

MOTIONS FOR DEBATE FROM INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

To consider the following Motions of which notice has been given in accordance with Standing Order 4(A)

A Councillors John Cotton and John O'Shea have given notice of the following motion:-

"This Council notes with grave concern the Government's proposals to impose a "Pay to Stay" policy that will compel council tenants earning over £30,000 to pay a full market rent in order to remain in their home.

Council believes that "Pay to Stay" is nothing more than a new "tax on tenants", unfairly penalising those who are already in employment and actively undermining efforts to help others back into work. Council is particularly concerned to note that a relatively marginal increase in the Government's recently announced national minimum wage premium rate would result in many households on modest incomes having to pay a full market rent.

Council understands that any additional income raised through "Pay to Stay" will be repaid direct to the Treasury, rather than retained locally. This is unjustifiable and runs counter to the Government's own commitment to localism.

This Council also notes that the administrative burden of implementing "Pay to Stay" is likely to result in an additional £1million in costs initially, with significant ongoing costs. This will need to be met from our already stretched resources and at a time when the government are setting rent policies that further reduce funds available for Birmingham to build and invest in homes.

Accordingly, Birmingham City Council confirms its opposition to the "Pay to Stay" policy and urges Ministers not to proceed with the imposition of this new tax on working tenants and their families."

B Councillors Matt Bennett and Debbie Clancy have given notice of the following motion:-

"At the recent Cabinet Meeting on 17th November 2015, the Council Business Plan monitoring report highlighted a number of concerning trends in children's services. The number of unallocated single assessments open for more than 7 days has increased by 25% July to September. The time taken from initial adoption enquiry to approval at panel remains 9 weeks above the statutory target. The average length of time from admission to care to being placed in adoption continues to rise. These targets and others which are off target cause this Council great concern. Even more concerning, some changes were made to the targets for this year which could be serving to conceal greater failings. For instance, the target for the length of time from admission

to adoption replaced one which measured the average length of care proceedings, which we were at the time failing to meet. Current performance in this area is now not in the public domain

The Council calls on the Executive to bring greater transparency to the oversight process and allow an opposition representative to attend and participate in the meetings of the “Quartet”.