
Boldmere	11.83	35

Walmley	9.25	36
Mere Green	8.63	37

Community Library	Building Condition	Ranking
Shard End	1	1
Aston	1	1
Birchfield	1	1
Kings Norton	1	1
Druids Heath	1	1
Acocks Green	1	1
South Yardley	1	1
Kings Heath	1	1
Small Heath	1	1
Harborne	2	10
Kingstanding	2	10
Ward End	2	10
Spring Hill	2	10
Northfield	2	10
Weoley Castle	2	10
Handsworth	2	10
Boldmere	2	10
Mere Green	2	10
Walmley	2	10
Tower Hill	3	20
Perry Common	3	20
Quinton	3	20
Hall Green	3	20
Sutton Coldfield	3	20
Yardley Wood	3	20
Frankley	3	20
Balsall Heath	3	20
Glebe Farm	4	28
Erdington	4	28
Stirchley	4	28
Sheldon	4	28
Bartley Green	4	28
Sparkhill	4	28
Kents Moat	5	34
Selly Oak	5	34
Bloomsbury	closed	36
West Heath	closed	36

- 1 -= excellent condition/refurbished in last 5 years
- 2 = good condition/refurbished in las vestment
- 3 = okay condition
- 4 = poor condition/needs investment
- 5 = very poor/needs significant investnment

Community Library	Number of libraries within a 2 mile radius	Ranked by nearest library
Erdington	0	1
Ward End	0	1
Frankley	0	1
Kings Norton	0	1
Northfield	0	1
Tower Hill	0	1
Mere Green	0	1
Walmley	0	1
Bartley Green	1	9
Quinton	1	9
Balsall Heath	1	9
Bloomsbury	1	9
Small Heath	1	9
Kingstanding	1	9
Perry Common	1	9
Druids Heath	1	9
Boldmere	1	9
Sutton Coldfield	1	9
Harborne	2	19
Birchfield	2	19
Spring Hill	2	19
Weoley Castle	2	19
Handsworth	2	19
Selly Oak	2	19
Stirchley	2	19
Yardley Wood	2	19
Acocks Green	2	19
Glebe Farm	2	19
Kents Moat	2	19
Sheldon	2	19
South Yardley	2	19
Hall Green	2	19
Kings Heath	2	19
Sparkhill	2	19
Shard End	2	19
Aston	2	19


Proposed Library Provision Across Birmingham

Appendix 6a

KEY:

Proposed Tier 2017

- LOB
- Tier 1
- Tier 2
- Tier 2/3
- Tier 3
- Possible Tier 4
- TBC
- Prison Library
- Mobile Library Stops (2016)
- 2 Mile Buffer
- District Boundaries
- City Boundary



Scale: 1:78,000 @ A3

Date: 03/02/2017

A-Z Street Map, if present, reproduced by permission of Geographers' A-Z Map Co.Ltd. Licence No. A1228.



P:\ArcGIS\Local Services\Proposed Library Provision Birmingham 2017.mxd



Individual Library and Catchment Area Profiles

Birmingham Community Libraries 2016

Version 4


Library and Catchment Area Profiles

The Profiles for each library were prepared using catchment area data to enable detailed analysis of the characteristics of each area. As libraries often draw their users from across ward boundaries, the catchment areas were created by including any Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where a defined percentage of the resident population (3%) used the library service in 2015/16.

Output Areas (OA) are created for Census Data, specifically for the output of census estimates. The OA is the lowest geographical level at which census estimates are provided. Lower and middle super output areas were designed to improve the reporting of small statistics and are built up from groups of output areas.

To create the catchment area definition we needed enough LSOAs to be generated to enable meaningful demographic data to be used. Each LSOA has an average of 1700 residents and 650 households. Measures of proximity (to give a reasonably compact shape) and social homogeneity (to encourage areas of similar social background) are also included.

The Profiles give detailed demographic information, economic activity, educational attainment as well as identifying the Index of Multiple Deprivation score (IMD). Local bus and rail stops are included, in addition individual library performance data collected from the library management system, Spydus.



Population: 1, 2 and 3 - Population in catchment area based on Mid-2014 Population Estimates, ONS


4 - Based on library members (can be a member of any library) who live in the library catchment area and have actively used that library during 2015/16

Library	Total Resident Population (1)	Resident Population age 0-19 (2)	Resident Population age 65+ (3)	Number of LSOAs in catchment (4)
Acocks Green Library	31,171	9,377	3,736	18
Aston Library	17,314	6,400	1,493	8
Balsall Heath Library	24,834	8,733	2,137	14
Bartley Green Library	10,850	2,810	1,864	7
Birchfield Library	18,458	6,364	1,460	10
Bloomsbury Library	6,739	2,656	520	3
Boldmere Library	19,058	4,120	4,255	12
Druids Heath Library	7,531	2,050	1,250	5
Erdington Library	47,631	12,552	6,268	28
Frankley Library	5,436	1,601	790	3
Glebe Farm Library	8,137	2,773	905	5
Hall Green Library	36,336	10,656	5,444	21
Handsworth Library	25,838	8,317	2,347	14
Harborne Library	28,766	6,007	4,805	17
Kents Moat Library	3,216	1,134	387	2
Kings Heath Library	42,710	10,527	6,357	26
Kings Norton Library	20,903	5,482	3,556	14
Kingstanding Library	16,441	4,782	2,429	11
Mere Green Library	35,226	8,043	8,544	21
Northfield Library	33,885	8,383	6,439	21
Perry Common Library	10,896	3,503	1,414	6
Quinton Library	25,282	6,928	4,080	16
Selly Oak Library	3,444	640	544	2
Shard End Library	13,962	3,961	2,238	8
Sheldon Library	11,309	2,899	2,065	7
Small Heath Library	45,809	18,405	3,518	24
South Yardley Library	27,126	8,163	3,591	16
Sparkhill Library	43,460	15,882	3,481	22
Spring Hill Library	6,580	1,914	623	4
Stirchley Library	16,735	3,907	2,309	11
Sutton Coldfield Library	39,721	8,849	8,596	25
Tower Hill Library	14,270	3,812	2,267	9
Walmley Library	16,554	3,644	3,425	11
Ward End Library	51,301	20,105	4,426	25
Weoley Castle Library	22,963	6,102	3,914	15
Yardley Wood Library	20,905	5,834	3,272	13


Public Transport: The stops and distance information has been supplied by Transport for West Midlands, as at 20th September 2016.

