

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

A. To the Leader of the Council

1. **High Value Properties**
From Councillor Gareth Moore.
2. **Cross Town Traffic**
From Councillor Deirdre Alden
3. **Minuting of Oral Questions**
From Councillor Jon Hunt

B To the Deputy Leader of the Council

1. **Drive my Car**
From Councillor Gary Sambrook
2. **Tax Man**
From Councillor Robert Alden
3. **Impact – Budget Projections**
From Councillor Jon Hut
4. **Missing Artwork**
From Councillor Deirdre Alden

C To the Cabinet Member for Children's Services

1. **Support to Families and Children (1)**
From Councillor Gareth Moore.
2. **Support to Families and Children (2)**
From Councillor Debbie Clancy

3. **Homestart Grants**

From Councillor Randal Brew

D To the Cabinet Member for Commissioning, Contract and Improvement

1. **Amey Contract – Work back in-house**

From Councillor Roger Harmer

2. **Care Workers – Living Wage**

From Councillor Jon Hunt

E To the Cabinet Member for Development, Transport and the Economy

1. **Properties 1**

From Councillor Gary Sambrook

2. **Properties 2**

From Councillor Ron Storer

3. **Living in the City**

From Councillor Rob Sealey

4. **Another House in a Park**

From Councillor Robert Alden

5. **Preserving our Heritage**

From Councillor Timothy Huxtable

6. **Cars**

From Councillor Deirdre Alden

7. **New Housing Units in Birmingham**

From Councillor Alex Yip

8. **Brownfield Sites Development 2**

From Councillor Ken Wood

9. Brownfield Sites Development

From Councillor David Barrie

F To the Cabinet Member for Sustainability

1. Highway to Charges

From Councillor Deirdre Alden

2. Red Card

From Councillor Randal Brew

3. Damaged Wheelie Bins

From Councillor Jon Hunt

4. Damaged Wheelie Bins in last year

From Councillor Karen Trench

5. Green Waste Sacks

From Roger Harmer

G To the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Management and Homes

1. Park Life

From Councillor Timothy Huxtable

2. Park Spaces

From Councillor Robert Alden

H To the Chair of Trusts and Charities Committee

Get off my Land

From Councillor Timothy Huxtable

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

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

“High Value Properties”

Question:

Under the draft proposals to force Councils to sell high value Council Housing Properties, how many council properties in Birmingham would fall into this category due to their value?

Answer:

The details of the operation of these proposals (which are contained within the draft Housing and Planning Bill) are still evolving, and in particular the range of property types that are likely to be exempt from the requirements to sell high value void properties is not yet settled.

Based on our current assessment of the valuation of properties held within the Housing Revenue Account, and the proposals as they currently stand, it is likely that very few of Birmingham’s council properties would be required to be sold.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

“Cross Town Traffic”

Question:

**When did the Leader become aware of any discussions as part of the
Birmingham Plan of a congestion style scheme for Birmingham?**

Answer:

There is no plan for congestion charging in Birmingham.

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

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

"Minuting of Oral Questions"

Question:

As there is no longer any minuting of oral questions in the Council, will the Leader ensure that archives of questions asked by Councillors and members of the public remain publicly available in perpetuity?

Answer:

Minuting of oral questions ceased on 3rd February 2015.

Live recordings of City Council meetings which include oral questions are kept for six months by Birmingham News Room. In addition to this, complete recordings of City Council meetings are kept in perpetuity by Committee & Members' Services.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

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

“Drive my Car”

Question:

When did the Deputy Leader become aware of any discussions as part of the Birmingham Plan of a congestion style scheme for Birmingham?

Answer:

There is no plan for congestion charging in Birmingham.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

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

“Tax Man”

Question:

After a resident has made a monthly payment for their Council Tax, how many days must the Council say has passed before they can change their direct debit for future payments?

Answer:

Changes to council tax liability can be made at any time, but legislation requires council tax payers to be given a minimum of 14 days' notice of any payment due.

This means that any instalment due within the 14 days following an account amendment will remain unaltered, but subsequent instalments will be recalculated taking this expected payment into account.

This applies equally to all methods of payment, including direct debit.

Council tax is payable in 10 statutory monthly instalments over the year, although council tax payers can opt for 12 instalments if they wish.

We encourage council tax payers to pay by direct debit as it is not only the most convenient way to pay, but also reduces the authority's collection and administration costs.

