

# BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

**HALL GREEN DISTRICT  
COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HALL  
GREEN DISTRICT COMMITTEE HELD ON  
TUESDAY 14 JULY 2015 AT 1000 HOURS, IN  
COMMITTEE ROOMS 3 & 4, COUNCIL HOUSE,  
BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:** - Councillors Mohammed Azim, Barry Bowles, Sam Burden, Jerry Evans, Kerry Jenkins, Tony Kennedy, Victoria Quinn, Habib Rehman, Claire Spencer and Martin Straker Welds.

**ALSO PRESENT:** -

Mike Davis – Erdington District Lead-  
Pete Hobbs – Service Integration Head, Housing Transformation  
Parmjeet Jassal – Head of City Finance, Place  
Errol Wilson - Committee Manager

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RECORDING**

153 The District Committee were advised that the meeting would be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Internet site and members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there were confidential or exempt items.

---

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE**

154 The membership of the Committee was noted as follows: -

**Councillors:** - Barry Bowles, Sam Burden and Kerry Jenkins (Hall Green Ward).

**Councillors:** - Claire Spencer, Martin Straker Welds and Lisa Trickett (Moseley and Kings Heath Ward).

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

**Councillors:** - Mohammed Azim, Tony Kennedy and Victoria Quinn (Sparkbrook Ward).

**Councillors:** - Jerry Evans, Mohammed Fazal and Habib Rehman (Springfield Ward).

**CO –OPTED MEMBERS** – Superintendent Bas Javid – West Midlands Police West Midlands Police; West Midlands Fire Service; and Housing Liaison Board Representatives

---

### **LEAD OFFICER ARRANGEMENTS**

155 The Chairman introduced the item and stated that the lead officer arrangements were likely to be changed in a few weeks. Mick Davis Erdington District Lead who was in attendance stated that they were likely to be determined as part of the overall review of District work, but that this would be discussed later under agenda item 12.

The lead officer arrangements were then noted as follows: -  
Lead Officer: - Salim Miah, District Head (Hall Green District)

Support Officers:-  
District Contact Lawyer: - Rob Barker  
Lead Finance Officer: - Parmjeet Jassal  
Area Democratic Services: - Errol Wilson/Marie Reynolds

---

### **APOLOGIES**

156 Apologies for non-attendance were submitted on behalf of Councillors Fazal Mohammed and Lisa Trickett.

---

### **MINUTES**

Councillor Spencer commented that the minutes did not mention that they had looked at the Housing data they had made comments as to how they would like this to be changed in the minutes which was not featured. She added that it would be good if the minutes were changed to reflect that and that she was happy to send the critic she made of the data if this would help.

157 **RESOLVED:** -

That subject to the above amendment the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2015 and 16 June 2015 having been previously circulated, were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

---

### **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

158 No declarations of interest were submitted.

**CODE OF CONDUCT FOR DISTRICT COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

The following Code of Conduct for District Committees was submitted:-

(See document No. 1)

159

**RESOLVED:-**

That the Code of Conduct for meetings of the District Committee be noted.

---

**DISTRICT COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

There was a brief discussion concerning the appointment of the District Champions. After consideration the following appointments were made:-

**I. Housing Champion**

160

**RESOLVED:-**

That Councillor Victoria Quinn be appointed as the hall Green District Housing Champion

---

**II. Education, Corporate Parenting and Special Educational Needs Champion**

161

**RESOLVED:-**

That Councillor Martin Straker Welds be appointed as the Hall Green District Committee's Education, Corporate Parenting and Special Educational Needs Champion.

---

**III. Arts Champion**

162

**RESOLVED:-**

That Councillor Lisa Trickett be reappointed as the Hall Green District Committee's Arts Champion.

---

**IV. Young People**

163

**RESOLVED:-**

That Councillor Kerry Jenkins be appointed as the Hall Green District Committee's Young People Champion.