Library Name	Nearest Bus Stop Name	Nearest Bus Stop	Nearest Train Station	Nearest Train Stop	Bus Stops in a 500m Walking Distance	Bus Stops in a 500m Radius
Acocks Green	WESTLEY RD, Acocks Green Village	10 m	Spring Road	830 m	16	26
Aston	WITTON RD, Prestbury Road	130 m	Witton	1390 m	15	16
Balsall Heath	MOSELEY RD, Edward Road	12 m	Bordesley	1870 m	7	12
Bartley Green	ADAMS HILL, St Peters Church	20 m	University	5230 m	17	20
Birchfield	BIRCHFIELD RD, Heathfield Rd	204 m	Perry Barr	1140 m	9	10
Bloomsbury	BLOOMSBURY STREET, Oliver Street	74 m	Duddeston	830 m	16	28
Boldmere	BOLDMERE RD, Highbridge Rd	14 m	Wylde Green	960 m	10	10
Druids Heath	ALCESTER RD SOUTH, Manningford Rd	32 m	Yardley Wood	3570 m	11	13
Erdington	ORPHANAGE RD, Erdington Fire Station	76 m	Erdington	455 m	22	33
Frankley	NEW STREET, Holly Hill Rd	137 m	Longbridge	3320 m	13	14
Glebe Farm	AUDLEY RD, Glebe Farm Road	180 m	Lee Hall	1340 m	14	17
Hall Green	STRATFORD RD, South Birmingham College	60 m	Hall Green	349 m	15	18
Handsworth	SOHO Rd, Waverhill Rd	30 m	Jewellery Quarter	2230 m	16	23
Harborne	HIGH STREET, Harborne Junction	20 m	University	2070 m	17	20
Kents Moat	MEADWAY, Poolway Shopping Centre	30 m	Lea Hall	840 m	10	22
Kings Heath	KINGS HEATH HIGH STREET, Station Rd	10 m	Bournville	3890 m	8	8
Kings Norton	PERSHORE RD SOUTH, Wharf Road	60 m	Kings Norton	860 m	11	12
Kingstanding	KINGSTANDING RD, Kingstanding Circle	40 m	Chester Road	4320 m	19	21
Mere Green	MERE GREEN RD, Sainsburys	120 m	Four Oaks	970 m	9	12
Northfield	CHURCH RD, Telephone Exchange	20 m	Northfield	920 m	17	22
Perry Common	HAWTHORN RD, Infant School/Crossways	20 m	Erdington	2840 m	16	16
Quinton	RIDGACRE RD, Quinton Library	20 m	University	4170 m	13	15
Selly Oak	BRISTOL RD, Selly Oak Canal Bridge/Station	60 m	Selly Oak	244 m	17	23
Shard End	SHARD END CRESCENT, Heath Way	190 m	Lee Hall	2250 m	11	18
Sheldon	BRAYS ROAD, Horrell Road	20 m	Marston Green	2830 m	12	18
Small Heath	MUNTZ STREET, Baker Street	70 m	Small Heath	850 m	8	16
South Yardley	YARDLEY RD, Coventry Road/Swan Island SJ	10 m	Acocks Green	1350 m	17	17
Sparkhill	STRATFORD RD, Witton Road	50 m	Small Heath	1310 m	19	24
Spring Hill	SUMMER HILL RD, Spring Hill Island	100 m	Jewellery Quarter	820 m	18	18
Stirchley	BOND ST, Bournville Lane	50 m	Bournville	310 m	16	18
Sutton Coldfield	LOWER PARADE, Sutton Coldfield, SD	10 m	Sutton Coldfield	350 m	27	30
Tower Hill	WALSALL RD, Beeches Rd	60 m	Hamstead	1000 m	9	11
Walmley	WALMLEY RD, Fox Hollies Road	120 m	Wylde Green	2840 m	11	11
Ward End	WASHWOOD HEATH RD, Library/Park Gates	30 m	Adderley Park	2450 m	8	10
Weoley Castle	CASTLE SQUARE, Millennium Medical Centre	60 m	Selly Oak	3010 m	20	23
Yardley Wood	GLASTONBURY RD, Highfield Rd	70 m	Yardley Wood	590 m	12	18

Acocks Green Library




Acocks Green Library, Shirley Road, Birmingham, B27 7XH



Library Catchment Area - Community Profile
Acocks Green Library, Shirley Road, B27 7XH

Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Acocks Green Library, Shirley Road, B27 7XH			Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £190,016		
Key Library Performance Information			Partnering Arrangements		
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)	2014/15	2015/16	Organisation	Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed	89850	94400	Village of Play	Weekly	US's Stay and Play and After School Club
Members registered at this library	58675	51520	Stonehall Adult Education Centre	Weekly	Adult Education classes e.g. ESOL, Calligraphy (hire rooms)
PC booking (hours used)	28837	31195	Halfax Building Society	Weekly	Basic IT help for public
	13464	17044	Friends of Acocks Green Library	Monthly	Reading group, Local History group, Arts & Media Group
Library Information			Volunteer	Weekly	Basic IT help for public
Number of PCs	27	14.5	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2015 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit		
Opening hours per week	40	30.64	Ward	Number	Rate
Library User demographic information			Acocks Green	580	3.20%
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender			Birmingham	29,760	4.20%
Under 16	4810		Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit		
16-24	1191		Ward	Number	Proportion
25-44	3014		Acocks Green	115	4.00%
45-54	3428		Birmingham	5,965	4.40%
65+	5414		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency?		
Male	7120		Ward	2015	
Female	10254		Acocks Green	55%	
None	483		LA average	54%	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹			Transport ³		
Total people who have borrowed an item in last 12 months	1737		Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking
			1, 11A, 31, 885	Spring Road	On street parking
Performance against defined priorities for the service			Distance to nearest bus stop		
Members registered at and borrowing items from Acocks Green Library			10m		
			Distance to nearest train station		
		11%	830m		
Deprivation measures			Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius		
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)	Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)				
7.20%			26		
Acocks Green Ward			Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance		
LSOA		41.54	16		
Footnotes					
¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16					
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015					
³ Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015					

Aston Library, 99 Whitehead Road, Birmingham, B5 6EJ




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Aston Library, 99 Whitehead Road, B6 6EJ				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £91,081			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				2014/15	2015/16	Organisation	Frequency
Items issued and renewed				29650	27700	Six Ways Children's centre	Weekly
Members registered at this library				29044	22449	Aston Pre-school	Twice weekly
PC booking (hours used)				15751	16381	NLDC	Fortnightly
				360	4582	HOPE - Let's get Computing	Monthly
							1:1 IT session for Adults
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs				Number	City Average	Ward	Number
Opening hours per week				12	14.5	Aston	1,835
				23	30.64	Birmingham	29,760
							8.80%
							4.20%
Library User demographic information Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Under 16				Number		Ward	Number
16-24				4115		Aston	380
25-44				975		Birmingham	5,965
45-64				1630			7.40%
65+				969			4.40%
Male				287		Ward	2015
Female				2891		Aston	48%
None				4943		LA average	54%
				142			
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				Transport ³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Number		Bus Numbers	Train Station
				902		7	Witton
							On street parking
Performance against defined priorities for the service							
Members registered at and borrowing items from Aston Library						Distance to nearest bus stop	
						130m	
						Distance to nearest train station	
						1390m	
Deprivation measures						Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius	
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)							
Aston Ward						16	
LSOA						Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance	
						15	
¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16 ² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015 ³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							


Balsall Heath Library




Balsall Heath Library, Moseley Road, Balsall Heath, Birmingham, B12 9BX



Bartley Green Library




Bartley Green Library, Adams Hill, Birmingham, B32 3QG




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16	
Bartley Green Library				£64,843	
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Frequency	
Items issued and renewed				Activity	
Members registered at this library				Organisation	
PC booking (hours used)				Rate	
Library Information				Rate	
Number of PCs				4.80%	
Opening hours per week				4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of ISA and Universal Credit	
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	
Under 15				Bartley Green	
16-24				Birmingham	
25-44				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit	
45-64				Ward	
65+				Bartley Green	
Male				Birmingham	
Female				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²	
None				Ward	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				Bartley Green	
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				LA average	
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Transport ³	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Bartley Green Library				Bus Numbers	
Deprivation measures				Train Station	
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				University	
Bartley Green Ward				Distance to nearest bus stop	
LSOA				20m	
All library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16				Distance to nearest train station	
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015				5230m	
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius	
				20	
				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance	
				17	

Birchfield Library




Birchfield Library, Trinity Road, Aston, Birmingham, B6 6AH




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Birchfield Library, 3 Trinity Road, B6 6AH				Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16 £184,144	
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				2014/15	2015/16
Items issued and renewed				34700	30750
Members registered at this library				28847	29278
PC booking (hours used)				11336	11922
				4628	7610
Library Information				Frequency	
Number of PCs				Number	Rate
Opening hours per week				11	14.5
				29	30.64
Library User demographic information				Activity	
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Weekly	Stay and Play for pre-school children and parents
Under 16				Weekly	Stay and Play for pre-school children and parents
16-24				Weekly	Basic IT help with a volunteer
25-44				Fortnightly	Job search/CVs/training/volunteering
45-64				Weekly	Job search help and information
65+				Weekly	Job search help and information
Male				Number	Rate
Female				1,835	8.80%
None				29,760	4.20%
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit	
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Ward	Proportion
				Aston	380
				Birmingham	5,965
					7.40%
					4.40%
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Birchfield Library				Ward	2015
				Aston	48%
				LA average	54%
Deprivation measures				Transport ³	
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				Bus Numbers	Train Station
Aston Ward				33, 907A	Perry Barr
LSOA				Distance to nearest bus stop	Car park at front of library
				204m	
				Distance to nearest train station	
				1140m	
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)				10	
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance				9	
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16					
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015					
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016					

