



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD
ON TUESDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2020 AT 1400 HOURS AS AN ON-LINE
MEETING**

PRESENT:- Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Yvonne Mosquito) in the Chair.

Councillors

Muhammad Afzal	Kath Hartley	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Adam Higgs	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Charlotte Hodiala	Gareth Moore
Safia Akhtar	Penny Holbrook	Simon Morrall
Robert Alden	Jon Hunt	John O'Shea
Olly Armstrong	Mahmood Hussain	David Pears
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Shabrana Hussain	Robert Pocock
Baber Baz	Timothy Huxtable	Julien Pritchard
Bob Beauchamp	Mohammed Idrees	Hendrina Quinnen
Matt Bennett	Zafar Iqbal	Chauhdry Rashid
Kate Booth	Ziaul Islam	Carl Rice
Sir Albert Bore	Morriam Jan	Lou Robson
Nicky Brennan	Kerry Jenkins	Gary Sambrook
Marje Bridle	Meirion Jenkins	Kath Scott
Mick Brown	Julie Johnson	Lucy Seymour-Smith
Tristan Chatfield	Brigid Jones	Shafique Shah
Debbie Clancy	Josh Jones	Mike Sharpe
Liz Clements	Nagina Kauser	Sybil Spence
Maureen Cornish	Mariam Khan	Ron Storer
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Sharon Thompson
Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Paul Tilsley
Adrian Delaney	Chaman Lal	Lisa Trickett
Barbara Dring	Mike Leddy	Ian Ward
Peter Fowler	Bruce Lines	Mike Ward
Eddie Freeman	Mary Locke	Suzanne Webb
Fred Grindrod	Ewan Mackey	Ken Wood
Paulette Hamilton	Majid Mahmood	Alex Yip
Roger Harmer	Zhor Malik	Waseem Zaffar

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

NOTICE OF RECORDING

19374 The Deputy Lord Mayor advised that the meeting would be webcast for live and subsequent broadcasting via the Council's internet site and that members of the Press/Public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

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

The Deputy Lord Mayor requested that Members ensure that their video cameras are switched off unless called to speak and that their microphone is switched off when they are not speaking.

The Deputy Lord Mayor advised Members that If they wished to speak, to indicate in the chat function and wait to be invited to speak and to state their name at the start of every contribution.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

19375 The Deputy Lord Mayor reminded Members that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests relating to any items of business to be discussed at this meeting

Any declarations would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

Councillor Alex Yip indicated that his sister worked for National Express who provided home to school transport.

Councillor Paul Tilsley indicated that he had solar panels on the roof of his home.

MINUTES

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

19376 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2020 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Death of Former Councillor James Sweeney

The Deputy Lord Mayor indicated that her announcement was a sad one in that she had to inform the Chamber of the death of former Councillor James Sweeney who was known as Jim. The Deputy Lord Mayor indicated that Jim

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

served as a Councillor for Longbridge Ward from May 1972 to May 1975 and died on 17 July leaving behind his wife Susi.

The Deputy Lord Mayor indicated that tributes to Jim would be reserved until such time as meetings were able to be held in the Council Chamber and in the meantime she invited all to join her in extending sincere condolences to Jim's wife Susi and all the family.

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

19377

RESOLVED:-

That this Council places on record its sorrow at the death of former Councillor James Sweeney and its appreciation of his devoted service to the residents of Birmingham. The Council extends its deepest sympathy to members of Jim's family in their sad bereavement.

PETITIONS

Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented prior to the Meeting

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 1)

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

19378

RESOLVED:-

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

Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented at the Meeting

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 2)

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

19379

RESOLVED:-

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

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Petitions Update

The following Petitions Update had been made available electronically:-

(See document No. 3)

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

19380 **RESOLVED:-**

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

EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDERS

19381 **RESOLVED:-**

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

- Increase the time for item No. 7 (Question Time) to 80 minutes and allocate the time as follows:-
 - A. Questions from Members of the Public to any Cabinet Member or Ward Forum Chair (10 minutes)
 - B. Questions from any Councillor to a Committee Chair, Lead Member of a Joint Board or Ward Forum Chair (Up to 10 minutes)
 - C. Questions from Councillors other than Cabinet Members to a Cabinet Member (Up to 30 minutes)
 - D. Questions from Councillors other than Cabinet Member to the Leader or Deputy Leader (Up to 30 minutes)
 - Allocate 30 minutes to agenda item 8 (Update on Birmingham City Council's Response to Covid 19)
 - Allocate 40 minutes to agenda item 9 (Route to Zero Interim Report)
 - Allocate 40 minutes to agenda item 10 (Home to School Transport Inquiry)
 - Allocate 10 minutes to agenda item 11 (Annual Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel 201920)
 - No Motions be submitted by individual Councillors at the meeting
-

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

EXTENTION OF TIME FOR VARIOUS ITEMS AND THE MEETING

Councillor Robert Alden indicated that he understood that there were a number of amendments at the meeting and proposed that the time for various items should be extended as follows:-

Agenda item 9 (Route to Zero Interim Report) increase the time further by 40 minutes.

Agenda item 10 (Home to School Transport Inquiry) increase the time further by 15 minutes.

The meeting be extended by 55 minutes to conclude at 1840 hours

Councillor Jon Hunt seconded the proposal

The Deputy Lord Mayor put the proposal to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19382 **RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That the time for consideration of Agenda item 9 (Route to Zero Interim Report) be extended by 40 minutes;
- (ii) that the time for consideration of Agenda item 10 (Home to School Transport Inquiry) be extended by 15 minutes; and
- (iii) that the meeting be extended by 55 minutes to conclude at 1840 hours

In reply to a query from Councillor Majid Mahmood, the Deputy Lord Mayor confirmed that the Council as Trustee meeting scheduled at 1745 hours would begin at the conclusion of this meeting

QUESTION TIME

19383 The Council proceeded to consider Oral Questions in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure (B4.4 F of the Constitution).

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

UPDATE ON BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO COVID-19

The following report of the Cabinet was submitted:-

(See document No 4)

The Leader Councillor Ian Ward presented the report and the recommendation was seconded.

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

A debate ensued during which a number of members paid tribute to the work of staff of the City Council, people in the third sector and people in local communities in helping vulnerable citizens during the Covid 19 pandemic.

The Leader Councillor Ian Ward replied to the debate.

The recommendation having been moved and seconded was agreed.

It was therefore-

19384 **RESOLVED:-**

That the report be noted.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

17385 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council be adjourned until 1623 hours on this day.

The Council then adjourned at 1617 hours.

At 1627 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

ROUTE TO ZERO INTERIM REPORT

The following report of the Acting Director Inclusive Growth was submitted:-

(See document No 5)

Councillor Waseem Zaffar moved the motion which was seconded.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Roger Harmer and Julien Pritchard gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 6)

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

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Tristan Chatfield and Sharon Thompson gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 6)

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Councillor Tristan Chatfield moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Sharon Thompson.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Robert Alden and Ewan Mackey gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 7)

Councillor Robert Alden moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Ewan Mackey.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Peter Fowler and Gareth Moore gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 8)

Councillor Peter Fowler moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Gareth Moore.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Paul Tilsley and Jon Hunt gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 9)

Councillor Paul Tilsley moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor John Hunt.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Waseem Zaffar replied to the debate.

The first amendment in the names of Councillors Roger Harmer and Julien Pritchard having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be lost.

For the amendment (26)

Robert Alden	Jon Hunt	Chauhdry Rashid
Baber Baz	Timothy Huxtable	Gary Sambrook
Debbie Clancy	Morriam Jan	Sybil Spence
Maureen Cornish	Bruce Lines	Ron Storer
Adrian Delaney	Ewan Mackey	Paul Tilsley
Peter Fowler	Gareth Moore	Mike Ward
Roger Harmer	Simon Morrall	Ken Wood
Adam Higgs	David Pears	Alex Yip
Charlotte Hodivala	Julien Pritchard	

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Against the amendment (48)

Muhammad Afzal	Kath Hartley	Majid Mahmood
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Penny Holbrook	Zhor Malik
Alex Aitken	Mahmood Hussain	Karen McCarthy
Safia Akhtar	Shabrana Hussain	Saddak Miah
Kate Booth	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Sir Albert Bore	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Nicky Brennan	Ziaul Islam	Robert Pocock
Marje Bridle	Julie Johnson	Hendrina Quinnen
Mick Brown	Brigid Jones	Carl Rice
Tristan Chatfield	Josh Jones	Kath Scott
Liz Clements	Nagina Kauser	Lucy Seymour-Smith
John Cotton	Mariam Khan	Shafique Shah
Phil Davis	Zaheer Khan	Mike Sharpe
Barbara Dring	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sharon Thompson
Eddie Freeman	Chaman Lal	Ian Ward
Fred Grindrod	Mike Leddy	Waseem Zaffar

Abstentions (5)

Olly Armstrong	Mary Locke	Lisa Trickett
Kerry Jenkins	Lou Robson	

The second amendment in the names of Councillors Tristan Chatfield and Sharon Thompson having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be carried.