The default due date for instalments is the first of each month, but in common with most other authorities Birmingham offers direct debit payers a choice of dates to encourage take-up.

Monthly payers can choose to pay on the 8th, 15th, 21st or 28th of the month.

We also offer a payment date of 1st April to council tax payers who opt to pay annually or half-yearly.

Full details, and an online direct debit form, are available on our website at <https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/directdebit>.

If Councillor Alden is aware of a specific case, I will arrange for the matter to be looked into further if he provides me with the relevant details.

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT

"Impact - Budget Projections"

Question:

Could the Deputy Leader set out, year by year, the projected impact of the local government settlement on the Council's budget projections, including projections for income from business rates?

Answer:

The Government announced the provisional local government finance settlement for 2016/17 to 2019/20 on 17 December 2015. A briefing note of the same date to the Leaders of each of the political groups indicated the level of funding the Government has calculated will be received by Birmingham City Council over that period. The 2016/17 settlement will be confirmed around the end of January 2016.

The Council has previously lobbied the Government, on a cross-party basis, for the implementation of the "Fairer Funding" proposal, in its approach to the allocation of grant reductions. The Government has now fully adopted these proposals in their calculations.

Despite the positive effect to Birmingham of these proposals being adopted, the City Council's 2016/17 Spending Power (Corporate Government Grants, plus locally-retained Business Rates and Council Tax) will reduce by 4.8% according to the Government's calculation. This compares to a national average reduction of 2.8%, based on the assumption that all Social Care authorities implement the social care precept. The City Council's reduction in Spending Power is greater than the national average because it generates a lower proportion of its income from the social care precept.

A summary of the estimated level of resources, based on the information available at the time of the local government finance settlement, is attached below.

The expected level of business rates income in 2016/17 will be approved at the Cabinet meeting on 26 January 2016.

Appendix 1 Government Spending Power Comparisons									
Funding Stream	2015/16 adj	2016/17		2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
	£m	£m	Variance %	£m	Variance %	£m	Variance %	£m	Variance %
Top Up Grant	126.017	127.067	0.8%	129.566	2.0%	133.388	2.9%	137.652	3.2%
RSG	286.790	226.587	-21.0%	177.752	-21.6%	143.992	-19.0%	109.743	-23.8%
Locally Retained Business Rates	199.104	200.763	0.8%	204.712	2.0%	210.751	2.9%	217.487	3.2%
Subtotal SFA	611.911	554.417	-9.4%	512.030	-7.6%	488.131	-4.7%	464.882	-4.8%
Other Spending Power Grants:									
New Homes Bonus	18.835	20.981	11.4%	21.094	0.5%	13.253	-37.2%	12.716	-4.1%
Subtotal Government Grant and Business Rates	630.746	575.398	-8.8%	533.124	-7.3%	501.384	-6.0%	477.598	-4.7%
Council Tax	271.175	277.721	2.4%	285.829	2.9%	294.462	3.0%	303.654	3.1%
Social Care Precept	0.000	5.483	N/A	11.37	107.4%	17.722	55.9%	24.588	38.7%
Improved Better Care Fund	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.728	N/A	31.268	364.7%	52.389	67.5%
Total Spending Power	901.921	858.602	-4.8%	837.051	-2.5%	844.836	0.9%	858.229	1.6%
England Average Spending Power % Change	44501.321	43254.758	-2.8%	42690.138	-1.3%	43170.302	1.1%	44278.858	2.6%

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

“Missing Artwork”

Question:

In December there was an article in the Daily Telegraph about missing artwork from around the country and it said that the four large two-dimensional bulls which used to decorate the sides of the old Bull Ring were taken down prior to demolition and have not been seen since.

Does anyone at the Council know where they are?

Answer:

At the time of the redevelopment, unfortunately the Council had no agreed policy on the decommissioning of public art (as approved by Cabinet last year as part of the Public Art Strategy) and the importance of these works was not appreciated as it might have been today.

Planning approvals for the new Bullring included requirements for new public art, both to fulfil the city’s planning requirements and also to compensate for the loss of historic pieces and this included the new bull statue and the relocation and restoration of the Nelson statue. In addition, glasswork, a poetry trail, light wands and work set into the Moor St railings were integrated into the new development and there was a requirement for architectural restoration at Moor St Station. The Spiral Café and water feature were also included, and subsequently were remodelled as part of the Spiceal Street development.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER OF CHILDREN SERVICES
FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

“Support to Families and Children (1)”

Question:

Can the Cabinet Member advise me of the total cost, including the number of families and children helped, by Birmingham City Council directly for the last three financial years 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 (to date).