Bloomsbury Library




Bloomsbury Library, The POD Oliver Street, Nechells B7 4NX




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16		
Bloomsbury Library, Operating from The POD, Oliver Street, Nechells, B7 4NX				£45,277		
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements		
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation	Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed		5400	6550	Rising Stars Nursery	Weekly	Twice-weekly class visits to promote reading via free story sessions
Members registered at this library		5091	4436	Bloomsbury Children's Centre	Weekly	Class visit to promote reading via free story sessions and book borrowing
PC booking (hours used)		5733	5789	St Matthews' Pre-School	Weekly	Class visit to promote reading via free story sessions and book borrowing
		0	0	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	Termly	Library information sessions and book borrowing to encourage reading
Library Information		Number	City Average	Reading Ahead Challenge	Termly <td>Promoting reading to parents' Adult Literacy Class [ESOL class]</td>	Promoting reading to parents' Adult Literacy Class [ESOL class]
		Number	Number	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit		
Number of PCs		0	14.5	Ward	Number	Rate
Opening hours per week		24	30.64	Nechells	1,525	6.30%
				Birmingham	29,760	4.20%
Library User demographic information		Number		Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit		
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	Number	Proportion
Under 16		969		Nechells	275	3.60%
16-24		224		Birmingham	5,965	4.40%
25-44		271				
45-64		318				
65+		144				
Male		643		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²		
Female		1220		Ward	2015	
None		63		Nechells	49%	
				LA average	54%	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)		Number		Transport ³		
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		257		Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking
				8A, 66	Duddeston	On street parking
Performance against defined priorities for the service			12%	Distance to nearest bus stop		
Members registered at and borrowing items from Bloomsbury Library				74m		
Deprivation measures			<td colspan="3">Distance to nearest train station</td>	Distance to nearest train station		
				830m		
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)		Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius		
Nechells Ward		6.70%		28		
LSOA			61.82	16		
				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance		
Footnote 1: A library catchment is formed of lower Super Output Areas (SOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16						
Footnote 2: Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4 academic year ending 2015						
Footnote 3: Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016						

Boldmere Library




Boldmere Library, 119 Boldmere Road, Birmingham, B73 5TU




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Baldmere Library, 119 Baldmere Road, B73 5TU				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £132,402			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation		Frequency	
Items issued and renewed		29350	23400	Bushbabies Children's centre		Weekly(term time)	
Members registered at this library		38459	34561	Police surgeries		Monthly	
PC booking (hours used)		8789	8973			Stories and rhymes	
		1029	2123			Police advice	
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs		Number	City Average Number	Ward		Number	
Opening hours per week		7	14.5	Sutton Vesey		175	
		26	30.64	Birmingham		29,760	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender		Number		Ward		Number	
Under 16		4020		Sutton Vesey		35	
16-24		136		Birmingham		5,965	
25-44		1053				2.00%	
45-64		2588				4.40%	
65+		4371		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²			
Male		3692		Ward		2015	
Female		7950		Sutton Vesey		76%	
None		526		LA average		54%	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹				Transport ³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		1204		Bus Numbers		Train Station	
				15A, 869		Wyde Green	
				Distance to nearest bus stop		On street parking	
				14m			
				Distance to nearest train station			
				960m			
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Baldmere Library		30%		10			
Deprivation measures				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)		Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		10			
4.40%				11.83			
Sutton Vesey Ward				10			
LSOA							
¹ A library catchment is formed of lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

Druids Heath Library



Druids Heath Library, Idmiston Croft, Birmingham, B14 5NJ




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Druids Heath Library, Idmiston Croft, BB14 5NU				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £130,022			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation		Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed		33700	29000	CAB		Weekly	Advice session
Members registered at this library		25914	19138	Councillors		3 times a month	Advice session
PC booking (hours used)		8566	8849	NAIS		Weekly	As above
		2277	4254	Freshwinds		Appointment only	As above
Library Information		Number	City Average Number	St Judes School		Weekly	Stories/ book introductions
Number of PCs		12	14.5	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Opening hours per week		24	30.64	Ward		Number	Rate
				Brandwood		620	3.80%
				Birmingham		29,760	4.20%
Library User demographic Information		Number		Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward		Number	Proportion
Under 16		1206		Brandwood		140	6.10%
16-24		151		Birmingham		5,965	4.40%
25-44		572		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency?			
45-64		1463		Ward		2015	
65+		1738		Brandwood		61%	
Male		1764		LA average		54%	
Female		3175		Transport ³			
None		191		Bus Numbers		Train Station	Car Parking
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹		Number		27, 50, 50A		Yardley Wood	On street parking
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		338		Distance to nearest bus stop			
Performance against defined priorities for the service			14%	32m			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Druids Heath Library				Distance to nearest train station			
Deprivation measures				3570m			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)			Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)	Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
Brandwood Ward			7.10%	13			
LSOA		47.19		Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
				11			
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015

³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016

Erdington Library




Erdington Library, Orphanage Road, Birmingham, B24 9HP




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Erdington Library, Orphanage Road, B24 9HP				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £266,375			
Key Library Performance Information				2014/15	2015/16		
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				91150	83700		
Items issued and renewed				53938	51625		
Members registered at this library				30386	31550		
PC booking (hours used)				8736	13074		
Library Information				Number	City Average Number		
Number of PCs				11	14.5		
Opening hours per week				40	30.64		
Library User demographic information				Number			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				5690			
Under 16				890			
16-24				3276			
25-44				5626			
45-64				6582			
65+				8755			
Male				12708			
Female				601			
None							
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				Number			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				2347			
Performance against defined priorities for the service							
Members registered at and borrowing items from Erdington Library							14%
Deprivation measures							
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)			
Erdington Ward				7.50%			
LSOA				42.38			
1. A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
2. Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
3. Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

Frankley Library




Frankley Library, Balaam Wood Academy, Birmingham. 845 0EU




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Frankley Library, New Street, B45 9EU				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £90,367	
Key Library Performance Information				2014/15	2015/16
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				34800	30450
Items issued and renewed				10166	8369
Members registered at this library				5949	6182
PC booking (hours used)				1845	2908
Library Information				Number	City Average Number
Number of PCs				9	14.5
Opening hours per week				21.5	30.64
Library User demographic information				Number	
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender					
Under 16				718	
16-24				73	
25-44				237	
45-64				644	
55+				773	
Male				734	
Female				1508	
None				203	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹				Number	
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				216	
Performance against defined priorities for the service					11%
Members registered at and borrowing items from Frankley Library					
Deprivation measures					
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)					
Longbridge Ward					
LSOA				49.71	
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)					
Longbridge Ward					
LSOA					
Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius				14	
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance				13	
Distance to nearest bus stop				137m	
Distance to nearest train station				3320m	
Bus Numbers				29, 49, 61	
Train Station				Longbridge	
Car Parking				On street parking	
Partnership arrangements					
Organisation				Frankley Art group and Frankley Mind group	Project October 2016
Sessions				Quarterly	Project to promote use of the Library, encourage reading children and parents
Ad Hoc				Weekly	Events to promote reading to parents and children
Twice weekly				Weekly	stories and activities to promote books
Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit				29,760	
Ward				Number	Rate
Longbridge				625	3.80%
Birmingham				29,760	4.20%
Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit				Number	Proportion
Longbridge				150	6.70%
Birmingham				5,965	4.40%
Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²				Number	Proportion
Ward				2015	
Longbridge				55%	
LA average				54%	
Transport ³					
Bus Numbers				29, 49, 61	
Train Station				Longbridge	
Car Parking				On street parking	
Distance to nearest bus stop				137m	
Distance to nearest train station				3320m	
Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius				14	
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance				13	
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)					
Longbridge Ward					
LSOA					
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)					
Longbridge Ward					
LSOA					