---

**V. Community Safety Champion**

164

**RESOLVED:-**

That Councillor Barry Bowles be appointed as the Hall Green District Committee's Community Safety Champion.

---

VI. **Sustainability Champion**

165

**RESOLVED:-**

That Councillor Claire Spencer be appointed as the Hall Green District Committee's Sustainability Champion.

---

**DISTRICT COMMITTEES FUNCTIONS AND GUIDELINES**

The following schedule of District Committee Functions and Guidelines were submitted:-

(See document No. 2)

166

**RESOLVED:-**

That the Functions and Guidelines be noted.

---

**FUTURE WORKING ARRANGEMENTS/DISTRICT WORK PROGRAMME**

167

Mike Davis, Erdington District Lead introduced the item and gave the following verbal presentation: -

1. The driver for change was Sir Bob Kerslake's report that made a number of recommendations about the role of Districts. It suggested that a new model of devolution be established, particularly that District Committees should not be responsible for the direct delivery of services, or for the budgets associated with delivering those services either directly or via Service Level Agreements (SLA).
2. The report recommended a refocus role for District Committees around influencing, shaping the whole Place making agenda.
3. A review of governance was already being considered, but, this was galvanised by the petition from Sutton Coldfield residents which led to a wider review of governance across the City. This was being reflected by some of the new thinking around District Committees. There was a Cross Party Governance Review which includes a cross party working group on devolution and a report was to be submitted to Cabinet later this month.
4. In terms of District Committees, it was worth reminding that apart from the 12 Members from the 4 Wards, they had the opportunity which was reinforced in the Constitution to co-opt up to five members onto the District Committee.

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

These would be non-voting members of the Committee to help in the Place shaping role moving forward.

5. The oversight of devolved budget had ceased, with the exception of the Local/District Innovation Budget which would be made available in the 2016/2017 financial year. This would be a District budget rather than a Ward by Ward budget which was the case with Community Chest. The decision concerning the Innovation Budget spend would be decisions of the District Committee. Whilst the Districts did not have budget responsibility, they had responsibility for that particular budget. The only other exception was the approval of any Neighbourhood Forum Funds grant operating within the District.
6. With regard to the work programme for District Committees, there was a requirement to produce a District Policy Statement. The District Policy Statement would be a short document that sets out the priorities on the work that would be undertaken in the District. As part of the District Committee work programme, there was an expectation that they would take the Policy Statement into a Community Plan. This would take into account the priorities and have a section on each of those i.e. some clearly identified actions with timescales.
7. There was a requirement to produce a Community Governance Framework document, about how decisions would be made within the District, who the Members were engaging with, which partnerships/groups they were working with and how this had come together in a cohesive way. This was the idea behind the Governance Framework document for Districts which would need to be included in the Work Programme for the year. There was also the District Challenge duty.
8. In relation to Ward Committees/Forums, these were about community leadership as per Sir Bob Kerslake's report. This was to encourage the strengthening of the relationship between Ward Members.
9. Ward Committees/Forums would not have any budget responsibilities as the decisions with regard to the Local Innovation Fund would be made at the District rather than Ward level. Meetings could be held in the format that they currently were as formal Committees or in a more relaxed and informal way. This was about giving Members the opportunity to bring people together from their Ward to engage with them, to understand what their issues were, to speak with officers regarding various issues that would be of interest and concern in their Wards.
10. It may not be possible for the meetings to be formally minuted in the way they had been in the past. There would still need to be actions and a clear record of those actions which would need to be distributed to the relevant sections etc. with a report/feedback on the issue or someone reporting on the actions progressed between meetings.
11. There would not be lengthy minutes of future meetings and rather than a Committee Manager taking the minutes, it could be a local officer, partner or member of the public who had the skills that could be entrusted to take notes of the meeting in future. There would perhaps be a local officer to assist with

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

preparing agendas and the booking of venues for the meetings. There was a new emphasis on officers attending meetings and providing information verbally that was easily understood by members of the public rather than by a formal report being submitted.