Answer:

The figures below include costs for all Young People and Families that have been supported under Early Help & Children’s Social Care including Disabled Children’s Social Care. This includes Family support but does not include any costs in relation to Children’s Centres.

Year	Cost	Numbers	
		For social care CIN census return:	For Family Support Total between 1 st Jan to end Dec
2013/14	£147,136,146	19883 Inc. 1416 disabled	3934
2014/15	£142,118,182	25391 Inc. 1600 disabled	4535
2015/16	£154,572,780 (Forecast)	18512 Inc. 2016 disabled (note for this year, figures incomplete and will rise until end March 2016)	5447

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER OF CHILDREN SERVICES
FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

“Support to Families and Children (2)”

Question:

Can the Cabinet Member advise me of the level of support given to families and children by each of the individual operating units of Homestart in Birmingham, for the three financial years 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 (to date), giving in each case, the number of families offered support, the number of children supported, the number of families receiving regular home visiting support, the number of families on average attending Family Group sessions, and the number of children subject to Child Protection Plans.

Answer:

2013/14	Families	Children	Home Visits received	Group sessions facilitated	Children subject to Child Protection Plans
Bartley Green & Quinton	130	152	635	N/A	34
Birmingham North West	99	104	900	162	12
Castle Vale	154	233	1514	N/A	10
Cole Valley	118	219	575	N/A	18
Stockland Green	316	357	480	N/A	16
Northfield	110	239	547	N/A	33

2014/15	Families	Children	Home Visits	Group sessions	Child Protection Plans
Bartley Green & Quinton	142	152	1398	N/A	36
Birmingham North West	54	118	496	213	2
Castle Vale	50	121	612	N/A	13
Cole Valley	89	149	231	N/A	5
Stockland Green	107	334	618	N/A	10
Northfield	107	169	552	N/A	44

2015/16 April - September	Families	Children	Home Visits	Group sessions	Child Protection Plans
Bartley Green & Quinton	45	113	514	N/A	5
Birmingham North West	37	51	88	100	7
Castle Vale	24	153	122	N/A	13
Cole Valley	72	150	118	N/A	6
Stockland Green	150	315	286	N/A	
Northfield	Data not submitted				

N.B. cases will have transferred across financial years so there will be a small element of duplication

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER OF CHILDREN SERVICES
FROM COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW**

“Homestart Grants”

Question:

Can the Cabinet Member advise me of the level of grants made to the individual operating units of Homestart in Birmingham for the three financial years 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16, together with the present predicted levels of such grants for 2016-17 included in the Council’s Business Plan 2016+ currently out for consultation.

Answer:

The level of grant funding received from Birmingham City Council for the individual operating units of Homestart in Birmingham for 2013 – 14, 2014 – 15 and 2015 – 16 is shown below.

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Bartley Green & Quinton	£24,293	£24,293	£24,293
Birmingham North West	£15,184	£15,184	£15,184
Castle Vale	£33,248	£33,248	£33,248
Cole Valley	£46,853	£46,853	£46,853
Stockland Green	£48,907	£48,907	£48,907
Northfield	£36,666	£36,666	£36,666
	£205,152	£205,152	£205,152

Since the government has decided to drastically reduce the council's Public Health grant, the current source of Homestart funding, we are assessing current spend on Homestart and whether we are able to fund it from the also drastically cut general fund.

Homestart schemes do apply and secure other funding from charitable trusts and other funding bodies such as Henry Smith Trust; The Big Lottery; Awards for all; Community Centre; BBC Children in need; Lloyds TSB Foundation and Community Chest. The Council does not hold information about the current funding levels.

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMISSIONING,
CONTRACTING AND IMPROVEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER
HARMER**

"Amey Contract - Work back in-house"

Question:

Given that the Council is in discussions with Amey about its contract, would the Cabinet Member consider bringing the scheduling of work back in-house and drawing on the assistance of Ward Councillors to identify roads and pavements that do not need work (in spite of being scheduled for work by Amey's computers), as well as those that are desperately in need of work but appear not to feature on Amey's radar?

Answer:

The Council is currently discussing contract matters with Amey associated with the choice of schemes and their programming.