Glebe Farm Library




Glebe Farm Library, Glebe Farm Road, Birmingham B33 9NA



Hall Green Library



Hall Green Library, 1221 Stratford Road, Hall Green, Birmingham, B28 9AD




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Handsworth Library, Soho Road, B21 9DP				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £244,082			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed				Reach Out Recovery	Once a week	Provide support for drug and alcohol recovery	
Members registered at this library				Police Surgery	First Monday of the month	Provide help and advice to the all the community	
PC booking (hours used)				Aquarius Coffee Morning	Every Tuesday	Meet people and make new friends - for over 50s	
				Health Exchange	Alternate Tuesdays	Advice on nutrition and blood pressure checks for all	
				National Careers Advice	Every Thursday	CV and job advice for all	
				ICT Buddy	Every Friday	Basic keyboard skills	
Library information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs				Ward	Number	Rate	
Opening hours per week				Lozells & East Handsworth	1,975	9.70%	
				Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16				Lozells & East Handsworth	335	9.00%	
16-24				Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
25-44				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²			
45-64				Ward	2015		
65+				Lozells & East Handsworth	43%		
Male				LA average	54%		
Female				Transport³			
None				Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				74	Jewellery Quarter	On street parking	
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Distance to nearest bus stop			
				30m			
				Distance to nearest train station			
Performance against defined priorities for the service							
Members registered at and borrowing items from Handsworth Library							
10%							
Deprivation measures							
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)							
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)							
7.40%							
Lozells & East							
Handsworth Ward							
LSOA							
50.64							
16							

¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


² Birmingham Source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015

³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016

Harborne Library




Harborne Library, High Street, Birmingham, B17 9QG




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Harborne Library, High Street, B44 0HH				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £175,164			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Chris Cooper	Weekly	Family History group	Activity
Items issued and renewed				Harborne Primary School	Occasional	Class visits to promote reading	
Members registered at this library				Chad Vale Primary School	Occasional	Class visits to promote reading	
PC booking (hours used)				St Peters Primary School	Occasional	Class visits to promote reading	
Library Information				First Steps Nursery	Occasional	Storytelling	
Number of PCs				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Opening hours per week				Ward	Number	Rate	
				Harborne	465	2.90%	
				Birmingham	29 760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16				Harborne	65	2.30%	
16-24				Birmingham	5 965	4.40%	
25-44				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²			
45-64				Ward	2015		
65+				Harborne	69%		
Male				LA average	54%		
Female							
None							
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)¹				Transport³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
				24, 48, 99	University		
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Distance to nearest bus stop			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Harborne Library				20m			
				Distance to nearest train station			
				2070m			
Deprivation measures							
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015))							
Harborne Ward				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
5.10%				20			
LSOA				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
				17			
¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

Kents Moat Library




Kents Moat Library, 55-57 Pool Way, Birmingham, B33 8NF




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Kents Moat Library, 55-57 Pool Way, B33 8NF				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £54,173	
Key Library Performance Information		2014/15	2015/16		
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		19900	8000		
Items issued and renewed		11143	7607		
Members registered at this library		6623	6761		
PC booking (hours used)		2213	3182		
Library Information		Number	City Average Number		
Number of PCs		10	14.5		
Opening hours per week		19	30.64		
Library User demographic information		Number			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender					
Under 16		871			
16-24		125			
25-44		242			
45-64		542			
65+		1002			
Male		871			
Female		1783			
None		128			
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)		Number			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		103			
Performance against defined priorities for the service					
Members registered at and borrowing items from Kents Moat Library			8%		
Deprivation measures					
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)			Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		
7.20%					
Stechford & Yardley N Ward					
LSOA		52.52			
10					
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16					
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015					
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016					

Kings Heath Library




Kings Heath Library, High Street, Birmingham, B14 7SW




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Kings Heath Library, High Street, B14 7SW					Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16 £205,992				
Key Library Performance Information					Partnering arrangements				
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)					Organisation				
Items issued and renewed					Frequency				
Members registered at this library					Activity				
PC booking (hours used)					Weekly				
					Weekly				
					Weekly				
					Occasional				
					Monthly				
					Family history class				
					Class visits to support reading				
					Introductions to the library				
					CV support				
					Provide debt advice to customers				
					Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit				
					Ward				
					Number				
					Rate				
					3.50%				
					4.20%				
					Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit				
					Ward				
					Number				
					Proportion				
					4.70%				
					4.40%				
					Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²				
					Ward				
					2015				
					75%				
					54%				
					Transport ³				
					Bus Numbers				
					Train Station				
					Bournville				
					On street parking				
					Distance to nearest bus stop				
					10m				
					Distance to nearest train station				
					3890m				
					Deprivation measures				
					Index of Multiple Deprivation score				
					(DCLG 2015)				
					Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius				
					8				
					Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance				
					8				
					1 A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16				
					2 Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015				
					3 Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016				

Kings Norton Library



Kings Norton Library, Pershore Road South, Birmingham, B30 3EU



Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Kings Norton Library, Pershore Road South, B30 3EU				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £137,606			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)	2014/15	2015/16		Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed	59250	50200		Ark Rose Academy	Weekly	Class visits to promote reading	
Members registered at this library	53970	36333		Volunteer	Weekly	Code Club for children	
PC booking (hours used)	13603	14113		Green Day Nursery	Fortnightly	Stories to encourage reading	
	232	4623		Fairway	Termly	Family literacy	
				Friends of Kings Norton Park	Quarterly	Committee Meeting	
Library Information				Newman College	3 Months	Work Placement	
Number of PCs	14	City Average		Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Opening hours per week	33	Number	14.5	Ward	Number	Rate	
			30.64	Kings Norton	555	3.70%	
				Birmingham	29 760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
<i>Based on customers who provided DOB/gender</i>				Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16	3765			Kings Norton	120	5.50%	
16-24	260			Birmingham	5 965	4.40%	
25-44	1555			Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²			
45-64	2744			Ward	2015		
65+	4156			Kings Norton	49%		
Male	4595			LA average	54%		
Female	7246			Transport³			
None	639			Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				45, 49, 84	Kings Norton	On street parking	
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months	1169			Distance to nearest bus stop			
Performance against defined priorities for the service				60m			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Kings Norton Library		24%		Distance to nearest train station			
Deprivation measures				860m			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)		Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
Kings Norton Ward				12			
LSOA		34.86		Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
				11			
¹ A library catchment is formed of lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							


**Kingstanding Library Core Catchment Area
Based on Borrower Data**

Key


- BCC Community Libraries
- Library Core Catchment Area
- BCC Wards

The map displays the Kingstanding Library Core Catchment Area, which is shaded in grey. The area is bounded by the following wards: Sutton Four Oaks to the north, Sutton Vesey to the east, Kingstanding to the south, and Perry Barr to the west. The map also shows the locations of BCC Community Libraries (marked with dots) and BCC Wards (outlined in black). The map is titled 'Kingstanding Library Core Catchment Area Based on Borrower Data'.

Mere Green Library




Mere Green Library, 30A Mere Green Road, Birmingham, B75 5BT




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Mere Green Library, 30A Mere Green Road, B75 5BT				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £183,645			
Partnering arrangements				Partnering arrangements			
Key Library Performance Information		2014/15		2015/16		Activity	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		93650		77650		Library visit/choose books	
Items issued and renewed		137960		122464		Story sessions during each school holiday	
Members registered at this library		20555		21330		IT training	
PC booking (hours used)		5149		7244		Ancestry training	
Library Information		Number		City Average Number		Children's club	
Number of PCs		21		14.5		Ancestry self help	
Opening hours per week		35		30.64		Proportion July 2015 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit	
Library User demographic information		Number				Rate	
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender						0.90%	
Under 16		9451				4.20%	
16-24		541					
25-44		2806				Proportion	
45-64		6033				0.90%	
65+		15378				4.40%	
Male		12208					
Female		21102					
None		899					
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)		Number					
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		3429					
Performance against defined priorities for the service							
Members registered at and borrowing items from Mere Green Library				30%			
Deprivation measures							
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)							
Sutton Four Oaks Ward							
LSOA		8.63					
Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius							
12							
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance							
9							
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2015							

Northfield Library



Northfield Library, 77 Church Road, Birmingham, B31 2LB




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Northfield Library, 77 Church Road, B31 2LB				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £232,900			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation		Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed		91400	90050	Keep fit Mums		Weekly	Coffee and keep fit
Members registered at this library		82367	73135	Reading Group		Monthly	
PC booking (hours used)		26475	27697	Poetry Group		Fortnightly	
		15083	17393	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Library Information		Number	City Average Number	Ward	Number	Rate	
Number of PCs		21	14.5	Northfield	575	3.50%	
Opening hours per week		39	30.64	Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender		Number		Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16				Northfield	130	5.20%	
16-24		5404		Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
25-44		824		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²			
45-64		2512		Ward	2015		
65+		4922		Northfield	57%		
Male		7772		LA average	54%		
Female		8148		Transport ³			
None		12241		Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)		Number		18, 27, 878	Northfield	On street parking	
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		1744		Distance to nearest bus stop		Distance to nearest train station	
Performance against defined priorities for the service				20m		920m	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Northfield Library			17%	Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius		22	
Deprivation measures				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)			Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)	17			
Northfield Ward		6.70%					
LSOA			28.02				
¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for Key stage 4, academic year ending 2015