12. District Committees would need to develop a Neighbourhood Challenge programme with one or two challenges for this year. This could be an outline produced in terms of the purpose, the key questions, and the people to be interviewed as part of the evidence gathering and then they could have a session where people could be called to give evidence. A report would then be produced with some recommendations. It was important that the recommendations be monitored and followed through.
13. In terms of the local officer support for all these arrangements, this was yet to be determined, but there were discussions taking place.
14. Whilst the 10 districts would be retained, there would not be 10 district teams, but it was more likely that they would have 4 area teams with a Quadrant Head for two/three districts.

Councillor Spencer gave the following updates: -

- i. Even when the Districts had budgets, there was a huge part that they could not influence such as the Amey contract, which had affected the residents in a profound way.
- ii. What was vital was that of the two training sessions so far was how they put themselves in a position where they could influence what was happening at the Centre.
- iii. In terms of the Neighbourhood Challenge, there was a need to have a quick win on Neighbourhood Challenge. There was a need to find something that was a priority for the District that they could scrutinise effectively which they could conclude within the year.
- iv. If the District assets were to be part of the future that they wanted for the District, there was a need for them to be proactive in saying what role they would play.
- v. There was a need to formalise how they communicate with people into the structure.
- vi. Finally, there were five places to co-opt people onto the District Committee, but there was nothing to say that this had to be the same five people every year. If they were running a particular Neighbourhood Challenge, there would be value in inviting a certain number of people on certain occasion, but not so valuable on others.

The Chairman highlighted that there were other processes that were taking place such as the District Strategic Housing Panel (DSHP). It was noted that the next meeting of the DSHP was the 24 August 2015. It was hoped that during that week they would have a follow up Boot Camp to put together some of the discussions that were on-going within the different Wards so that they could look at these in

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

September 2015. It was hoped that all colleagues would be involved in this in due course.

An extensive discussion then ensued and the following was a summary of the principal points raised: -

- a. As a District they would be holding meetings in the future with a skeletal team and minimal budget or resource. Concerns were raised at the number of documents that they had struggled to produce in the past and that it was unrealistic in terms of what they could achieve with the people and resources they had. This was the real challenge for the District going forward and the danger was that they would become talking shops.
- b. Recognition of where they were and how they were working through the reductions in finance in comparison to previous years. A view had been expressed that as Councillors they should not be preparing policy documents. They should be reviewing and having an input into these, but they should be put together by officers.
- c. It was useful to have some initial commentary on Ward Committees, but the same challenge applies. The danger was that they could become a talking shop. It was encouraging to hear that there was going to be some support in having these, but they needed to get dates in diaries so that they could plan for the future.
- d. The Chairman noted the comments and suggested that they could discuss the issues outside the meeting in terms of how it was proposed to support things. There was a wide range of offers of support from skilled social organisations and individuals who lived in the District.
- e. Reference was made to the proposed Innovation Fund for the Districts and that a lot of things they might want to support would not be there the following year as they would have disappeared.
- f. With regard to the partners, a number of partners were being supported by the City Council by way of the Community Chest and hopefully by the proposed Innovation Fund, but if they did not receive it this year they might not be there the following year.
- g. It was uncertain that one officer covering up to 400,000 people, in terms of Quadrants, would be able to cope with the work load.
- h. In terms of Ward Committees the issue had been discussed with Sir Bob Kerslake that the statement that there had been no engagement at Ward level between Councillors was unfounded.
- i. There were no assets in Hall Green and people would only be protecting their interest for their Wards and Districts. The demographics and the situation in Sparkbrook were different from that of Hall Green for example.
- j. As Members, they had to start doing something. This would not be just a talking shop. People had elected them as Councillors and they did not expect Members just to talk, but also to deliver.