However, it is a fundamental principle underpinning the PFI grant that the City Council receives from Government (almost £1million per week) that the risk of determining and programming the works is carried out by Amey as the service provider. Therefore should they propose and conduct works that do not meet the requirements of the contract then Amey alone it carry the consequences, including appropriate penalties.

The contract between the City Council and Amey signed off by Cllr Paul Tilsley requires Amey to maintain the road network in an average "fair" condition for 20 years after the initial 5 year core investment period. Of course Members will realise that if some streets are in a "good" condition, to have a net average "fair" across the city some streets can be in a "poor" condition yet still within the terms of the contract overall.

Nevertheless the Council is constantly seeking to explore ways that improvements to programming and service delivery can be made, and particularly by using the local knowledge of Members, within the constraints above. I will report further on this when appropriate.

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMISSIONING
AND IMPROVEMENT FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

"Care Workers - Living Wage"

Question:

How many care workers providing services to clients of Birmingham City Council are not in receipt of the living wage?

Answer:

Approximately the same number as when the Tory/LibDem coalition ran the Council and Cllr Anderson was responsible for this service.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

“Properties 1”

Question:

**How many properties that the Council assumes will be built/completed in
Sutton Coldfield in 2015-2021?**

Answer:

It is estimated that between 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2021 approximately 1,700 homes will be built in Sutton Coldfield.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

“Properties 2”

Question:

**How many properties that the Council assumes will be built/completed in
Sutton Coldfield in 2021-2030?**

Answer:

It is estimated that between 1st April 2021 and 31st March 2030 approximately 4,000 homes will be built in Sutton Coldfield.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR ROB SEALEY**

“Living in the City”

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member inform me how many adults does the Cabinet Member believe will be living on the Selly Oak Hospital residential development site by May 2021.

Answer:

Outline planning consent was granted for the site in 2013. This permitted a maximum of 650 dwellings. Based on average household size, this would give a total of approximately 1,495 people living on the site. Applying the Birmingham average for the percentage of adult population 18yrs and over, an estimated 1,114 adults may live on the site, assuming the whole site is built-out by 2021.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT ALDEN**

“Another House in a Park”

Question:

Please provide a list of all the park land (including green open space, public open spaces and any other currently undeveloped land the Council considers within this category the council considers unwanted/under-utilised, including the area size and Ward of each piece?

Answer:

There is no detailed list of such sites, at this time. However Councillor Alden will be aware that such sites do exist, such as the former allotments at Jarvis Road, in his own ward, where the Council is building 116 new homes, and where I was delighted to see him attend the 'start on site' event, on 17th December. This was a site which had been disused for many years, and will now provide 116 much needed new homes for the people of Birmingham.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY
HUXTABLE**

“Preserving our Heritage”

Question:

With regard to written answer C1 at the City Council meeting on 1st December 2015, as the Cabinet Member can see from the attached e-mail sent to Amey Birmingham Highways Limited, I raised the issue of the need for the ‘heritage’ school crossing sign that was on Bournville Village Green to be restored on 14/4/15. This was immediately I realised the sign had been removed.

Unfortunately the reply I received to this e-mail was that Amey Birmingham Highways Limited had inadvertently discarded this sign after its removal and that it could not be located.

Given the above timescale, and the earlier action taken by myself on (14/4/15), the Cabinet Member may wish to revisit his comment that “it is a pity that you did not raise this with me sooner, rather than waiting to raise this matter at Council. Earlier action may have saved the original sign” as it is quite clear this sign has not been able to be located since April 2015.

Would the Cabinet Member for Development, Transport and the Economy commit to leaving no stone unturned in search for an equivalent sign?

Answer:

While I regret the loss of this sign by Amey, I cannot add to my previous response, except to emphasise that every reasonable effort will be made to find a replacement.

Amey have confirmed that they continue to search across the country for an equivalent sign.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

“Cars”

Question:

When did the Cabinet Member for Development, Transport and Economy become aware of any discussions as part of the Birmingham Plan of a congestion style scheme for Birmingham?

Answer:

There is no plan for congestion charging in Birmingham.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

“New Housing Units in Birmingham”

Question:

What is the total number of new housing units in Birmingham that can be created in sites that have approved planning permission but have not commenced work, including how old the planning permission and any that lapsed, without any work happening, in the last ten years?