For the amendment (59)

Muhammad Afzal	Jon Hunt	Saddak Miah
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Mahmood Hussain	Brett O'Reilly
Alex Aitken	Shabrana Hussain	John O'Shea
Safia Akhtar	Mohammed Idrees	Robert Pocock
Olly Armstrong	Zafar Iqbal	Hendrina Quinnen
Kate Booth	Ziaul Islam	Chauhdry Rashid
Sir Albert Bore	Kerry Jenkins	Carl Rice
Nicky Brennan	Julie Johnson	Lou Robson
Marje Bridle	Brigid Jones	Kath Scott
Mick Brown	Josh Jones	Lucy Seymour-Smith
Tristan Chatfield	Nagina Kauser	Shafique Shah
Liz Clements	Mariam Khan	Mike Sharpe
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Sybil Spence
Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Paul Tilsley
Barbara Dring	Chaman Lal	Sharon Thompson
Fred Grindrod	Mike Leddy	Lisa Trickett
Roger Harmer	Mary Locke	Mike Ward
Paulette Hamilton	Majid Mahmood	Ian Ward
Kath Hartley	Zhor Malik	Waseem Zaffar
Penny Holbrook	Karen McCarthy	

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Against the amendment (19)

Robert Alden	Charlotte Hodivala	Simon Morrall
Baber Baz	Morriam Jan	David Pears
Debbie Clancy	Meirion Jenkins	Gary Sambrook
Maureen Cornish	Bruce Lines	Ron Storer
Adrian Delaney	Ewan Mackey	Ken Wood
Peter Fowler	Gareth Moore	Alex Yip
Adam Higgs		

Abstentions (1)

Julien Pritchard

The third amendment in the names of Councillors Robert Alden and Ewan Mackey having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be lost.

For the amendment (22)

Robert Alden	Charlotte Hodivala	Simon Morrall
Debbie Clancy	Jon Hunt	David Pears
Maureen Cornish	Timothy Huxtable	Gary Sambrook
Adrian Delaney	Meirion Jenkins	Ron Storer
Peter Fowler	Bruce Lines	Paul Tilsley
Eddie Freeman	Ewan Mackey	Mike Ward
Roger Harmer	Gareth Moore	Alex Yip
Adam Higgs		

Against the amendment (55)

Muhammad Afzal	Mahmood Hussain	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Shabrana Hussain	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Safia Akhtar	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Olly Armstrong	Ziaul Islam	Robert Pocock
Kate Booth	Kerry Jenkins	Julien Pritchard
Sir Albert Bore	Julie Johnson	Hendrina Quinnen
Nicky Brennan	Brigid Jones	Chauhdry Rashid
Marje Bridle	Josh Jones	Carl Rice
Mick Brown	Nagina Kauser	Lou Robson
Tristan Chatfield	Mariam Khan	Kath Scott
Liz Clements	Zaheer Khan	Lucy Seymour-Smith
John Cotton	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Shafique Shah
Phil Davis	Chaman Lal	Mike Sharpe
Barbara Dring	Mike Leddy	Sharon Thompson
Fred Grindrod	Mary Locke	Lisa Trickett
Paulette Hamilton	Majid Mahmood	Ian Ward
Kath Hartley	Zhor Malik	Waseem Zaffar
Penny Holbrook		

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Abstentions (2)

Baber Baz

Morriam Jan

The fourth amendment in the names of Councillors Peter Fowler and Gareth Moore having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be lost.

For the amendment (19)

Robert Alden

Charlotte Hodivala

Simon Morrall

Debbie Clancy

Timothy Huxtable

David Pears

Maureen Cornish

Meirion Jenkins

Gary Sambrook

Adrian Delaney

Bruce Lines

Ron Storer

Eddie Freeman

Ewan Mackey

Ken Wood

Peter Fowler

Gareth Moore

Alex Yip

Adam Higgs

Against the amendment (56)

Muhammad Afzal

Mahmood Hussain

Saddak Miah

Mohammed Aikhlaq

Shabrana Hussain

Brett O'Reilly

Alex Aitken

Mohammed Idrees

John O'Shea

Safia Akhtar

Zafar Iqbal

Robert Pocock

Olly Armstrong

Ziaul Islam

Julien Pritchard

Kate Booth

Kerry Jenkins

Hendrina Quinnen

Sir Albert Bore

Julie Johnson

Chauhdry Rashid

Nicky Brennan

Brigid Jones

Carl Rice

Marje Bridle

Josh Jones

Lou Robson

Mick Brown

Nagina Kauser

Kath Scott

Tristan Chatfield

Mariam Khan

Lucy Seymour-Smith

Liz Clements

Zaheer Khan

Shafique Shah

John Cotton

Narinder Kaur Kooner

Mike Sharpe

Phil Davis

Chaman Lal

Sybil Spence

Barbara Dring

Mike Leddy

Sharon Thompson

Fred Grindrod

Mary Locke

Lisa Trickett

Paulette Hamilton

Majid Mahmood

Ian Ward

Kath Hartley

Zhor Malik

Waseem Zaffar

Penny Holbrook

Karen McCarthy

Abstentions (4)

Roger Harmer

Paul Tilsley

Mike Ward

Jon Hunt

The fifth amendment in the names of Councillors Paul Tilsley and Jon Hunt having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be lost.

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

For the amendment (24)

Robert Alden	Charlotte Hodivala	David Pears
Baber Baz	Jon Hunt	Julien Pritchard
Debbie Clancy	Timothy Huxtable	Gary Sambrook
Maureen Cornish	Morriam Jan	Ron Storer
Adrian Delaney	Bruce Lines	Paul Tilsley
Peter Fowler	Ewan Mackey	Mike Ward
Roger Harmer	Gareth Moore	Ken Wood
Adam Higgs	Simon Morrall	Alex Yip

Against the amendment (53)

Muhammad Afzal	Penny Holbrook	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Shabrana Hussain	Brett O'Reilly
Safia Akhtar	Mohammed Idrees	John O'Shea
Kate Booth	Zafar Iqbal	Robert Pocock
Sir Albert Bore	Ziaul Islam	Hendrina Quinnen
Nicky Brennan	Julie Johnson	Chauhdry Rashid
Marje Bridle	Brigid Jones	Carl Rice
Mick Brown	Josh Jones	Kath Scott
Tristan Chatfield	Nagina Kauser	Lucy Seymour-Smith
Liz Clements	Mariam Khan	Shafique Shah
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Mike Sharpe
Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sybil Spence
Barbara Dring	Chaman Lal	Sharon Thompson
Eddie Freeman	Mike Leddy	Lisa Trickett
Fred Grindrod	Mary Locke	Ian Ward
Paulette Hamilton	Majid Mahmood	Waseem Zaffar
Kath Hartley	Zhor Malik	

Abstentions (3)

Olly Armstrong	Kerry Jenkins	Lou Robson
----------------	---------------	------------

The Motion as amended having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be carried.