- k. In terms of co-option, this could be an action point. The Committee could suggest co-opting representatives from the Housing Liaison Board (HLB) onto the District Committee and that there could be merits in considering the members of the Birmingham Educational Partnership (BEP) from schools within the District by inviting a member from them. Equally, the Early Years community which was different to the BEP. There was perhaps a role to put together all the District's Neighbourhood Forums and get a representative from one or another to attend each of the District Committee meetings.
- l. Over the last two years enquiries had been made as to how many jobs the District had received from the 50% top-slicing of the Community Chest that was made in relation to Birmingham Jobs Fund with no response.
- m. The Policy Statement, Community Governance etc., was confusing and that these could be called 'The Plan'. Too much of the Council's work was locked up in fancy language which loses the meaning of what was intended.
- n. The District Challenge idea was to be saluted as they could get something to happen, but it should be noted that of the 10 Districts, Hall Green District had been the District that had lost the most officers.
- o. As districts were being reconfigured into Quadrants, there was a need for more resource to be put into Hall Green as in the last four years the District was disproportionately penalised.
- p. In terms of Ward Committees, they have not had a Ward Committee meeting in Sparkbrook for over a year. It was now perceived that the City Council had cancelled Ward Committee meetings, which in theory was not true. The issue was raised at Full City Council, the Labour Group and every potential level. They could work with the Police at the Police Tasking meetings in their communities and they did not necessarily need to be live-streamed. The question was how much was this also costing as there was a financial cost to the live-streaming of meetings.
- q. When District Challenge meetings were being held and witnesses were being brought in to give evidence, this was what was needed to be captured and recorded as was the case with Scrutiny inquiry. What they talk about had to be publicly transparent to people outside as this was what Sir Bob Kerslake alluded to as this was the future Council. The question was what should the role of a Councillor in the changing context of local government be.
- r. It was noted that the BEPs formation was now District led. They could get the BEP to engage with the District Committee by having one of their members attending future District Committee meetings.
- s. That the rules with regard to RB28 should be changed as it relates to the funding of Neighbourhood Forums and that it be referred back to the Executive.
- t. There was a need to have dates in diaries in terms of Ward Committees/Forums before September 2015. In terms of co-option, someone from the Youth Service could also be co-opted on to the District Committee.



- u. It was up to Elected Ward Members for each Ward to come up with their own arrangements.
- v. The District Champions should have the opportunity at some stage to pick up things and work with partners/bring partners and officers with that particular commitment to a meeting to declare what was happening and to also invite greater participation.

It was noted that Councillor Straker Welds would be delighted to work with people in this area particularly; special educational needs with Early Years and make that an item on the agenda for a future Hall Green District Committee meeting. For each of the Championship areas there was an issue for a meeting where people could come together with the local Members and form a common purpose in delivering a presentation of some sort.

Mr Davis stated that the comments were insightful and thoughtful with some positive suggestions. The answers were not all there to do everything that the Members and officers recognised. Resources would be a challenge as some of the resources were not all there. It was good to be ambitious as they had a programme to work through all year as Officers and Members and within the area teams they would be doing their best to take things forward. It was hoped that the arrangement being put in place by Mr Ifor Jones for District Services were affordable and sustainable to take us forward.

The Chairman thanked Mike Davis and Councillor Claire Spencer for presenting the information

---

## **HALL GREEN DISTRICT HOUSING ISSUES**

### **a) Review of Housing Reporting Format**

168 The Chairman stated that they had made many comments in the past about the format of the Housing reporting. The KPIs and the information that appeared in the report was unusable for the purpose of looking at Place Management, Neighbourhood Management and the wider homes and housing issues in general. He added that from this Committee, he was requesting support for the review of the Housing reporting format so that it become more usable for all. Councillor Quinn advised that they had requested this at 6 separate meetings of this Committee, but this had proved futile.

### **b) Extending Licensing for the Private Rented Housing Sector**

Pete Hobbs, Service Head, Housing Transformation gave the following verbal presentation. He advised that the local authority by approval of the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor John Cotton, was consulting on whether the City Council needed to consider using additional selective licensing powers for the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in the City.