³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016


Perry Common Library



Perry Common Library, College Road, Birmingham, B44 0HH



Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Perry Common Library, Perry Common Road, B44 0HH				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £123,570			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation		Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed		33250	32350	Ancestry		Weekly	One to one help to trace your family tree
Members registered at this library		32682	27486	Perry Barr Pensioners		Monthly	Social group
PC booking (hours used)		11042	11595	Reach Out Recovery		Weekly	Provide support for drug and alcohol recovery
		4362	6635	Knit and Natter		Weekly	Social group
Library Information		Number	City Average Number	Wilson Stuart Special School		Weekly	Stories and singing
Number of PCs		19	14.5	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of ISA and Universal Credit			
Opening hours per week		24	30.64	Ward		Number	Rate
				Oscott		395	2.50%
				Birmingham		29,760	4.20%
Library User demographic information		Number		Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Under 16		2217		Ward		Number	Proportion
16-24		282		Oscott		105	4.60%
25-44		772		Birmingham		5,965	4.40%
45-64		1199		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²			
65+		2651		Ward		2015	
Male		2694		Oscott		59%	
Female		4215		LA average		54%	
None		212		Transport ³			
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹		Number		Bus Numbers		Train Station	Car Parking
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		489		7,907		Edington	On street parking
Performance against defined priorities for the service		14%		Distance to nearest bus stop			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Perry Common Library				20m			
				Distance to nearest train station			
				2840m			
Deprivation measures				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)		Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		16			
6.70%				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
Oscott Ward				16			
LSOA		45.28					
¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data (fed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015)							
³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							



**Quinton Library Core Catchment Area
Based on Borrower Data**


Key

- BCC Community Libraries
- Library Core Catchment Area
- BCC Wards


The map displays the Quinton Library Core Catchment Area, which is shaded in grey. The area is bounded by the River Trent to the north and the River Stour to the south. The map includes labels for various wards and locations, including SOKO, EDGECASTON, HARECANE, Harborne, WEOLLEY, Weoley Castle, BARTLEY GREEN, Bartley Green, and QUINTON. A key in the bottom left corner explains the symbols used: a black dot for BCC Community Libraries, a grey shaded area for the Library Core Catchment Area, and a white box for BCC Wards. The map also shows the River Trent and River Stour, and the location of the Quinton Library Core Catchment Area is marked with a black dot.

Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Quinton Library, Ridgacre Road, B32 2TW				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £147,690			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed				World's End Primary School	Weekly	Class visits to promote reading	
Members registered at this library				Court Oak Nursery	Occasional	Stories to encourage reading	
PC booking (hours used)				Dementia Friends		Support group	
				Chris Cooper	Weekly	Family history group	
Library Information				Neighbourhood Office	Twice weekly	Verification service	
Number of PCs				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Opening hours per week				Ward	Number	Rate	
				Quinton	575	3.90%	
				Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16				Quinton	105	5.00%	
16-24				Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
25-44				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²			
45-64				Ward	2015		
65+				Quinton	49%		
Male				LA average	54%		
Female				Transport³			
None				Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)					24 University		
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Number			
				1667			
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Distance to nearest bus stop			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Quinton Library					20m		
					Distance to nearest train station		
					4170m		
Deprivation measures				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)					15		
Quinton Ward					Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance		
LSOA					13		
					31.81		
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015))				1 A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16			
6.40%				Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015			
				Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016			

Selly Oak Library




Selly Oak Library, 669 Bristol Road, Birmingham, B29 6AE




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Selly Oak Library, 669 Bristol Road, B29 6AE				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £100,322			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed				Birmingham Adult Dyslexic Group	Twice weekly	Support Group	
Members registered at this library							
PC booking (hours used)							
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of ISA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs				Ward	Number	Rate	
Opening hours per week				Selly Oak	350	1.50%	
				Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 15				Selly Oak	85	0.60%	
16-24				Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
25-44							
45-64							
65+							
Male					2015		
Female				Selly Oak	59%		
None				LA average	54%		
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹				Transport ³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
				61, 63, 76	Selly Oak	On street parking	
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Distance to nearest bus stop			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Selly Oak Library				60m			
				Distance to nearest train station			
Deprivation measures				244m			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)			
3.20%				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
Selly Oak Ward				23			
LSOA				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
				17			

Shard End Library




Shard End Library, The Shard, All Saints Square, Birmingham, B34 7AG




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile			Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16		
Shard End Library, All Saints Square, Shard End Crescent, B34 7AG			£87,942		
Key Library Performance Information			Partnering arrangements		
Visits (Based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation	Frequency
Items issued and renewed		48550	60550	Severn Trent	Weekly
Members registered at this library		26295	23715	Shard End Book group	Weekly
PC booking (hours used)		10905	11550	Shard End Community First	Fridays
		8056	10279	Busy feet	Mondays
Library Information			Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit		
Number of PCs		Number	City Average	Ward	Rate
Opening hours per week		19	14.5	Shard End	5%
		40	30.64	Birmingham	4.20%
Library User demographic information			Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit		
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender		Number		Ward	Proportion
Under 16		2281		Shard End	5.80%
16-24		135		Birmingham	4.40%
25-44		952		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²	
45-64		1470		Ward	2015
65+		1964		Shard End	36%
Male		2252		LA average	54%
Female		4147		Transport ³	
None		403		Bus Numbers	Train Station
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹			Number	55, 55A, 56	Lea Hall
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		827		Distance to nearest bus stop	Large car park at front of library
Performance against defined priorities for the service				190m	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Shard End Library			13%	Distance to nearest train station	
Deprivation measures				2250m	
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)					
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (best for Communities and Local Gov 2015)					
9.40%					
Shard End Ward					
LSOA			50.04		
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance					
11					
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16					
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015					
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016					

Sheldon Library



Sheldon Library, Brays Road, Birmingham, B26 2RJ




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Sheldon Library, Brays Road, B26 2RJ					Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £113,895				
Key Library Performance Information					Partnering arrangements				
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)					2014/15	2015/16	Organisation	Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed					27900	22700	FOSL-Friends of Sheldon Library	weekly	Socialising/Trips/Tea parties/Coffee morning
Members registered at this library					24696	22613	Service Birmingham	monthly	ICT support sessions
PC booking (hours used)					10679	11011	Stanville School	weekly	Library visits
					3036	5461	St Thomas More School	weekly	Library Visits
Library Information					Number	City Average	Volunteer	Weekly	Click IT
Number of PCs					14	14.5	Ward	Number	Rate
Opening hours per week					26	30.64	Sheldon	410	3.00%
							Birmingham	29,760	4.20%
Library User demographic information					Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit				
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender					Number		Ward	Number	Proportion
Under 16					1965		Sheldon	80	4.10%
16-24					291		Birmingham	5,965	4.40%
25-44					538				
45-64					1066				
65+					2601				
Male					2597				
Female					3793				
None					71				
Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency?									
Ward					2015				
Sheldon					51%				
LA average					54%				
Transport ³									
Bus Numbers					Train Station	Car Parking			
73					Marston Green	On street parking			
Distance to nearest bus stop									
20m									
Distance to nearest train station									
2830m									
Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius									
18									
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance									
12									
Sheldon Ward									
LSOA					35.05				
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)					Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)				
7.30%									
Sheldon Ward									
LSOA					35.05				
1					1				
2					2				
3					3				
4					4				
5					5				
6					6				
7					7				
8					8				
9					9				
10					10				
11					11				
12					12				
13					13				
14					14				
15					15				
16					16				
17					17				
18					18				
19					19				
20					20				
21					21				
22					22				
23					23				
24					24				
25					25				
26					26				
27					27				
28					28				
29					29				
30					30				
31					31				
32					32				
33					33				
34					34				
35					35				
36					36				
37					37				
38					38				
39					39				
40					40				
41					41				
42					42				
43					43				
44					44				
45					45				
46					46				
47					47				
48					48				
49					49				
50					50				
51					51				
52					52				
53					53				
54					54				
55					55				
56					56				
57					57				
58					58				
59					59				
60					60				
61					61				
62					62				
63					63				
64					64				
65					65				
66					66				
67					67				
68					68				
69					69				
70					70				
71					71				
72					72				
73					73				
74					74				
75					75				
76					76				
77					77				
78					78				
79					79				
80					80				
81					81				
82					82				
83					83				
84					84				
85					85				
86					86				
87					87				
88					88				
89					89				
90					90				
91					91				
92					92				
93					93				
94					94				
95					95				
96					96				
97					97				
98					98				
99					99				
100					100				

¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


² Birmingham sources: Department for Education Performance tables: pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015

³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016

Small Heath Library



Small Heath Library, Muntz Street, Birmingham, B10 9RX




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile				Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16	
Small Heath Library, Muntz Street, B810 9RX				£231,991	
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Organisation	Frequency
Items issued and renewed					Activity
Members registered at this library					
PC booking (hours used)					
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit	
Number of PCs				Ward	Rate
Opening hours per week				Nechells	6.30%
Library User demographic information				Birmingham	4.20%
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit	
Under 16				Ward	Proportion
16-24				Nechells	3.60%
25-44				Birmingham	4.40%
45-64					
65+					
Male				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency*	
Female				Ward	
None				Nechells	2015
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				LA average	49%
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months					54%
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Transport ³	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Small Heath Library				Bus Numbers	Train Station
Deprivation measures				8C	Small Heath
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				Distance to nearest bus stop	Car parking in front of leisure centre
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)				70m	
6.70%				Distance to nearest train station	
Nechells Ward				850m	
LSOA				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius	
53.58				16	
17%				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance	
8					

*1 A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


*2 Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015

*3 Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016

South Yardley Library




South Yardley Library, Yardley Road, Birmingham, B25 8LT




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile South Yardley Library, Yardley Road, B25 8LT				Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16 £263,110			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)	2014/15	2015/16		Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed	87650	109300		Fox Hollies Children's Centre	Weekly	Craft activities, stories and songs for under 5s	
Members registered at this library	64289	54360		W1 - Lace Makers	Weekly	Needlecrafts & Lace making	
PC booking (hours used)	18273	19139		Class Act Drama Group	Weekly	Drama classes for 6 to 17 year olds	
	15252	24353		Keep Fit Instructor	Weekly	A lively but steady exercise session for fitness and fun	
Library Information				Genealogist	Weekly x2	Family history sessions	
	Number	City Average		Mind	Monthly	Mental health support group	
	36	14.5		UK On-line	Weekly	Basic online course - Learn My Way	
Number of PCs				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016-16-64 yr old claimants of USA and Universal Credit			
Opening hours per week	40	30.64		Ward	Number	Rate	
Library User demographic information				South Yardley	835	4.30%	
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Under 16	4706			Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
16-24	576			Ward	Number	Proportion	
25-44	1603			South Yardley	170	5.70%	
45-64	2473			Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
65+	3675			Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²			
Male	5227			Ward	2015		
Female	7145			South Yardley	47%		
None	661			LA average	54%		
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹				Transport ³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months	1509			Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
Performance against defined priorities for the service				11A, 11C	Acocks Green	Limited on site parking	
Members registered at and borrowing items from South Yardley Library	17%			Distance to nearest bus stop			
Deprivation measures				10m			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				Distance to nearest train station			
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)				1350m			
South Yardley Ward				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
LSOA	36.42			17			
Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance				17			
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16				Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for Key stage 4, academic year ending 2015			
A transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

Sparkhill Library




Sparkhill Library, 641 Stratford Road, Birmingham, B11 4EA




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Sparkhill Library, 641 Stratford Road, B11 4EA				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £137,384			
Key Library Performance Information				2014/15	2015/16		
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				9900	105000		
Items issued and renewed				91922	73963		
Members registered at this library				26470	27583		
PC booking (hours used)				10551	13236		
Library Information				Number	City Average Number		
Number of PCs				16	14.5		
Opening hours per week				35	30.64		
Library User demographic information Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Number			
Under 16				11293			
16-24				1871			
25-44				3124			
45-64				2107			
65+				981			
Male				7897			
Female				10800			
None				679			
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Number			
				3267			
Performance against defined priorities for the service							
Members registered at and borrowing items from Sparkhill Library				23%			
Deprivation measures							
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)			
7.00%				24			
Springfield Ward LSOA				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
				19			

Spring Hill Library




Spring Hill Library, Spring Hill, Birmingham, B18 7BH




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Spring Hill Library, Spring Hill, B18 7BH		Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £167,069	
Key Library Performance Information Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50) Items issued and renewed Members registered at this library PC booking (hours used)		2014/15	2015/16
		31000	31800
		19843	16760
		7805	8302
		1208	6912
Library Information		Number	City Average
		14	14.5
Number of PCs		24	30.64
Opening hours per week			
Library User demographic information Based on customers who provided DOB/gender		Number	
Under 16		2133	
16-24		297	
25-44		964	
45-64		581	
65+		676	
Male		1848	
Female		2698	
None		105	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		Number	
		264	
Performance against defined priorities for the service Members registered at and borrowing items from Spring Hill Library			16%
Deprivation measures			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)	Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		
7.30%			
Soho Ward			
LSOA		51.06	
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16			
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015			
Transport for West Midlands and National Express: West Midlands as at 20th September 2016			

Stirchley Library




Stirchley Library, Bournville Lane, Birmingham, B30 2JT




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Stirchley Library, Bournville Lane, B30 2JT				Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16 £134,939	
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Frequency	
Items issued and renewed				Organisation	
Members registered at this library				Activity	
PC booking (hours used)					
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of ISA and Universal Credit	
Number of PCs				Ward	Rate
Opening hours per week				Bournville	3.00%
Library User demographic information				Birmingham	4.20%
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Youth Unemployment (Unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit	
Under 16				Ward	Proportion
16-24				Bournville	4.60%
25-44				Birmingham	4.40%
45-64				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²	
55+				Ward	2015
Male				Bournville	62%
Female				LA average	54%
None				Transport ³	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)				Bus Numbers	Train Station
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				27	Bournville
Performance against defined priorities for the service				On street parking	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Stirchley Library					
Deprivation measures				Distance to nearest bus stop	
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				50m	
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)				Distance to nearest train station	
Bournville Ward				310m	
LSOA				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance	
5.20%				18	
22.06				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	
29%				16	
29%				Footpath	

Sutton Coldfield Library




Sutton Coldfield Library, Lower Parade, Sutton Coldfield, Birmingham, B72 1XX




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Sutton Coldfield Library, Lower Parade, B72 1XX				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £575,089			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)	2014/15	2015/16		Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed	87050	102750		Local History Society	Weekly	Research on local area	
Members registered at this library	66997	59225		Holyfield Primary school	Monthly	Class visit to promote reading	
PC booking (hours used)	28897	29613		Volunteer	Weekly	Code club for children	
	14010	17843					
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs	Number	City Average Number		Ward	Number	Rate	
Opening hours per week	24	14.5		Sutton Trinity	215	1.40%	
	40	30.64		Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender	Number			Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16	4686			Sutton Trinity	55	2.80%	
16-24	805			Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
25-44	2598						
45-64	5058			Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²			
65+	15103			Ward	2015		
Male	11701			Sutton Trinity	66%		
Female	16921			LA average	54%		
None	628						
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)¹				Transport³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months	Number			Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
	1822			5 879 902 904 905	Sutton Coldfield	Victoria Street car park	
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Distance to nearest bus stop			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Sutton Coldfield Library		15%		10m			
Deprivation measures				Distance to nearest train station			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				350m			
Sutton Trinity Ward	4.70%			Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
LSOA		12.41		30			
				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
				27			
¹ A library catchment is formed of lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables: pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016							