For the Motion as amended (60)

Muhammad Afzal	Penny Holbrook	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Shabrana Hussain	Brett O'Reilly
Safia Akhtar	Mohammed Idrees	John O'Shea
Olly Armstrong	Zafar Iqbal	Robert Pocock
Baber Baz	Ziaul Islam	Julien Pritchard
Kate Booth	Morriam Jan	Hendrina Quinnen
Sir Albert Bore	Kerry Jenkins	Chauhdry Rashid
Nicky Brennan	Julie Johnson	Carl Rice
Marje Bridle	Brigid Jones	Lou Robson
Mick Brown	Josh Jones	Kath Scott
Tristan Chatfield	Nagina Kauser	Lucy Seymour-Smith

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Liz Clements	Mariam Khan	Shafique Shah
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Mike Sharpe
Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sybil Spence
Barbara Dring	Chaman Lal	Paul Tilsley
Fred Grindrod	Mike Leddy	Sharon Thompson
Roger Harmer	Mary Locke	Lisa Trickett
Paulette Hamilton	Majid Mahmood	Ian Ward
Kath Hartley	Zhor Malik	Waseem Zaffar

Against the motion as amended (1)

Eddie Freeman

Abstentions (14)

Robert Alden	Charlotte Hodivala	Gary Sambrook
Debbie Clancy	Timothy Huxtable	Ron Storer
Maureen Cornish	Bruce Lines	Ken Wood
Adrian Delaney	Gareth Moore	Alex Yip
Adam Higgs	David Pears	

It was therefore-

19386

RESOLVED:-

1. Council welcomes the progress made since declaring a climate emergency and notes the Council's ambition to achieve a net zero carbon outcome as soon as possible for both its own operations and the City.
2. Approves that the target date for achieving net-zero carbon is set at 2030 for the city council's own operations, with further work to be done on housing and procured goods and services to understand the costs and consequences in these areas.
3. Notes the challenge of achieving the 2030 net zero carbon date for the City as a whole but commits the Council to working with partners and neighbouring local authorities to become the first City Region to become Carbon neutral. The Council's ambition remains to achieve a net zero carbon outcome as soon as possible and a revised date will not be set until these discussions have taken place.
4. Approves that an advisory group to Cabinet is established to oversee the City Council's own progress on achieving net zero carbon.
5. Approves that the City Council endorse the Recommendations for reducing the City Council's own emissions as set out in Table 2 of this report.
6. Notes the content of the Anthesis report and commits the City Council to work with partners to pursue the recommendations where practical and feasible, developing appropriate Action Plans for future Cabinet approval.

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

7. However, this cannot be achieved without significant additional resources, powers, and flexibilities from Government.
8. The impending Local Recovery and English Devolution White Paper and Comprehensive Spending Review provide the opportunity for Government to get serious on Climate and facilitate action across all spheres of government.
9. With our neighbouring authorities and partners, we need to reach a collective understanding and make a shared commitment to working together to become the first City Region to reach net zero carbon.
10. Working from the bottom up with Birmingham's residents and businesses, the council will need to develop, and deliver in partnership, solutions that are just and relevant to people's and businesses' lived experiences.
11. Council welcomes the Executive's commitment for achieving carbon neutral for the Council's operations by 2030 whilst carrying out further work in the coming weeks to determine the contribution the housing and procured goods and services can and must make.
12. The Council therefore commits to:
 - i. Draw upon the recommendations set out within the Anthesis Report and work through the implications for all our key areas of operation, building upon the recommendations for reducing the City Council's own emissions.
 - ii. Facilitate the production of a fully costed action plan to be considered by Council in December 2020 which includes a comprehensive list of resources required from regional and national government to deliver the actions;
 - iii. Bring forward a plan and process for facilitating community and business participation in the determining of policy and priority for work in this area;
 - iv. Join with communities across the city in calling upon the Government to act now and provide the upfront investment and resources required to drive a just transition.
 - v. Require the Executive to introduce as soon as is practically possible a binding policy that all future decision reports shall incorporate a consideration of the impact of that decision on the Council's carbon reduction goals.
13. Notes that an annual report will be taken to Full Council to update on progress on reducing carbon emissions.

HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT INQUIRY

The following report of the Education and Children's Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee together with an Executive Commentary was submitted:-

(See document No 10)

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Councillor Kath Scott in moving the motion indicated that wished to add an addendum to it.

The following addendum was read out

(See document No. 11)

Councillor Kerry Jenkins seconded the motion and addendum.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Alex Yip and Peter Fowler gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 12)

Councillor Alex Yip moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Peter Fowler.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Kath Scott replied to the debate.

The amendment in the names of Councillors Roger Harmer and Julien Pritchard having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be lost.

For the amendment (23)

Robert Alden	Adam Higgs	Simon Morrall
Baber Baz	Charlotte Hodivala	David Pears
Debbie Clancy	Jon Hunt	Gary Sambrook
Maureen Cornish	Timothy Huxtable	Ron Storer
Adrian Delaney	Meirion Jenkins	Paul Tilsley
Eddie Freeman	Bruce Lines	Mike Ward
Peter Fowler	Ewan Mackey	Ken Wood
Roger Harmer	Gareth Moore	

Against the amendment (46)

Muhammad Afzal	Kath Hartley	Zhor Malik
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Penny Holbrook	Karen McCarthy
Alex Aitken	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Safia Akhtar	Shabrana Hussain	Brett O'Reilly
Kate Booth	Mohammed Idrees	John O'Shea
Sir Albert Bore	Zafar Iqbal	Robert Pocock
Nicky Brennan	Ziaul Islam	Hendrina Quinnen
Marje Bridle	Julie Johnson	Carl Rice
Mick Brown	Brigid Jones	Lucy Seymour-Smith
Tristan Chatfield	Nagina Kauser	Shafique Shah
Liz Clements	Mariam Khan	Mike Sharpe
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Sybil Spence
Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sharon Thompson
Barbara Dring	Chaman Lal	Ian Ward
Fred Grindrod	Mary Locke	Waseem Zaffar

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Paulette Hamilton

Abstentions (6)

Olly Armstrong	Julien Pritchard	Kath Scott
Kerry Jenkins	Lou Robson	Lisa Trickett

The motion as amended by the addendum having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be carried.

For the Motion as amended (69)

Muhammad Afzal	Adam Higgs	Gareth Moore
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Charlotte Hodivala	Simon Morrall
Alex Aitken	Jon Hunt	Brett O'Reilly
Robert Alden	Mahmood Hussain	John O'Shea
Olly Armstrong	Shabrana Hussain	David Pears
Baber Baz	Timothy Huxtable	Robert Pocock
Kate Booth	Zafar Iqbal	Julien Pritchard
Sir Albert Bore	Ziaul Islam	Hendrina Quinnen
Nicky Brennan	Kerry Jenkins	Carl Rice
Marje Bridle	Julie Johnson	Lou Robson
Mick Brown	Brigid Jones	Gary Sambrook
Tristan Chatfield	Nagina Kauser	Kath Scott
Debbie Clancy	Mariam Khan	Lucy Seymour-Smith
Liz Clements	Zaheer Khan	Shafique Shah
Maureen Cornish	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Mike Sharpe
John Cotton	Chaman Lal	Sybil Spence
Phil Davis	Mike Leddy	Ron Storer
Adrian Delaney	Bruce Lines	Sharon Thompson
Peter Fowler	Mary Locke	Lisa Trickett
Fred Grindrod	Ewan Mackey	Ian Ward
Paulette Hamilton	Zhor Malik	Mike Ward
Roger Harmer	Karen McCarthy	Ken Wood
Kath Hartley	Saddak Miah	Waseem Zaffar

Against the Motion as amended (2)

Eddie Freeman	Paul Tilsley
---------------	--------------

Abstentions (0)

It was therefore-

19387

RESOLVED:-

That the Executive provide an assessment of progress against the outcomes set out above, and the key areas listed in Section 7 in this report, to the Education & Children's Social Care Overview & Scrutiny Committee in March 2021.

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

That the Chief Executive at Birmingham City Council:

- a.) Take steps to ensure that immediate changes will be made to the most pressing issues within the Travel Assist service, including [but not limited to] safeguarding of children, cancelled routes, guide changes, bus lateness, and telephone lines going unanswered;
- b.) Commission an external and independent inquiry into the Full Travel Assist Service that fully addresses the concerns laid out by Parents, Carers, Schools and other users of the service as listed in section 7 and listed in paragraph number a.) above, by providing clear recommendations, lines of accountability together with an open and transparent timetable for sustainable improvement;
- c.) Commission an external and independent investigation into the assurances that have been given to Members about the safety of the service and the status of improvements at meetings of Overview and Scrutiny, City Council and Audit Committee since January 2020

The investigations referred to in paragraphs b.) & c.) will report by 1 November 2020.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL 201920

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

(See document No 13)

The Leader Councillor Ian Ward moved the motion which was seconded.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Jon Hunt and Roger Harmer gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 14)

Councillor Jon Hunt moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Roger Harmer.