He highlighted that in the 2004 Housing Act, the Government introduce the power to licence Houses in Multi Occupation (HMO) of a certain type. This was five or more people who share facilities in a three storeys or larger property. This did not include

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

self-contained flats or Registered Social Landlord (RSL) properties. It was estimated that 2,500 properties in the City would fall within mandatory licensing.

Within the legislation, there was the power to consider additional or selective licensing. Additional licensing would be where there were significant issues in an area or community that relates to the private rented sector. These could be issues around increase in fly-tipping, refuse, decline in terms of the local environment where this was having a significant impact and the use of these additional powers would help to tackle this. Selective licensing was where there may be issues of low demand or anti-social behaviour that relates to the private rented sector. These powers could be used in order to try to control the activities of landlords and tenants.

With regard to selective licensing, additional guidance had come from the Government to restrict the volume and number of PRS property in the local authority's area, which could be subject to selective licensing. Prior to this a number of local authorities had introduced selective licensing across the board to deal with specific issues - Newham was an example where they had bedsits in sheds as per press reports which was a problem in their area. The powers and guidance had been amended, but Birmingham was not looking to do something citywide. A consultation exercise was being done to phase this in.

The first phase was to gather the information on what the impact of the PRS might be. This was whether they might be related to the problem across the City and this was being done in a number of ways:-

- ❖ A letter from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor John Cotton to Members;
- ❖ There was a community resident's questionnaire that was placed on the Be Heard website encouraging people to go on to the website and complete the licensing questionnaire. It was hoped that this would give a view of where there were neighbourhoods where the PRS may be an issue; and
- ❖ This would then be followed up with the local information and intelligence they had from their partners and Housing Strategy and Planning colleagues across the City to try and correlate what the residents were telling them and the information they had on the PRS.

The PRS was part of the housing offer in the City and was the only housing sector that had seen an increase in the last 10 years by over 3000 properties. Over 68,000 properties in the City was privately rented. With all of the types of services, they had a proportion of that sector that failed standards and dealt poorly with their tenants. There were tenants who were vulnerable and could be challenging in communities.

In the Cabinet Member's report that was approved in February 2015 in relation to the consultation, it was identified that 3 priority areas were Stockland Green and Selly Oak Wards where there were perceived instances about concentration of PRS properties and the hostels market, where not all the hostels in the City was covered by mandatory licensing. They had some vulnerable people living in hostels in the City that were privately managed. From officers' point of view, these vulnerable people would be better suited within a licensing regime in terms of control, but this had to be demonstrated by the evidence they needed to collect.

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

This was the initial briefing for Members, the Districts and local residents to be aware that they were interested to know about the PRS, to be able to evidence the impact they had. They were working with their Community Safety Partnership colleagues particularly around issues of anti-social behaviour which was a lot of data gathering.

All of the information would then be taken back to the Cabinet Member and colleagues in order to build up the picture of where they think licensing powers may or may not be appropriate. One of the challenges was from landlord colleagues where there were Landlord Forum Steering Group in the City who were the responsible part of the PRS in the City. They had a view concerning the role of licensing and were concerned that a lot of the perceptions that may not be in their district, but in other parts of the City where the challenges of the PRS was. The problem was that the private providers were registered providers.

The Homes and Communities Agency registered landlords under their own regulatory regime. Registered Social Landlords (RLS) and Housing Associations had their own mechanisms. If they received enquiries concerning these with regard to disrepair etc., the tenants were referred back to the Housing Association or RSL. A number of landlords and managing agents were registered by the Homes and Communities Agency and were excluded from licensing. In parts of the City there were some registered providers and it was alleged that those properties were cause for concerns, but they would not fall within the licensing regime.