Tower Hill Library



Tower Hill Library, Tower Hill, Birmingham, B42 1LG




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Tower Hill Library, Tower Hill, B42 1LG				Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16 £80,764			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				Organisation	Frequency	Activity	
Items issued and renewed				Perry Barr Arts forum	Weekly	Knit and Natter	
Members registered at this library				Tower Hill Book Sharers	Monthly	Share and discuss books	
PC booking (hours used)							
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs				Ward	Number	Rate	
Opening hours per week				Perry Barr	520	3.30%	
				Birmingham	29,760	4.20%	
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Ward	Number	Proportion	
Under 16				Perry Barr	95	3.10%	
16-24				Birmingham	5,965	4.40%	
25-44							
45-64							
65+							
Male				Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²			
Female				Ward	2015		
None				Perry Barr	54%		
				LA average	54%		
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)¹				Transport³			
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				Bus Numbers	Train Station	Car Parking	
				740	51, X51, 52, 52A, 886	Hamstead	On street parking
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Distance to nearest bus stop			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Tower Hill Library				60m			
				Distance to nearest train station			
				1000m			
Deprivation measures				Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)				11			
Perry Barr Ward				Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance			
LSOA				9			

¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4 academic year ending 2015

³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016

Walmley Library



Walmley Library, Walmley Road, Sutton Coldfield, B76 1NP




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Walmley Library, Walmley Road, B76 1NP			Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16		£78,474
Key Library Performance Information			Partnering arrangements		
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)			Organisation		
Items issued and renewed			Walmley Playgroup		
Members registered at this library			Shrubbery School		
PC booking (hours used)			Volunteers		
			Paul Wilkinson		
Library Information			Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit		
Number of PCs			Ward		
Opening hours per week			Sutton New Hall		
			Birmingham		
Library User demographic Information			Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit		
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender			Ward		
Under 16			Sutton New Hall		
16-24			Birmingham		
25-44					
45-64			Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency²		
65+			Ward		
Male			Sutton New Hall		
Female			LA average		
None					
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)			Transport³		
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months			Bus Numbers		
			15C, 71, 71S, 838, 839, 904, 914		
Performance against defined priorities for the service			Train Station		
Members registered at and borrowing items from Walmley Library			Wyde Green		
			Distance to nearest bus stop		
			120m		
Deprivation measures			Distance to nearest train station		
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)			2840m		
4.80%			Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius		
Sutton New Hall Ward			11		
LSOA			Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance		
			11		

¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16


² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015

³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016

Ward End Library




Ward End Library, Washwood Heath Road, Birmingham, B8 2HF




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Ward End Library, Washwood Heath Road, B8 2HF				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £177,697			
Key Library Performance Information				Partnering arrangements			
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation		Frequency	Activity
Items issued and renewed		61750	75450	Ward End Camera Club		Fortnightly	Photography group
Members registered at this library		77789	67209	Coffee morning group		Weekly	Socialising/attending library sessions
PC booking (hours used)		28765	30368	Pensioners Group		Weekly	Socialising/Bingo/Attending library sessions
		7200	11159	Adult Education		Weekly	ESOL lessons
Library Information				Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit			
Number of PCs		Number	City Average	Ward		Number	Rate
Opening hours per week		22	14.5	Hodge Hill		760	4.50%
		35	30.64	Birmingham		29,760	4.20%
Library User demographic information				Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit			
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender		Number		Ward		Number	Proportion
Under 16		10041		Hodge Hill		165	5.70%
16-24		1814		Birmingham		5,965	4.40%
25-44		3406		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ²			
45-64		1902		Ward		2015	
65+		1512		Hodge Hill		52%	
Male		7789		LA average		54%	
Female		10422		Transport ³			
None		564		Bus Numbers		Train Station	Car Parking
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) ¹		Number		55, 55A, 56, 94		Adderley Park	Car park at front
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		3612		Distance to nearest bus stop			
Performance against defined priorities for the service				30m			
Members registered at and borrowing items from Ward End Library			17%	Distance to nearest train station			
Deprivation measures				2450m			
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)		Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius			
Hodge Hill Ward		7.00%		10			
LSOA		49.43		8		Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance	
¹ A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16							
² Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015							
³ Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2015							

Weoley Castle Library




Weoley Castle Library, 76 Beckbury Road, Birmingham, B29 5HR




Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Weoley Castle Library, 76 Beckbury Road, B29 5HR				Budget: Outturn Figure 2015/16 £202,495			
Key Library Performance Information				2014/15	2015/16	Partnering arrangements	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)				56750	79750	Organisation	Frequency
Items issued and renewed				48038	41138	Weoley Castle Children's Centre	Weekly
Members registered at this library				15672	16219	Friends of Weoley Castle Library	Weekly
PC booking (hours used)				7363	11616	Friends of Weoley Castle Library	Monthly
Library Information				Number	City Average	When requested	Activity
Number of PCs				12	14.5	Reachout Recovery	Coffee Morning
Opening hours per week				35	30.64	Local Councillor	Support for addiction recovery
Library User demographic information				Number	Rate	Twice monthly	Advice Surgery
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender				Number	Proportion	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit	
Under 16				3413	6.40%	Ward	Rate
16-24				383	6.40%	Weoley	4.50%
25-44				1530	4.40%	Birmingham	4.20%
45-64				2285		Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit	
65+				5135		Ward	Proportion
Male				4428		Weoley	6.40%
Female				7701		Birmingham	4.40%
None				617		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency*	
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)†				Number	2015	Ward	Rate
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months				1317	52%	Weoley	54%
Performance against defined priorities for the service						LA average	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Weoley Castle Library						Transport‡	
Deprivation measures						Bus Numbers	Train Station
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)						29, 48	Selly Oak
7.20%						Distance to nearest bus stop	On street parking
Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)						60m	
Weoley Ward						Distance to nearest train station	
LSOA						3010m	
36.28						Number of bus stops within a 500 metre radius	
A library catchment is formed of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) where 3% or more of its population has actively used the library during 2015/16						23	
Birmingham source: Department for Education Performance tables pupil data feed for key stage 4, academic year ending 2015						Number of bus stops within 500 metre walking distance	
Transport for West Midlands and National Express West Midlands as at 20th September 2016						20	

Yardley Wood Library



Yardley Wood Library, Highfield Road, Birmingham, B14 4DU



Library Catchment Area - Community Profile Yardley Wood Library, Highfield Road, B14 4DU				Budget Outturn Figure 2015/16 £247,316	
Key Library Performance Information				Partnership arrangements	
Visits (based on a one week count in October x 50)		2014/15	2015/16	Organisation	Frequency
Items issued and renewed		53845	93950	Grendon Nursery	Twice a week
Members registered at this library		11316	48330	Billesley School	Once a term
PC booking (hours used)		4086	12185	Yardley Wood School	Once a term
Library Information		City Average	5717	Highters Heath School	Once a term
Number of PCs		13	14.5	Chilcote School	Once a term
Opening hours per week		34	30.64	Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion July 2016 16-64 yr old claimants of JSA and Universal Credit	
Library User Demographic Information		Number		Ward	Number
Based on customers who provided DOB/gender		Number		Billesley	Rate
Under 16		4041		Birmingham	3.30%
16-24		321			4.20%
25-44		1372		Youth Unemployment (unadjusted) Proportion June 2016 18-24 yr old claimants including Universal Credit	
45-64		2576		Ward	Proportion
65+		4856		Billesley	5.10%
Male		4793			4.40%
Female		7931		Educational Attainment - pupils achieving 5+ A* to C (including English and Maths) GCSEs by pupil residency ⁷	
None		442		Ward	2015
Active library usage based on Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)		Number		Billesley	52%
Total people who have used the library in last 12 months		1265		LA average	54%
Performance against defined priorities for the service				Transport ³	
Members registered at and borrowing items from Yardley Wood Library			25%	Bus Numbers	Train Station
Deprivation measures				27	Yardley Wood
% residents identifying as bad or very bad health (Census 2011)		Index of Multiple Deprivation score (Dept for Communities and Local Gov 2015)		Distance to nearest bus stop	On street parking
Billesley Ward		7.60%		70m	
LSOA		38.47		Distance to nearest train station	
				590m	

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING & PROCUREMENT
Date of Decision:	14TH FEBRUARY 2017
SUBJECT:	PLANNED PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES (MARCH 2017 – MAY 2017)
Key Decision: No	Relevant Forward Plan Ref: n/a
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "tick" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Cllr Majid Mahmood – Value for Money and Efficiency
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Cllr Mohammed Aikhlaq, Corporate Resources and Governance
Wards affected:	All

1. Purpose of report:

- 1.1 This report provides details of the planned procurement activity for the period March 2017 – May 2017. Planned procurement activities reported previously are not repeated in this report.