A debate ensued.

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward replied to the debate.

The amendment in the names of Councillors Jon Hunt and Roger Harmer having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be lost.

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

For the amendment (6)

Baber Baz
Roger Harmer

Jon Hunt
Morriam Jan

Paul Tilsley
Mike Ward

Against the amendment (63)

Muhammad Afzal
Mohammed Aikhlaq
Alex Aitken
Safia Akhtar
Robert Alden
Olly Armstrong
Gurdial Singh Atwal
Kate Booth
Sir Albert Bore
Nicky Brennan
Marje Bridle
Mick Brown
Tristan Chatfield
Liz Clements
Maureen Cornish
John Cotton
Phil Davis
Barbara Dring
Peter Fowler
Eddie Freeman
Fred Grindrod

Paulette Hamilton
Kath Hartley
Adam Higgs
Charlotte Hodivala
Penny Holbrook
Mahmood Hussain
Shabrana Hussain
Mohammed Idrees
Zafar Iqbal
Ziaul Islam
Meirion Jenkins
Julie Johnson
Brigid Jones
Nagina Kauser
Mariam Khan
Zaheer Khan
Narinder Kaur Kooner
Chaman Lal
Mary Locke
Mike Leddy
Ewan Mackey

Zhor Malik
Karen McCarthy
Saddak Miah
Gareth Moore
Brett O'Reilly
John O'Shea
David Pears
Robert Pocock
Hendrina Quinnen
Carl Rice
Kath Scott
Lucy Seymour-Smith
Shafique Shah
Mike Sharpe
Sybil Spence
Sharon Thompson
Lisa Trickett
Ian Ward
Ken Wood
Alex Yip
Waseem Zaffar

Abstentions (4)

Debbie Clancy
Kerry Jenkins

Julien Pritchard

Lou Robson

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and, by the recorded vote set out below, was declared to be carried.

For the Motion (56)

Safia Akhtar
Robert Alden
Gurdial Singh Atwal
Kate Booth
Sir Albert Bore
Nicky Brennan
Marje Bridle
Mick Brown
Tristan Chatfield
Debbie Clancy
Liz Clements
Maureen Cornish
John Cotton
Phil Davis

Kath Hartley
Adam Higgs
Penny Holbrook
Mahmood Hussain
Shabrana Hussain
Mohammed Idrees
Zafar Iqbal
Ziaul Islam
Meirion Jenkins
Julie Johnson
Brigid Jones
Nagina Kauser
Mariam Khan
Narinder Kaur Kooner

Karen McCarthy
Saddak Miah
Gareth Moore
Brett O'Reilly
John O'Shea
David Pears
Robert Pocock
Hendrina Quinnen
Carl Rice
Lou Robson
Kath Scott
Lucy Seymour-Smith
Shafique Shah
Sharon Thompson

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Peter Fowler	Chaman Lal	Ian Ward
Eddie Freeman	Mary Locke	Ken Wood
Fred Grindrod	Mike Leddy	Alex Yip
Paulette Hamilton	Ewan Mackey	Waseem Zaffar
Roger Harmer	Zhor Malik	

Against the Motion (5)

Baber Baz	Morriam Jan	Mike Sharpe
Barbara Dring	Julien Pritchard	

Abstentions (10)

Mohammed Aikhlaq	Jon Hunt	Paul Tilsley
Alex Aitken	Kerry Jenkins	Lisa Trickett
Olly Armstrong	Zaheer Khan	Mike Ward
Charlotte Hodivala		

It was therefore-

19388 **RESOLVED:-**

The Recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel on page 4 of its Annual Report be accepted and implemented with effect from 19 May 2020.

PROVISIONAL DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

19389 The Deputy Lord Mayor asked Members to note that the provisional date of the next meeting of City Council is 3 November 2020.

The meeting ended at 1655 hours.

APPENDIX

Questions and replies in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure B4.4 F of the Constitution:-

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR
SIMON MORRALL**

A1 Land Search Requests

Question:

In the last 12 months what is the average time taken for the council to fully respond to Land Search requests for conveyancing and how many in that time have taken longer than 7 working days?

Answer:

During the 12 months 1st September 2019 to 31st August 2020, a total of 4,446 LLC1 and CON29 searches were processed. The average response time was 3.71 days with 2 taking more than 7 days.

The searches team has also received 950 letter requests in the 12 months 1st September 2019 to 31st August 2020 for additional information regarding highways. The average response time for dealing with these was 18.7 days. Of these 66 were completed in less than 7 days.

The closure of Council offices has resulted in officers receiving a surge in additional search requests under the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR). In normal circumstances these would be undertaken by private search agents at Lancaster Circus utilising publicly available systems. Council officers have to date dealt with 2,363 EIR requests in addition to normal workload. In this context, and that of the Government's stimulation of the housing market, delays have been encountered in processing this significant uplift in requests.

In mitigation, an additional 7 members of staff have now been trained and their duties reprioritised to support the substantive searches team of 2 officers. In addition, a new online service using Microsoft teams has been put in place to allow private search agents to resume their work with officer assistance. Search agents are pleased with the new system and have responded positively to it. Since its introduction they are reporting to be back to normal timescales having dealt with their backlogs for EIR searches.

Further efficiencies including the introduction of e-payments and e-forms are being investigated.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR
DEBBIE CLANCY**

A2 Staff

Question:

Are staff responsible for carrying out land searches able to fully carry out their jobs from home with at least the same level of promptness as in the office? If not, when did they return to the office?

Answer:

Staff responsible for carrying out land searches are able to fully carry out their roles from home and continue to do so in the context of arrangements put in place to mitigate and control the COVID-19 virus. The searches process involves accessing data intensive systems and mapping, with some slowness experienced by officers due to home internet bandwidth and reliability limitations. The Council has provided 4G dongles to improve performance in this respect.

The closure of Council offices has resulted in officers receiving an additional 2,363 search requests under the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR), that in normal circumstances would be undertaken by private search agents at Lancaster Circus utilising publicly available systems. In this context and that of the Government's stimulation of the housing market, delays have been encountered in processing this significant uplift in requests.

In mitigation, an additional 7 members of staff have now been trained and their duties reprioritised to support the substantive searches team of 2 officers. In addition, a new online service using Microsoft teams has been put in place to allow private search agents to resume their work with officer assistance.

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

A3 Average Build Cost

Question:

What is the average build cost of each property type in the Athletes Village as per current business plan?

Answer:

The gross construction costs before taking account of the grant funding for the PBRS and sale receipts included on the RFBC approved by Cabinet in March 2020 are as set out in the following table:

Plot	Property Type	Number of Units	Estimated cost (£'m)	Cost per unit (£)
1	Apartments	125	31.094	248,752
3/4/5	Family Housing	58	15.000	258,620
6	Extra Care	268	64.848	241,970
7	Apartments	270	65.326	241,948
8	Apartments	217	39.290	181,060
9	Apartments	213	38.774	182,038

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

A4 Projected Sale Cost

Question:

What is the average projected sale cost of each property type in the Athletes Village as per the current disposal strategy?

Answer:

The disposal strategy for the accommodation to be provided at Perry Barr is currently being developed for the Council by Avison Young, taking into account the decision announced on 11 August 2020 that the scheme would no longer be used to accommodate athletes and officials for the 2022 Commonwealth Games. This will provide a robust assessment of the likely disposal proceeds for the overall scheme, that will help to fund construction and site assembly costs alongside the various grants secured to support the regeneration, including £148m from Government and £20m from the Combined Authority.

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

A5 German Market

Question:

What costs will the Council incur should the German Market need to be cancelled this year due to Covid without any notice?

Answer:

The Frankfurt Christmas Market is one of Birmingham's great festive events, attracting millions of people to the city centre – so it is disappointing we won't be hosting the market this year, but I welcome the organiser's decision to put the public's health and safety first. It is not envisaged that there will be any cost to the city council as a result of the organisers decision.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR
MATT BENNETT**

A6 Maintenance on Council Asset

Question:

Since 2012 can you provide a list of all maintenance carried out on each council asset (non-housing)?