There was a need to build the evidence and fix the right problem as the Landlord Forum Steering Group would like them to do. If there was a Business Case in parts of the City or in relation to a category of properties, they would then submit a formal Business Case setting out the reasons for doing it, the evidence collected for the reasons they were doing it, the alternative arrangements they could have and the alternative powers. Licensing was seen as part of a framework of powers rather than it been a sole problem. The Business Case would be subject to a formal consultation of about 12 weeks. Some of the formal cases across the country were subject to challenge both at the local level in the courts and the High Court.

In response to questions from Members, the following were amongst the points made:-

- In terms of the gathering of local information, where they were able to identify some of the key issues, colleagues in Strategic Housing had produced the Strategic Housing Assessment for each District. The information for Hall Green District was circulated to the Elected Members which sets out what they knew about housing in the area and the tables that were attached also sets out the information.
- In Hall Green District it was shown that there was a high proportion of the PRS of 22% in comparison to the City average which was 18%. There were 2,968 private rented properties in the District between 2001 and 2011. It also gives information on the service that was managed on request for assistance in terms of housing options, disrepairs which was a significant issue as was possession proceedings advice.
- Of the properties in the area when the information was produced, there were 1,800 licensed HMO's of which 151 were in the Hall Green District, which was a small proportion of the District's private rented sector.

- Although they had the statistics, there were others from other parts of the local authority that they need. There were issues in terms of the Data Protection, but they were interested in broad information on the PRS and properties per se rather than the individual. They were confident that they could build up a better picture at a local level.
- The Stockland Green and Selly Oak issues were those where the original areas came forward to say that they were having these issues and they were aware of the additional powers. Having looked at these issues they considered the option to consult on the development of these, but it was clear that these were not exclusive areas they would consider and as a result of the consultation they may well identify other areas. It was known that there were other parts of Hall Green where they had a high concentration of the PRS which gives rise to issues.
- In terms of the size of the licensable area there was none. It could have a street or a series of houses. From the landlords point of view the question was whether the City would do something on a Ward basis. If they got the information and licensing was appropriate to tackle the issue it could be as small as that. They were not bound that a significant number had to be in a licensable area. Similarly, it could not be extended beyond what was reasonable as it would get caught in the Business Case. The Business Case acts as back up as to how they take this forward.
- It was a lengthy process and in terms of resources, the Cabinet Member was clear that they wanted to get it right and that they were not just doing this as a thing, but were doing it to see what were the issues and if there were issues, whether licensing was the right fix, or do they need to fix the problem in other ways. If the problem was with a registered provider in the area where the tenants and the registered provider was deemed the issue, licensing would not fix that and they were in contact with the Homes and Communities Agency with issues concerning registered providers and the regulatory regime that fits alongside that as part of the challenge.
- It was noted that the PRS had grown as a significant number of people were using it. The majority of the PRS operates successfully and was a choice for some people. There was still core services around the PRS as the majority of things they deal with was around advice for tenants, but they had statutory power which they could still use if there was significant problems around these issues.
- In terms of the combined approach, if they go down the licensing route, this had to sit alongside all the regulatory regimes. The Regulatory Services dealt with fly-tipping and rubbish and colleagues in Fleet and Waste Management, Planning etc. where they had issues in certain areas of the City concerning unregulated planning development, infringement of party wall acts by landlords who were looking to develop and increase in capacity of properties to let. It was a combined approach in areas.
- The Government was talking about rogue landlords, but they did not keep a register of rogue landlords as this was not their role as a local authority. What Strategy did was that they had maps which could be used for census

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

information to map where there were concentrations of properties in the private rented sector.