2. Decision(s) recommended:

That Cabinet

- 2.1 Notes the planned procurement activities under officer delegations set out in the Constitution for the period March 2017 – May 2017 as detailed in Appendix 1.

Lead Contact Officer (s):	
Telephone No: E-mail address:	Nigel Kletz Corporate Procurement Services Corporate Resources 0121 303 6610 nigel.kletz@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

3.1 Internal

This report to Cabinet is copied to Cabinet Support Officers and to Corporate Resources and Governance Overview & Scrutiny Committee and is the process for consulting with relevant cabinet and scrutiny members. At the point of submitting this report Cabinet Members/ Corporate Resources and Governance Overview & Scrutiny Committee Chair have not indicated that any of the planned procurement activity needs to be brought back to Cabinet for executive decision.

3.2 External

None

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies

Details of how the contracts listed in Appendix 1 support relevant Council policies, plans or strategies, will be set out in the individual reports.

4.2 Financial Implications

Details of how decisions will be carried out within existing finances and resources will be set out in the individual reports.

4.3 Legal Implications

Details of all relevant implications will be included in individual reports.

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

Details of Risk Management, Community Cohesion and Equality Act requirements will be set out in the individual reports.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

- 5.1 At the 1 March 2016 meeting of Council changes to procurement governance were agreed which gives Chief Officers the delegated authority to approve procurement contracts up to the value of £10m over the life of the contract. Where it is likely that the award of a contract will result in staff employed by the Council transferring to the successful contractor under TUPE, the contract award decision has to be made by Cabinet.
- 5.2 In line with the Procurement Governance Arrangements that form part of the Council's Constitution, this report acts as the process to consult with and take soundings from Cabinet Members and the Corporate Resources and Governance Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
- 5.3 This report sets out the planned procurement activity over the next few months where the contract value is between the EU threshold (£164,176) and £10m. This will give members visibility of all procurement activity within these thresholds and the opportunity to identify whether any procurement reports should be brought to Cabinet for approval even though they are below the delegation threshold.
- 5.4 Individual procurements may be referred to Cabinet for an executive decision at the request of Cabinet, a Cabinet Member or the Chair of Corporate Resources and Governance Overview & Scrutiny Committee where there are sensitivities or requirements that necessitate a decision being made by Cabinet.
- 5.5 Procurements below £10m contract value that are not listed on this or subsequent monthly reports can only be delegated to Chief Officers if specific approval is sought from Cabinet. Procurements above £10m contract value will still require an individual report to Cabinet in order for the award decision to be delegated to Chief Officers if appropriate.
- 5.6 A briefing note including financial information is appended to the Private report for each item on the schedule.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

- 6.1 A report approved by Council Business Management Committee on 16 February 2016 set out the case for introducing this process. The alternative option is that individual procurements are referred to Cabinet for decision.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):

- 7.1 To enable Cabinet to identify whether any reports for procurement activities should be brought to this meeting for specific executive decision, otherwise they will be dealt with under Chief Officer delegations up to the value of £10m, unless TUPE applies to current Council staff.

Signatures:**Date:**

.....
Nigel Kletz – Director of Commissioning & Procurement

.....

.....
Councillor Majid Mahmood - Value for Money and Efficiency

.....

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:**List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):**

Appendix 1 - Planned Procurement Activity March 2017 – May 2017

Report Version	1	Dated	30/01/2017
-----------------------	---	--------------	------------

APPENDIX 1 – PLANNED PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES (MARCH 2017 - MAY 2017)

Type of Report	Title of Procurement	Ref	Brief Description	Contract Duration	Directorate	Portfolio Value for Money and Efficiency Plus	Finance Officer	Contact Name	Planned CO Decision Date	Comments - including any request from Cabinet Members for more details	Living Wage apply Y / N
Approval To Tender Strategy	Resources to Support ICT Transition and Contract Negotiation	TBC	The budget consultation includes the opportunity to negotiate reductions of approx. £10m pa in the Council's ICT spend. In addition the Council is commencing transition to a new set of arrangements over the period to April 2021 as the current contract with Service Birmingham expires.	4 years	Change and Supprt Services	Deputy Leader	Alison Jarrett	Andy Fullard / Nigel Kletz	17/03/2017		Y
Approval To Tender (SCN)	Public Health Primary Care Data Extraction System (MSDi)	TBC	MSDi is a web based software currently installed in 207 GP practices across the city, extracting data for public health services including NHS Health Checks and sexual health. Monthly reports allow public health to monitor performance, quality assure, monitor compliance and provide an electronic system for generating payments.	2 years, 1 month	People	Health and Social Care	Peter Woodhall	Kathy Lee / Robert Cummins	17/03/2017		Y

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	CABINET
Report of:	City Solicitor
Date of Decision:	14 February 2017
SUBJECT:	APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES
Key Decision: No	Relevant Forward Plan Ref:
If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box)	Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/>
	O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/>
Relevant Cabinet Member(s):	Cllr John Clancy
Relevant O&S Chairman:	Cllr Mohammed Aikhlaq, Chairman of Corporate Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Wards affected:	City Wide

1. Purpose of report:

The report seeks the approval of the Cabinet to the appointment of representatives to serve on outside bodies detailed in the appendix to this report.

2. Decision(s) recommended:

That Cabinet agrees to appoint representatives to serve on the Outside Bodies detailed in the appendix to this report.

Lead Contact Officer(s):	Celia Janney
Telephone No:	Committee Services
E-mail address:	Tel: 0121 303 7034
	e-mail: celia.janney@birmingham.gov.uk

3. Consultation

3.1 Internal

Councillor John Clancy, Leader of the Council.

For appropriate items, the Secretaries to the Political Groups represented on the Council.

3.2 External

4. Compliance Issues:

4.1 Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?

The appointments are consistent with the legal and constitutional requirements of the City Council.

4.2 Financial Implications (Will decisions be carried out within existing finances and Resources?)

There are no additional resource implications.

4.3 Legal Implications

See paragraph 4.1.

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

The main risk of not making appointments might lead to the City Council not being represented at meetings of the bodies concerned. It is always important in making appointments to have regard to the City Council's equal opportunities policies.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

At the Annual General Meeting on 22 May, 2012, the City Council approved changes to the Constitution and Article 11 sets out those appointments that are reserved to the full City Council to determine. All other appointments of Members and officers to outside bodies shall be within the remit of Cabinet to determine and the proportionality rules will not automatically apply.

6. Evaluation of alternative option(s):

Not applicable, as these appointments are a matter for the Cabinet to determine.

7. Reasons for Decision(s):

To approve the appointment of representatives to serve on Outside Bodies.

Signatures**Date**

Cabinet Member

Chief Officer

List of Background Documents used to compile this Report:

1. Report of the Council Business Management Committee to City Council on 24 May 2005 "Annual Review of the City Council's Constitution"; along with relevant e-mails/ file(s)/correspondence on such appointments.

List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any):

1. Appendix to Report to Cabinet 14 February 17 – Appointments to Outside Bodies

APPENDIX TO REPORT TO CABINET 14 February 2017
APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**1. Summary of Decisions**

With reference to those bodies included in this report where the terms of office of City Council representatives expire, the Cabinet is asked to note that, where appropriate, the representatives have been contacted and in accordance with the practice agreed by Resolution No. 2769, of the former General Purposes Committee unless indicated, are not willing to be re-appointed. Accordingly, unless indicated in this report, such representatives are not willing to be re-appointed.

2. Alderson Disabled Ex-Servicemen's Trust

Four Representative Trustees, need not be Members of the Council, appointed for four years.

The term of office of Hon. Ald. Anita Ward (Lab) expires on 28 February 2017. The Honorary Alderman has confirmed that she would like to serve for a further term.

The other appointees are Cllr Chatfield (Lab), Cllr John Lines (Con), Lord Mayor (Ex-officio) and Hon. Ald. Jim Whorwood (Lib Dem).

Therefore, it is

RECOMMENDED:-

That Cabinet agrees to the re-appointment of Hon. Ald. Anita Ward from 1 March 2017 until 28 February 2021 as Representative Trustee.