Answer:

The information requested would take too much officer time to access and collate. If there are specific council assets of interest, please advise and officers will look at them on an individual basis.

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

A7 Local Monuments

Question:

Will the Leader commit to publishing in full his review into the appropriateness of local monuments and statues on public land and council property for debate at a Council meeting before any statues are removed?"

Answer:

Other than for the standard reasons of development (such as Paradise Circus in the city centre) or dilapidation or if the statue is deemed unsafe, there is currently no intention to remove city council owned statues or monuments.

Officers will however be undertaking a review of the appropriateness of the current interpretation of controversial subjects in the public realm, several of which were identified as part of the Black Lives Matter movement.

Where relevant, these statues and monuments will have a refreshed and updated interpretation as part of a holistic portrait of the subjects concerned. This could include new plaques and the introduction of technology such as QR codes where people can access fuller details of the subject via their mobile device.

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

A8 Brummie Rule

Question:

Will you commit to investigating the possibility of a ‘Brummie rule’ for jobs with the City Council to ensure better representation at all levels of the organisation of people who live in the city?

Answer:

The council are proud that our workforce is already predominantly ‘Brummies’, with 91% of staff having a Birmingham home postcode.

We have also already committed that new apprentices hired by the council will mainly be Birmingham residents.

On 8th September 2020, the Cabinet approved a report called ‘Everyone’s Battle, Everyone’s Business: Tackling Inequality in Birmingham that seeks to address improved representation across all equality characteristics.

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

A9 Athletes Village Decision

Question:

Could the Leader set out the process by which it was decided that the new village in Perry Barr would no longer be used as an Athletes Village for 2022, setting out his own role in the making of this decision?

Answer:

The Commonwealth Games Federation approved the final decision to switch to a campus village model as a result of the challenges to project delivery caused by the coronavirus pandemic.

This was via their Executive Board on July 31 of this year.

Prior to the pandemic, the delivery plans showed that the project was on track to be delivered in time for the Games, but the Birmingham 2022 Games Partners also had a range of contingency plans available in case any unforeseen events hit the project.

The Birmingham 2022 board, which I sit on, agreed its preference for a campus village solution, if an alternative was ultimately needed.

However as stated above, the authority to approve a final decision rested with the CGF who, based on all of the information available, made their decision on July 31.

The reason the CGF was required to approve this decision is because it was a material change to the Host City Contract

For clarity, I do not sit on the CGF Executive Board.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN

A10 Perry Barr Regeneration Governance

Question:

Now that the Perry Barr Regeneration project is being reviewed and is no longer needed for the Commonwealth Games, could the Leader assure Council that meaningful governance structures will be created for the project that involve the Ward Councillors that are affected, ie those of us in Perry Barr, Aston and Birchfield wards, bearing in mind his previous commitments to take action on this in line with good practice developed for other regeneration projects?

Answer:

The delivery of much needed housing and associated transport infrastructure and public realm improvements, remain vital to the future sustainable growth in our City, and is one of the Council's priorities for delivery. This is why I led the discussions with central Government to ensure that all of the funding promised to the city council to deliver this scheme remains committed.

The decision not to use the Perry Barr Residential Scheme, which is just one part of a wider programme of regeneration works in Perry Barr, to accommodate athletes and officials at Games-time means that there is an opportunity to reconsider how that element of the overall programme is delivered, to ensure the best possible outcomes to meet the councils long term requirements. The delivery of the transport infrastructure projects will still be delivered prior to the 2022 Games and will facilitate improved access to and from key venues during the Games in this part of the city as well as providing a legacy.

Officers will continue to ensure there is effective Governance in place for this programme of works and will continue to engage with local councillors on this and future phases of the wider regeneration programme of works as they progress.

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

B1 Complaints

Question:

What is the average time taken to resolve a complaint to the Council and what percentage take longer than 10 days?

Answer:

Based on the current financial year performance data (April-2020 to July-2020):

- On average, complaints take 5.51 working days to resolve.
- 18% of complaints take longer than 10 working days to resolve.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

B2 Unresolved Complaints

Question:

What percentage of complaints to the council are escalated from the first stage due to the complainant feeling the matter is unresolved?

Answer:

Based on the current financial year performance data (April-2020 to July-2020):

8.2% of complaints received were escalated from the initial investigation stage to the next stage.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
COUNCILLOR MAUREEN CORNISH**

C1 School Support Services

Question:

Have all school support services (educational psychologists, communication Autism Team etc.) resumed school visits now all schools are fully reopen? If not, why not and how are these important services being delivered instead?

Answer:

For each of the school support service areas risk assessments have been undertaken and school visits are taking place, with many restricting access to one visit per day to minimise the risk of transmission. Although it is important to note that some settings are expressing a preference for ongoing virtual meetings whilst they are settling in the new intake of children. Allowing schools to ensure they are meeting all requirements in the current COVID environment before receiving external visitors so a blended model of support will be ongoing. Larger meetings will continue to be held virtually.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN LINES**

C2 Home to School Transport Arrangements

Question:

By what date did all parents who use home to school transport receive all necessary details of the arrangements and route for the September term?

Answer:

Letters were sent in stages according to school start dates. Schools due to start for 1, 2, 3 September letters were sent by 28 August 2020 either via the postal system which arrived Saturday or via the contractors on 29 August 2020 which were handed out in person by the contractor meet and greet door to door.

Additional letters were sent out on 3 September 2020 with all being sent 5 September 2020.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

C3 Home to School Transport Cancellations

Question:

In the first week of school reopening, how many routes on the Home to School Transport were cancelled?

Answer:

In the first 5 days of the new school term (to 8 September) there were just over 120 routes cancelled out of 3000 routes. This equates to an average of 30 routes on any given school day. The cancellation rate is 4% which is not acceptable but we are working in unprecedented times and we have also seen a 25% increase in demand for home to school travel.

This academic term we have an additional 173 routes to cope with school bubbles and to remain in line with government guidelines.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR MEIRION JENKINS**

C4 Complaints

Question:

In the first week of school reopening, how many complaints did the council receive about the home to school transport service?

Answer:

We have received 5 formal complaints and 5 formal councillor enquiries since 1st September 2020.

In addition we have received a significant number of emails on a variety of home to school transport related matters that are currently being dealt with by the service.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

C5 Breakdown of Contracts

Question:

At more than one Scrutiny meeting I have asked – and been promised – a breakdown of the contracts for home to school transport detailing what is actually contracted and paid for. Despite promises, this has still not been provided. Can you please provide that detail here along with an explanation of why the executive and officers were unable to respond to legitimate requests from scrutiny that they committed to providing?

Answer:

The below outlines what is covered in the contract in terms of the specifics for this service and the clauses are underpinned by general contractual conditions to ensure all obligations and commitments are clear for both parties.

As an overview, the contracts confirm that the duties of BCC are to arrange transport for children who are in specific circumstances, provide context to the Home to School Service at BCC and they outline the Council's vision to ensure every eligible pupil is able to access safe and efficient services that are reliable and flexible, and are appropriate to their needs. The aim of ensuring pupils arrive at their destination safely, giving them the best possible opportunity to start the day ready to learn, is clear.

The below areas are then covered in detail within the contract service specification, stating exactly what the providers and the Council's obligations are for each area:

1. Legislation

Requirement to comply with specific legislation and guidance (e.g. Department for Education (DfE) Home to School Transport Statutory Guidance July 2016; <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/home-to-school-travel-and-transport-guidance> and the DfE Transport to education and training for people aged 16 and over <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/post-16-transport-to-education-and-training>) and the BCC Code of Conduct, along with the requirements relating to Enhanced DBS & Barred List Checks.

2. Communication

Confirmation of how bookings, work scheduling and co-ordinating effective transportation arrangements between the Council and provider will operate.

3. Health & Safety

Requirements detailed specifically including emergency arrangements, accident reporting, needs assessments, safety on board and compliance with school site arrangements.

4. Licensing

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Requirements in terms of Private Hire, PCV, taxation and documentation.

5. Safeguarding

Detailed requirements covering expected standard, authorised provider employees, DBS, training, accident and incident reporting, emergency procedures and Councils right to audit.