- It was accepted that using Elected Members at Election time or otherwise was a useful task in getting the information. A number of streets were identified where potential they needed to be considering where the evidence was.
- Mr Hobbs noted Councillor Quinn's comment concerning people who were referred by the Home Options Team to the PRS and advised that it was correct that people were referred to the PRS if they were unable to access enough points under Home Options. He was not aware whether the Homeless Team refers people specifically to the private rented sector.
- They had 'Let to Birmingham' which was a private organisation set up to access the PRS formally, which was a partner organisation which landlords could put their properties into 'Let to Birmingham' which was an option. They did not keep a list of accredited landlords, but they advise tenants who were looking to rent was that there were accredited landlords both nationally and locally through the National Landlords Association.
- There were also a number of accredited bodies and Residential Landlords Associations who they would recommend if someone was looking for a landlord. As a local authority, they did not operate an accreditation scheme.
- The Place Managers as and when identified will be important, whether it goes in this consultation or in future where they identify the need for licensing, that those people who had that local intelligence Members have will be important in joining up some of these issues and identifying where the priorities were.
- In terms of short-term tenancies, licensing will not resolve this, but the high turnover of people in and out of properties leads to issues of either cleaning and furniture renewal or just neglect i.e. such as the advancement of refuse. If landlords were not on top of this it leads to problems in the local neighbourhoods.
- They were writing to the Government to ascertain whether the recommendations concerning Tenants Charter and other things, to encourage the landlords to give longer term tenancies. Licensing will not address the issue.
- There were good practice and different ways of doing things across the country such as a pilot approach which was being done in Doncaster. Their approach was for people to be in an accredited landlord scheme

The Chairman thanked Pete Hobbs for attending the meeting and presenting the information.

### **RESOLVED:-**

That the verbal report be noted.

**c) Housing Transformation Board Performance Report**

The following report of the Service Director, housing Transformation was submitted: -

(See document No. 3)

It was noted that no officer was in attendance to present the report and therefore consideration of the report be deferred to a future meeting. Pete Hobbs undertook to take back members questions and concern to colleagues for a response to be submitted to a future Committee

170

**RESOLVED:-**

That consideration of the report be deferred to a future meeting.

---

**HALL GREEN DISTRICT - INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR  
ENDING 31 MARCH 2015**

The following report of the Service Directors (District Services and Housing Transformation) and the Director of Finance was submitted:-

(See document No 4)

Parmjeet Jassal, Head of City Finance, Place introduced the item and advised that the report was the final in the cycle and that it identified the financial performance for Hall Green District for the 2014/15 financial year. She drew the Committee's attention to the information in the report and responded to the detailed questions from Members concerning the report.

It was

171

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That the net overspend of £0.721m for Directly Managed and SLA Services, as detailed in report Appendix 1, compared to a projected overspend of £0.815m at month 10, after taking into account the write off of prior year overdrawn reserves and debit balances from 2013/14 of £0.205m. The net overspend had been written off corporately as approved by Cabinet on 16 March 2015 be noted;
  - (ii) that the financial position of the Community Chest projects of an underspend of £0.092m, as detailed in report Appendix 2, which will be carried forward into 2015/16 to fund approved commitments be noted.
- 

**DATES OF FUTURE HALL GREEN DISTRICT COMMITTEES**

172

**RESOLVED: -**

That the District Committee note the schedule of meetings for 2015/16: -

**2015**

**2016**

## **Hall Green District Committee - 14 July 2015**

Tuesday 14 July  
Tuesday 22 September  
Tuesday 17 November

Tuesday 18 January  
Tuesday 15 March

All meetings will be held at 1000 hours in Committee Rooms 3 & 4 at the Council House, Victoria Square.

---

### **OTHER URGENT BUSINESS (REPORTS BY OFFICERS)**

#### 173 **Colgreave Avenue Car Park**

The Committee agreed for this matter to be dealt with in private due to the commercially sensitive nature of the information.

---

### **AUTHORITY TO CHAIRMAN AND OFFICERS**

#### 174 **RESOLVED: -**

Chairman to move:-

‘That in an urgent situation between meetings, the Chair jointly with the relevant Chief Officer has authority to act on behalf of the Committee’.

---

The meeting ended at 1220 hours.

-----  
CHAIRMAN