Answer:

There are 4013 dwellings on sites with unimplemented planning permissions in Birmingham. Of these, 1106 dwellings are on sites where planning permission was granted in 2012/13, 1028 dwellings are on sites where planning permission was granted in 2013/14 and 1879 dwellings are on sites where planning permission was granted in 2014/15.

In the last 10 years there was a capacity of 5059 dwellings on sites with planning permission which lapsed. The number of dwellings which have lapsed by year are as follows:

Year in which Permission Lapsed	Dwellings on Lapsed Permissions
2006/07	94
2007/08	18
2007/08	49
2008/09	82
2009/10	99
2010/11	1245
2011/12	350
2012/13	128
2013/14	1519
2014/15	1475
Total 2006/15	5059

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

“Brownfield Sites Development 2”

Question:

How many new housing units can potentially be built in brownfield sites across Birmingham, including the number of units per ward and the number of sites per ward?"

Answer:

City wide there are 1297 Brownfield sites with a capacity of 32,863 dwellings which are suitable for residential development. The distribution by ward is shown in the following table:

Ward	Number of Sites	Number of Dwellings
Acocks Green	38	571
Aston	54	1547
Bartley Green	22	281
Billesley	16	144
Bordesley Green	20	138
Bournville	24	903
Brandwood	19	390
Edgbaston	37	830
Erdington	31	736
Hall Green	19	238
Handsworth Wood	33	331
Harborne	30	269
Hodge Hill	24	199
Kings Norton	18	264
Kingstanding	16	285
Ladywood	133	7316
Longbridge	24	1524
Lozells and East Handsworth	69	803
Moseley and Kings Heath	55	223
Nechells	88	6881

Northfield	20	129
Oscott	22	466
Perry Barr	12	601
Quinton	14	114
Selly Oak	25	784
Shard End	33	514
Sheldon	18	326
Soho	38	897
South Yardley	19	273
Sparkbrook	49	566
Springfield	30	886
Stechford and Yardley North	18	596
Stockland Green	40	488
Sutton Four Oaks	34	123
Sutton New Hall	31	135
Sutton Trinity	45	831
Sutton Vesey	28	92
Tyburn	16	526
Washwood Heath	25	325
Weoley	10	318
City Total	1297	32,863

Source: Birmingham Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2015

In addition to the identified sites (above), it is anticipated that land for around 6000 additional dwellings will become available on Brownfield 'windfall' sites over the next 15 years. 'Windfalls' are sites which become available unexpectedly and their locations cannot be anticipated in advance.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DEVELOPMENT,
TRANSPORT AND THE ECONOMY FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BARRIE**

“Brownfield Sites Development”

Question:

How many new housing units are potentially available in brownfield sites in each ward for developers to regenerate/Birmingham residents to live in?

Answer:

City wide there are 1297 Brownfield sites with a capacity of 32,863 dwellings which are suitable for residential development. The distribution by ward is shown in the following table:

Ward	Number of Sites	Number of Dwellings
Acocks Green	38	571
Aston	54	1547
Bartley Green	22	281
Billesley	16	144
Bordesley Green	20	138
Bournville	24	903
Brandwood	19	390
Edgbaston	37	830
Erdington	31	736
Hall Green	19	238
Handsworth Wood	33	331
Harborne	30	269
Hodge Hill	24	199
Kings Norton	18	264
Kingstanding	16	285
Ladywood	133	7316
Longbridge	24	1524
Lozells and East Handsworth	69	803
Moseley and Kings Heath	55	223
Nechells	88	6881
Northfield	20	129

Oscott	22	466
Perry Barr	12	601
Quinton	14	114
Selly Oak	25	784
Shard End	33	514
Sheldon	18	326
Soho	38	897
South Yardley	19	273
Sparkbrook	49	566
Springfield	30	886
Stechford and Yardley North	18	596
Stockland Green	40	488
Sutton Four Oaks	34	123
Sutton New Hall	31	135
Sutton Trinity	45	831
Sutton Vesey	28	92
Tyburn	16	526
Washwood Heath	25	325
Weoley	10	318
City Total	1297	32,863

Source: Birmingham Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2015

In addition to the identified sites (above), it is anticipated that land for around 6000 additional dwellings will become available on Brownfield 'windfall' sites over the next 15 years. 'Windfalls' are sites which become available unexpectedly and their locations cannot be anticipated in advance.

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABILITY
FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

“Highway to Charges”

Question:

When did the Cabinet Member for Sustainability become aware of any discussions as part of the Birmingham Plan of a congestion style scheme for Birmingham?