6. Service Performance Standards & Penalty Points

Reliability, codes of conduct, contract performance monitoring eg route checks/school visits and the penalty point system is detailed. For example, the providers must supply evidence of employees, vehicle licenses, daily vehicle check reports, maintenance and MOT reports etc upon request.

7. Satisfaction Surveys, Comments, Compliments & Complaints

Feedback from schools and families is requested to monitor and assess standards. Escalations, policies and the ability to remove particular employee(s) are included.

8. Seating Capacity

Reinforcing vehicle licensing and physical requirements for users.

9. Pick Up & Drop Off Arrangements

Authorised points only must be used. Parent/carer to board child and Provider to ensure child is only handed over to responsible adult.

10. Pupil Guides

Outlines the process of picking up and dropping off the guides

11. Journey Times

This covers recommended journey times, timings for school drop offs/pick ups, delays, cancellations, school closures and breakdowns.

12. Route Work with additional clauses around SEND

Describes who may travel in the vehicles, continuity of staff and how changes are managed, route efficiencies, parent/carer responsibility to accompany child to/from vehicle and how equipment changes will be managed.

13. Vehicle standards, design requirements and equipment

Minimum standards eg MOT specified along with legislative requirements detailed.

14. Additional provisions for transporting children

Requirements on signage, safety specifics such as booster seats/restraints etc, absence reporting specified.

15. Vehicles carrying wheelchair passengers

DoT Guidance specified, driver responsibilities on loading, securing and unloading wheelchair users detailed and specifics on equipment and fittings.

16. Provision for complex needs children and associated risk assessments.

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Requirement for both parties to jointly risk assessment and create travel plans for complex needs children.

General Contractual Points for note:

- The Home to School Transport Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) was established on 1 November 2019 and set up for 4 year period from contract award date and has an annual value of approx. £10.5M.
- National Express Accessible Transport Ltd (NEAT) hold a separate contract with BCC owing to collapse of a previous incumbent supplier ATG. This has an annual value of approximately £6.2M
- In total there are 17 commissioned suppliers currently providing transport to BCC covering approximately 190 schools. The list of suppliers is on the next page.
- Over 4000 children are on contracted transport.
- The majority of children are transported in 9-16 seater minibuses. Approximately 800 children are transported in cars/MPVs.
- NEAT are the largest provider transporting approximately 1500 children on 215 minibuses daily (pre-COVID figures).
- All providers are paid on 30 day terms in consideration of the satisfactory performance of their obligations.

There has been a delay in finalising the information to this request.

In response to the challenges that have presented and a drive to improve data and contract management, alongside embedding more effective communication, a procurement activity has been undertaken to commission a new IT system. A preferred provider has now been selected and a contract awarded. There is a mobilisation plan in place to ensure the key milestones are achieved with a view to full implementation across the academic year 2020/21. The new IT system will include a central, secure location for storage of information enabling robust data, contract and communication management. A suite of reports will be available that will allow for responsive, up to date, validated, accurate and timely information to be provided.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

C6 Breakdown of Contracts

Question:

On how many occasions in the last 3 years has a child being taken to the wrong school\placement by the Home to School Transport Service?

Answer:

In September 2020, 7 children were taken to the wrong school by a home to school transport provider. A full investigation is underway to understand the reasons why and fully address the issues.

In the previous 3 academic years this has happened on one further occasion.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

C7 SEND Expenditure

Question:

Please provide a breakdown of expenditure on SEND mediation services in the last academic year by provider and by type (refusal to assess/refusal to issue/content of EHCP).

Answer:

Payments made to SEND mediation services in the last year by provider:

Provider	Amount	Refusal to Assess	Refusal to Issue	Content of EHCP
Kids	£42,077.40	74	29	54
Prime resolution	£2,460.00	2	1	1
Resolution Dynamics Ltd	£75,260.00	61	24	0

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

C8 EHCP's

Question:

The Council has a statutory duty to have reviewed, amended and finalised EHCPs for young people transferring to Post-16 provision this September by 31st March this year. This duty was not affected by the Coronavirus Act. Please tell us how many of these plans should have been issued (in numerical and percentage terms) and how many actually were issued by the deadline?

Answer:

While it is correct to say that, for this particular cohort, the duty to amend and finalise EHCPs by the deadline of 31 March 2020 was not affected by the Coronavirus Act, there were nevertheless significant practical issues resulting from the Covid 19 crisis that affected our ability to comply with the deadline. A major emergency was declared by the Council on 24 March 2020 and all staff were by then complying with the instruction to work from home. This impacted on the ability to print amended EHCPs and issue letters remotely via a temporary mailing service. As a result, while notices of intended decisions were issued in February 2020 in accordance with our usual practice, final EHCPs were not issued until 27 April 2020.

Number of Pupils Transitioning to Post 16 in September 2020	664	
Notice of Intent issued in February 2020	645	97%
Finals issued to Date (All issued on 27 April 2020)	658	99.1%
Finals issued by deadline	0	0%

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BARRIE**

C9 Numbers

Question:

For routes from September 2020, what is the average number of children on each bus in the home to school transport service, and what is the highest number on any one bus?

Answer:

The maximum number of children transport on a single vehicle is 11.

On average the estimated number of children on each bus is six. With the lowest number being one.

The largest vehicles used are 16-seater minibuses.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING
FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS**

C10 Length of Route

Question:

For routes from September 2020 what is the average length of each route in the home to school transport service and what is the longest route (in time)?

Answer:

This information is not currently available. We have contacted operators to ask for this information be provided by the end of this week. This information will then be collated.

It is important to note that the average length of routes this academic year has changed due to new COVID ways of working introduced, which has led to additional routes being put on to maintain safety of school bubbles.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE
COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

D Action Plan

Question:

Can you publish the action plan for a second wave in the Covid pandemic you referenced at the last Council meeting?

Answer:

There was no mention of an action plan by the Cabinet Member. There is on the City Council's website a copy of the Birmingham Covid-19 Local Outbreak Plan.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

E1 Appeals

Question:

What is the average time taken to review appeals against removal from the housing register and how many cases over the last 3 years have taken longer than 8 weeks?

Answer:

In the 3 years 1/9/17-1/9/20 the team completed 6322 reviews, so in the period in question just over 10% of reviews went over 8 weeks.

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

E2 Housing

Question:

When was the last time council properties in the following roads in Longbridge and West Heath were painted? Edgehill Road, Chirbury Grove (off Edgehill), Fairfax Road, Merrishaw Road, Condover Road, Broseley Avenue, Clunbury Road, Titterstone Road, Cropredy Road, Clee Road, Sibdon Grove

Answer:

The last painting programme on this estate was in 2005/06, as part of the “Decent Home” initiative. The City Council is experiencing significant pressure on the capital investment programme, the housing division is undertaking a complete review of the programme to identify opportunities for additional investment in the Council Stock over the forthcoming years.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES & NEIGHBOURHOODS COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ

E3 Digital Autopsy Scanner Trial Up-Date

Question:

Can you provide an update on the Digital Autopsy Scanner trial?

Answer:

Birmingham and Solihull Coroners service have sent 441 cases for CT scans in the period 1 July 19 to 31 July 2020, figures for August 20 are not yet available. 240 scans have identified cause of death and 201 cases have required an invasive post mortem following the CT scan.

Since July 2019 nine scans have been requested by families with three identifying cause of death, (there have been no family requests since the last update at the beginning of July), as well as five requests from the Police with three requiring an invasive post mortem.

The results have not achieved expected levels of diagnosis from CT scans, but this continues to improve, has been steadily improving during the trial period and the CT scan consistently achieves 52% diagnosis of cause of death. The City Council has met its obligations in terms of the numbers (250) for the pilot scheme. The pathologists remain concerned about the reporting, the inability to discuss cases and the 'mechanical' nature of the process. The Senior Coroner met with i-Gen and pathologists to work through these issues to ensure there were improvements in performance. Some operational issues have been addressed over transport of bodies and scheduling of scans by the Interim Assistant Director.

The formal review of the pilot has been delayed due to the pressure of work on the service due to Covid19, but is due to take place in the coming months, so in order to maintain the service an extension of the pilot has been agreed. In this extension a commitment has been given to send 500 bodies in the coming year. This will enable the future service provision to be considered and procured.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

E4 Drainage Gullies Cemeteries

Question:

Who is responsible for clearing and cleaning out the drainage gullies on roads within our cemeteries?

Answer:

The Cemetery Operatives are responsible for the clearing and cleaning of the drainage gullies within the city cemeteries. In addition, a roadsweeper is brought in to clean the roadways when required, which is usually more often throughout the Autumn/Winter period or following heavy winds due to the increased leaf fall.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

E5 Maintenance Programme

Question:

What routine maintenance programme is in place for the clearing and cleaning out the drainage gullies on roads within our cemeteries?

Answer:

Cemetery Operatives regularly sweep the roads and pathways and a roadsweeper is brought in to clean the roadways when required, which is usually more often throughout the autumn/Winter period or following heavy winds due to the increased leaf fall.

Due to minimal leaf fall during the summer period the roadsweeper had not been required for several months.

Due to recent weather changes, the roadsweeper has been attending relevant sites once every two weeks.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

E6 Handsworth Cemetery

Question:

On what exact date were the gullies last cleaned/cleared at Handsworth Cemetery last cleaned prior to the recent flooding?

Answer:

The exact date is not recorded but the last time that the gullies were swept was in July 2020.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

F1 Slab and Cab

Question:

Are all relevant waste employees now fully trained and fully utilising the Slab in the Cab technology or is anyone still working of paper copies of forms?

Answer:

The original 'Slab in the Cab' technology was installed in 2015 and extensive training began in October 2015 until August 2016. All relevant staff were given a briefing, a practical demonstration, a fully comprehensive handbook and later a FAQ sheet.

The current technology is now due to be replaced. Some of the equipment is failing therefore teams are operating with manual documentation where necessary.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE & PARKS
FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL EUSTACE**

F2 Early Binmen

Question:

Residents have reported some crews starting work as early as 5am or even earlier from the Perry Barr depot. Whilst the industry of the crews is to be applauded, it does inevitably lead to complaints about disturbance at that time of the morning. Could the Cabinet Member explain the benefits of such early starts?

Answer:

During the Covid 19 pandemic it has been necessary to stagger the start times of all the crews to minimise the potential contact within the depot and this has resulted in earlier start times. We decided to start earlier rather than later to ensure that our crews can safely drive around the City whilst causing the minimum amount of disruption.

I agree the teams have been incredibly industrious during the pandemic and maintained our important collection service. I will ask depot managers to reiterate to crews the need to operate as quietly as possible.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE & PARKS
FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

F3 Flytipping

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide a report on the number of complaints about flytipping and the number of incidents logged by month for the last two years?

Answer:

Table 1 and 2, below show: (1) the service enquiries recorded in the Council’s waste management and regulatory teams databases that reference involvement of or that were categorised at the initial reporting stage as relating to waste/rubbish; and (2) the incidents reportable as ‘fly-tipping’ under the statutory DEFRA’s Waste Data Flow arrangements.

The total number of service enquiries/reports does not equate to the number of reportable incidents, which is due to a number of reasons which includes, but that is not limited to: duplicate enquiries/incidents being reported more than once, by different reporters or on multiple dates or to different council teams; enquiries for which linked records are created in the electronic database for the purpose of assisting with job management; and enquiries where waste/rubbish may not subsequently be identified as the route cause or primary element of a multi-issue referral.

Table 1			
Financial Year	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Apr	2447	2579	2173
May	2769	2200	2380
Jun	2825	2006	3369
Jul	2754	2947	3799
Aug	2480	2209	
Sep	2119	2273	
Oct	2203	2223	
Nov	2027	1962	
Dec	1748	1925	
Jan	2310	2277	
Feb	1792	2091	
Mar	2114	1606	
TOTAL	27588	26298	7922

Table 2			
Financial Year	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Apr	1631	1843	2001
May	1351	1764	1667
Jun	1473	1441	2106
Jul	1801	2068	
Aug	1619	1756	
Sep	1494	1834	
Oct	1371	1958	

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Nov	1234	1781	
Dec	1170	1855	
Jan	1520	2190	
Feb	1353	1637	
Mar	1558	1634 *	
TOTAL	17575	21761	5774

* - Includes fly-tipping captured by the service but not reported by residents and is therefore a higher figure than for March in Table 1

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE & PARKS
FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

F4 Tip Visits

Question:

Can the Cabinet Member advise how many visits have been made by residents to each of the Council's Household Recycling Centres, per week, since they re-opened following lockdown. How do these numbers compare with the same weeks last year?

Answer:

Please see the table below, The impact to the Household Waste Recycling Centres has been felt greatly, with the need to ensure that Social Distancing takes place on all sites has led to a significant reduction in the amount of vehicles that can be processed through the sites. This led in the immediate return to very heavy queuing at all sites, with waiting times ranging between 2.5 and 4 hours leading to disruption to local communities and businesses that neighbour the sites. A booking system was introduced to help to ensure that residents could gain access to the sites without severe disruption to their day. Since the introduction of the booking system we have worked closely with our provider to release as many slots as we are able whilst still ensuring the safety of our users. This has led to an increase of around 29% since the launch. We will continue to work with our provider to ensure that where it is possible we will look at all options to further extend the offer to our users as we move forward, The booking system will also allow the flexibility to react to any government changes around Covid requirements should this be necessary.

Week Number	Castle Bromwich *	Perry Barr	Kings Norton	Sutton Coldfield	Tyseley
Week 19 2019	3628	5229	7304	6969	7079
Week 19 2020	0	995	909	756	904
Week 20 2019	4832	7439	9164	9115	9228
Week 20 2020	0	3278	2021	1909	2172
Week 21 2019	4954	7521	9625	9200	9065
Week 21 2020	0	3150	1910	2048	2233
Week 22 2019	4948	7686	9301	9096	9366
Week 22 2020	0	2392	1925	2086	2260
Week 23 2019	3890	5772	7927	7163	7358
Week 23 2020	0	2214	2042	2093	2233
Week 24 2019	3069	4698	6321	6046	6184

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Week 24 2020	0	2297	1983	2155	2114
Week 25 2019	4367	6518	8843	8508	8461
Week 25 2020	133	2330	1844	1880	1761
Week 26 2019	4600	7095	9121	8708	9221
Week 26 2020	1706	2394	1999	1817	1869
Week 27 2019	5355	7749	10265	9562	10548
Week 27 2020	1684	2333	1967	1835	1895
Week 28 2019	4936	7236	9665	8881	9986
Week 28 2020	1821	2596	2229	2059	2093
Week 29 2019	4994	1359	8777	9863	8564
Week 29 2020	1873	2596	2225	2057	2113
Week 30 2019	5069	1389	8987	10017	8583
Week 30 2020	1916	2551	2282	2090	2163
Week 31 2019	4345	6483	9020	8256	7831
Week 31 2020	1819	2548	2367	2091	2088
Week 32 2019	5130	7065	9511	9734	8991
Week 32 2020	2274	3011	2730	2504	2652
Week 33 2019	4116	5933	8528	8101	7221
Week 33 2020	2223	3045	2682	2437	2501
Week 34 2019	5122	7464	10017	9751	9806
Week 34 2020	2042	2887	2466	2353	2376
Week 35 2019	5031	7266	9800	9420	9313
Week 35 2020	1825	2877	2514	2341	2388

* Castle Bromwich HRC was closed until 18 June 2020 to accommodate urgent works to the highway

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE & PARKS
FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

F5 Park Life

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member set out the Council's estimates for use of city parks this year compared with last year?

Answer:

The latest Google GB Covid Mobility reports shows an increase in UK footfall across the UK parks at 67%. There is no individual data for Birmingham but the increase in footfall across the West Midlands is at 93%.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS

G1 Free Bike Schemes

Question:

What has been the results of the Council's Free Bikes schemes for residents, including how many were given out, how many were subsequently returned for not being used and participation rates in follow up surveys?

Answer:

Delivered as part of the Birmingham Cycle Revolution programme, Big Birmingham Bikes was designed to improve health and wellbeing, social mobility, and access to employment opportunities by encouraging people to cycle more often and reduce short trips being made by car.

Over 7,000 free bikes were given away through the Council's Free Bikes scheme to people living in the most socially deprived parts of the city, alongside provision of cycle training and bike maintenance sessions.