Answer:

There is no plan for congestion charging in Birmingham.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABILITY
FROM COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW**

“Red Card”

Question:

The final roll-out for wheelie-bins took place in November from our Lifford Lane depot.

In respect of this Depot can the Cabinet Member advise me, by Ward, of the number of homes supplied with bins, the number who were originally assessed as “green” but later amended to “red”, the number who are retained on the black sacks system, the number of assisted collections registered, and for the first two collection cycles, the number of missed collections recorded showing recyclables and general household rubbish separately.

Answer:

Depot	Ward	Total	Green (Bins)	Red (Sacks)	Assisted Collection Service	Properties changed from Green to Red
LIFFORD	Total	107,573	101,541	6,032	3,990	553
	Bartley Green	10,233	9,987	246	384	69
	Billesley	9,826	9,441	385	274	56
	Bournville	10,035	9,225	810	258	128
	Brandwood	9,105	8,721	384	608	1
	Edgbaston	3,963	3,729	234	116	54
	Harborne	7,758	7,018	740	348	3
	Kings Norton	9,300	8,717	583	296	72
	Longbridge	10,273	9,804	469	395	23
	Northfield	10,231	9,693	538	425	49
	Quinton	9,246	8,977	269	380	53
	Selly Oak	8,041	7,197	844	119	31
	Weoley	9,562	9,032	530	387	14

Missed Collections reported from 16 November 2015 to 13 December 2015								
Depot	Ward	Total Missed Collections	Missed Residual (Total)	Missed Residual (Individual Property)	Missed Residual (Whole Road)	Missed Recycling (Total)	Missed Recycling (Individual Property)	Missed Recycling (Whole Road)
LIFFORD	Total	4376	2650	1541	1109	1726	836	890
	Bartley Green	404	242	141	101	162	90	72
	Billesley	369	284	123	161	85	50	35
	Bournville	355	191	107	84	164	75	89
	Brandwood	298	215	121	94	83	40	43
	Edgbaston	376	176	100	76	200	102	98
	Harborne	405	241	147	94	164	67	97
	Kings Norton	440	274	156	118	166	81	85
	Longbridge	392	251	152	99	141	60	81
	Northfield	402	175	114	61	227	87	140
	Quinton	232	156	120	36	76	54	22
	Selly Oak	242	154	80	74	88	37	51
	Weoley	461	291	180	111	170	93	77

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABILITY
FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

"Damaged Wheelie Bins"

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member say how many wheelie bins delivered as part of the Perry Barr rollout have been reported as damaged, stating what proportion of those have been accepted as the Council's responsibility?

Answer:

PERRY BARR			
Total		Damaged by CREW	Damaged by CUSTOMER
Total	197	16	181
Mar-15	1	0	1
Apr-15	5	0	5
May-15	1	0	1
Jun-15	39	3	36
Jul-15	23	2	21
Aug-15	18	1	17
Sep-15	31	0	31
Oct-15	31	2	29
Nov-15	25	7	18
Dec-15	23	1	22

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABILITY
FROM COUNCILLOR KAREN TRENCH**

"Damaged Wheelie Bins in last year"

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member say how many wheelie bins have been reported as damaged in the last year, stating what proportion of those have been accepted as the Council's responsibility?

Answer:

	Total	Damaged by Crew	Damaged by Customer
Total	580	137	443
Jan-15	10	2	8
Feb-15	14	1	13
Mar-15	13	0	13
Apr-15	16	0	16
May-15	14	0	14
Jun-15	56	4	52
Jul-15	56	4	52
Aug-15	51	4	47
Sep-15	59	5	54
Oct-15	62	9	53
Nov-15	70	17	53
Dec-15	159	91	68

CITY COUNCIL - 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABILITY
FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

"Green Waste Sacks"

Question:

A number of residents, mostly elderly, have been told to accept wheelie bins rather than sacks for their paid green waste collection. For a number, being asked to handle a third wheelie bins, this has proved the last straw, especially when the access from rear gardens to the front is poor. Could the Cabinet Member say whether these paying clients of Fleet and Waste will be able to get a re-assessment of their circumstances if they request to stay with the green waste sack collections?

Answer:

The (optional) green waste service has been developed over the last three years in conjunction with the rollout of wheelie bins across the City and which is now completed.

We have a record number of orders for the service in this year to date.