- 81.2% of the bike owners are from the most deprived quintile, compared to 56.8% of Birmingham's population
- 62.2% of bike owners are from BAME backgrounds
- 70% of bike owners are from mosaic groups with the highest inequality

This initiative continues to be delivered by The Active Wellbeing Society (TAWS) as part of their Big Bike Project. They have produced a case study highlighting impact of this initiative to date, including the following results from participant surveys:

- 74% have improved health/fitness from using their free bike
- 73% have increased cycling confidence by using their free bike
- 43% have replaced car journeys of 1 mile or more with cycling
- 18% have met new people through using their new bike

With regards to bikes being returned to the project, TAWS have informed us that on average they get a couple of bikes per month. These bikes are repurposed and then distributed back out into one of their cycle hubs for general use.

Further details on the success of Big Birmingham Bikes and the Birmingham Cycle Revolution programme can be found at www.birmingham.gov.uk/bcrlegacy.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY

G2 Consultation

Question:

What consultation took place with Emergency Services prior to the installation of the temporary traffic measures such as pop up cycle lanes and pavement widening?

Answer:

The Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 1 comprises a range of schemes including pop-up cycle lanes and low traffic neighbourhoods. All scheme designs were shared with contacts at the emergency services (Fire, Police and Ambulance) prior to installation of the schemes. In addition, designs were shared with contacts at NHS Hospital Trusts on, or close to, schemes.

Pavement widening has also taken place in some local centres as part of emergency Covid-19 funding and Reopening High Streets Safely Fund. This additional space in areas of high footfall enables safer social distancing. Schemes were discussed with the Council's Community Safety Team and supported by local policing teams, such as in Erdington.

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

G3 Risk Assessment

Question:

What risk assessment took place prior to the installation of the temporary traffic measures such as pop up cycle lanes and pavement widening to assess the suitability of access for emergency vehicles?

Answer:

A number of risk assessments were completed prior to the installation of the temporary traffic measures. These consisted of designer risk assessments, road safety audit reports and dilapidation surveys.

Independent road safety audits were carried out during the development stage, with a further Road Safety Audit to be carried out following implementation on site. Any comments raised will be reviewed and addressed as necessary.

Access for emergency vehicles was considered during the design, and plans were shared with the emergency services for information.

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

G4 Dangerous No Parking Signs

Question:

Councillors in the Perry Barr Constituency have been told that they can no longer have ‘no parking on the grass’ signs placed in verges under the Local Highway’s budgets for health and safety reasons. Could the Cabinet Member tell me how many times the Council has been successfully sued because of injury or damage caused by a “No Parking on the Grass Verge” sign, setting out the costs of any such action?

Answer:

There are a number of reasons why the signs in question are no longer being replaced, principally because the legislation that these historic “No Parking” signs refer to no longer exists. Therefore, it is not appropriate to reinstate signs that promote restrictions that can no longer be enforced.

There are other issues that need to be considered when replacing or creating signs on our roads including the visual impact on the streetscene and street clutter. The overall objective is to ensure that only signs that are absolutely necessary are placed on the highway as every post adds to clutter, cost and the potential for those items to be a hazard in certain circumstances (e.g. road traffic collisions, obstructions to partially sighted pedestrians, etc.).

So, whilst there have been no identified cases where the Council has been found to be at fault in those circumstances, the practice we have adopted for many years to assess the necessity for each new or replaced sign on the highway (which includes an assessment of any unnecessary risk being created to road users) is correct and aligns with best practice across the country.

With respect to grassed verge parking measures, through the provision of additional local ward funding in recent years, we have sought to look at more practical and effective measures to protect grass verges across the city, such as new Traffic Regulation Orders, double kerbing and the placing of ‘No parking on verges’ stickers on nearby lamp columns.

Therefore, if members wish to consider such measures within their ward, Local Engineering Officers would be pleased to work with the local ward councillors to identify suitable locations for such measures.

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

G5 High Speed Bus Times

Question:

The roadworks, demolition of Perry Barr flyover and planned traffic lights at Perry Barr will slow down the express X51 service, Bus lanes are being put in at great expense to speed it up again. Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether he believes this is a huge waste of public expenditure so that a bus can run at the same speed as before, if not, setting out in what way the work will improve the X51 service, which provides a high speed service from Walsall, Great Barr and any proposed park and ride on junction 7 of the motorway?

Answer:

The A34 Perry Barr highway works are providing priority for public transport and active modes in line with the draft Birmingham Transport Plan and enabling the significant regeneration of Perry Barr including 1000's of new homes, public realm improvements, and a new rail station.

New bus priority on the A34 through Perry Barr will be delivered through the A34 Perry Barr highway works, as a key part of the wider TfWM A34 Sprint project, which will make all bus journeys more reliable on the A34. As part of the proposals express bus services such as the X51 will be able to use the new bus lanes, and the underpass at the Aston Lane/Birchfield Road, and it is therefore expected that overall journey times from Walsall, Great Barr, and potential park and ride sites along the route will be shorter and more reliable than before.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM
COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

H1 HMO'S

Question:

Could the Chair set out how many applications have been made for conversion to HMO under the Article 4 direction that came into force in June, setting out how many have been approved and how many refused?

Answer:

The city-wide Article 4 Direction relating to the change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a C4 HMO (3-6 people sharing) came into force on the 8 June 2020.

Since the 8 June, a total of 9 planning applications have been received for a change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a C4 HMO. Of these, one has been approved, one was refused, and one was withdrawn by the applicant. The rest are in the process of being considered.

During the 1-year notice period, prior to the Article 4 Direction coming into force, the City Council encouraged landlords and developers of HMOs to self-declare their C4 HMOs.

In total, we received 2,600 declarations before 8 June 2020. Of these, we have accepted 1,547 and rejected 771. For the rest (282) we have requested further evidence about the HMO use and are continuing to receive further evidence documents. The accepted and rejected numbers will therefore change as the processing of the remaining 282 declarations conclude, but this is the snapshot of the figures as they are at today.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM
COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

H2 Directive

Question:

Were you consulted about the directive issued on 7th August, shown below?

“Dear Councillors,

As part of an ongoing drive to improve the Councils planning enforcement function, along with the ongoing work to introduce the Councils first Local Enforcement Plan, we have recently been working on a complete re-design of the online complaints procedure which is now finished and went live yesterday.

In order for this to be successful we need your help as all planning enforcement enquires must now follow the process as set out below:

In the first instance, all constituents must now be directed to the online complaints page which can be found at

https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/info/20160/planning_applications/23/planning_enforcement . If you wish to make a complaint on behalf of your constituent please can you also refer to the online form in the first instance.

Significant improvements have been made to the online complaints form to capture more specific detail relating to each enquiry. Furthermore the form has been designed so that links to guidance regarding PD, Advertisements, Listed Buildings and other common issues are now encapsulated within the online form. The intention is for this guidance to evolve as we go along and it is hoped this will improve the efficiency of the enforcement service by reducing the number of non-planning or basic PD enquiries and in turn allow us to concentrate our efforts on more serious breaches of planning control.

To encourage this new approach, wherever possible please can you advise your constituents to make use of the guidance provided in the form before they submit the complaint, as this may save them time filling out the form and will also potentially answer some of the concerns they may have wanted us to investigate.

The most significant change to the process that I need to explain is we no longer accept anonymous complaints. We have taken this decision as a large proportion of anonymous complaints are found to be neighbour disputes and In cases where we do not have a contact to go back to, it is difficult to obtain feedback which hinders evidence gathering and proves problematic for monitoring purposes and case investigation. This change is clearly explained in the online complaints form and generally the only exceptions will be the most serious of allegations, for example damage to a listed building or cutting down protected trees. If anybody questions this change, we should provide reassurance that any details provided will be strictly confidential.

If you have any concerns or require any further information regarding the new complaint form or the process to be followed please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you all for your assistance.

James Wagstaff

Meeting of City Council – 15 September 2020

Head of Enforcement & Technical Services”

Answer:

The decision to introduce the new complaint form was an operational one to improve the enforcement service and as such there was no requirement for me to be consulted. The procedural change was agreed by the Director of Inclusive Growth as part of ongoing service improvements. Concerns have been expressed by various members who have perhaps misunderstood what these changes mean, and I have asked the Head of Enforcement to send out further clarification before Council.