Where properties are deemed suitable for bins we are encouraging residents to use a green wheelie bin service for reasons of efficiency and economy and where the resident needs an assisted collection this will be provided. The service aims to recover its costs.

We recognise in a small number of cases that there may be additional needs and consequently are reviewing how best these can be met, especially where the resident feels that they are not able to manoeuvre their garden waste bin in their garden.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD
MANAGEMENT AND HOMES FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

“Park Life”

Question:

In the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+ SN45: Disposal of unwanted/under-utilised parks land (8 acres per year) provides for the transfer from Birmingham City Council Parks to Birmingham City Council Housing of 8 acres of park land per annum to build new homes over the next five years.

Would the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Management and Homes as part of the consultation process list the locations of the 32 acres of unwanted/under-utilised parks land?

Answer:

The sites that have currently been declared surplus are listed below. These sites have been identified and passed to Property Services for disposal. We constantly review our land portfolio, and where additional sites are identified for potential disposal, these will go through the prescribed consultation process before being added to the list.

The sites are

Wychbury Road Allotments Bartley Green 2.5 Acres

Dawberry Fields Allotments Selly Oak 5.44 Acres

Garwood Road Allotments Stechford and Yardley North 2.33 Acres

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD
MANAGEMENT AND HOMES FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT ALDEN**

“Park Spaces”

Question:

Listing separately please list the geographical area size of every park/public open space in Birmingham City Council’s borders?

Answer:

We do have a comprehensive list of all parks with their sizes. Also included within the list are the parks we maintain outside the city's boundary, such as the Lickey Hills. As you can imagine with well over 500 parks the information will be best presented to you electronically. I will arrange for this information to be sent you.

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JANUARY 2016

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF TRUSTS AND CHARITIES
COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

“Get off my Land”

Question:

Would Councillor Davis provide an update with regard to which piece of land Birmingham City Council wish to re-designate as ‘Trust’ land to replace the land (former bowling green) Birmingham City Council held in trust which is now a car park on the new Stirchley Baths Community Centre Site, noting the wishes of both the Bournville Ward Committee and the local community that the land should be within the Bournville Ward.

Could Councillor Davis in his update consider the re-designation of the derelict brownfield land owned by Birmingham Properties Service along Hazelwell Street, Stirchley Baths Community Centre site and create a community garden/orchard on this site to replace the open space list as part of the Stirchley Baths redevelopment.

Answer:

I am happy to report to Full Council that the relocation of the Trust status from part of the land at Stirchley Recreational Ground was resolved last Summer in time to allow the successful completion of the new Stirchley Baths Community Centre which is now open to the public. The involvement of the Trust was required to allow the use of part of the Trust’s recreational land as the main car park for the Community Centre. A report was brought to the Full Council meeting on 4th March 2014 to deal with this and to which the motion was agreed allowing land within Bournville Ward and outside it to be considered as an alternative site for the trust land.

This matter was procedurally complex in that in addition to the trust status it was also specially designated as land for open space recreational purposes and would also be a disposal to a ‘connected party’ (Birmingham City Council). Any transfer would in addition to meeting normal best value considerations also required the consent of the original giftors and of the Charity Commission who also made clear that the alternative venue must have equal but preferably larger size or merit in terms of its recreational value. Of equal consideration was that the Stirchley Recreational Ground Trust having no revenue or capital funds at its disposal, it was important that

any alternative did not create or increase costs to the Trust or to the City Council generally.

Local consultation did express a strong preference for the substitute land to be located within the Ward and this was fully considered and while the decision was delayed as long as possible to allow new options to come forward the need to progress the Community Centre development ultimately concluded that the best option for the Trust available at the time was to re-site this trust status to land at Muntz Park which although just outside of the Ward is close to it and within the District. That land measures 2.28 hectares of existing park land managed by the Parks service compared to the land surrendered of 0.153 hectares. The matter was ratified by an Order from the Charity Commission on 4th August 2015.

A large number of sites, both green field and brown, and inside and outside of the Ward were considered but in seeking the most appropriate solution for the Trust to comply with the above requirements limited the options available. A community orchard project on trust land would very likely be supported by the Trusts & Charities Committee and indeed a number already exist in general parks in the City but the site suggested although close to the new Community Centre and in need of improvement was not considered suitable in this instance. The Community Orchard proposal would of course bring valid community and recreational value to the site but if at any time in the future the project ceased or relocated it would not be possible to prove the site itself could meet the requirements set down.