



**MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM  
CITY COUNCIL  
13 APRIL 2021**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD  
ON TUESDAY, 13 APRIL 2021 AT 1400 HOURS AS AN ON-LINE  
MEETING**

**PRESENT:-** Lord Mayor (Councillor Mohammed Azim) in the Chair to and including agenda item No. 6.  
Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Yvonne Mosquito) in the Chair from agenda item 7 onwards.

**Councillors**

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

**NOTICE OF RECORDING**

19458 The Lord Mayor indicated that he was very pleased to be joining Members today, but, advised that as today was the first day of Ramadan, he would not be staying for the whole meeting, and would hand over to the Deputy Lord Mayor after Question Time.

The 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 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 Lord Mayor highlighted that the meeting was being held in the pre-election period in relation to the by-elections combined with the Police & Crime Commissioner and West Midlands Combined Authority elections, which would take place on the 6 May 2021. During this pre-election period the Council cannot undertake any activity which could call into question political impartiality or could give rise to the criticism that public resources (which includes Council Meetings) are being used for political purposes and/or seeking to influence voters. Therefore, the Lord Mayor asked Councillors to refrain from saying anything which could be perceived to influence the voting intentions of members of the public during the course of the meeting. Members will be interrupted and ask to stop if they are found to be breaching pre-election rules.

The 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 Lord Mayor advised Members that If they wished to speak, to indicate by using the Raise your Hand button and wait to be invited to speak and to state their name at the start of every contribution.

The Lord Mayor requested Members not to use the chat function unless they were having technical difficulties.

---

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

19459 The 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 Mary Locke declared a non pecuniary interest as a Birmingham City Council appointed nominee on the Birmingham Midland Institute.

## **City Council – 13 April 2021**

Councillor Peter Fowler declared a non pecuniary interest as a Birmingham City Council appointed nominee on the Birmingham Midland Institute.

Councillor Robert Pocock declared a non pecuniary interest as a Birmingham City Council appointed nominee on the Birmingham Midland Institute.

Councillor Mike Ward declared a non pecuniary interest as a Birmingham City Council appointed nominee on the Birmingham Midland Institute.

---

### **MINUTES**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

19460

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2021 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

---

### **LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **Death of The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh**

The Lord Mayor indicated that it was with a heavy heart that he had received news last week of the death of His Royal Highness, The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, who passed away peacefully at Windsor Castle on Friday morning. Prince Philip was an extraordinary man, who lived an extraordinary life; with achievements too numerous to mention here. He gave his life to service, giving up his much-loved Naval career, when literally overnight, and for 65 years to follow, it became his life to support his wife, The Queen.

The Lord Mayor observed that the legacy of his life, including to name just two; the founding of the Duke of Edinburgh youth awards programme in 1956 and his pioneering work promoting environmental causes, would ensure that Prince Philip's extraordinary service to the Nation, and to the Commonwealth would never be forgotten.

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

19461

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That this Council places on record its great sorrow at the death of His Royal Highness, The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh and its appreciation of his devoted service to the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth. The Council extends its deepest sympathy to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and members of The Royal Family in their sad bereavement.

Members and officers stood for a minute's silence, following which a number of tributes were made by Members.

**PETITIONS**

**Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented at the Meeting**

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 1)

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

19462 **RESOLVED:-**

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

---

**Petitions Update**

The following Petitions Update had been made available electronically:-

(See document No. 2)

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19463 **RESOLVED:-**

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

---

**QUESTION TIME**

19464 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.

At this point the Lord Mayor withdraw from the meeting.

---

At this point in the meeting the Deputy Lord Mayor assumed the chair.

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL  
2019/20**

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

(See document No 3)

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward moved the Motion, which was seconded.

A debate ensued

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward replied to the debate.

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 (66)**

Muhammad Afzal	Eddie Freeman	Mary Locke
Akhlaq Ahmed	Fred Grindrod	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Paulette Hamilton	Saddak Miah
Deirdre Alden	Roger Harmer	Majid Mahmood
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Kath Hartley	Gareth Moore
David Barrie	Penny Holbrook	John O'Shea
Baber Baz	Jon Hunt	David Pears
Bob Beauchamp	Mahmood Hussain	Robert Pocock
Kate Booth	Shabrana Hussain	Hendrina Quinnen
Sir Albert Bore	Mohammed Idrees	Chauhdry Rashid
Nicky Brennan	Zafar Iqbal	Carl Rice
Mick Brown	Morriam Jan	Shafique Shah
Tristan Chatfield	Kerry Jenkins	Mike Sharpe
Zaker Choudhry	Meirion Jenkins	Sybil Spence
Debbie Clancy	Julie Johnson	Martin Straker Welds
Liz Clements	Brigid Jones	Sharon Thompson
Maureen Cornish	Nagina Kauser	Paul Tilsley
John Cotton	Mariam Khan	Lisa Trickett
Diane Donaldson	Zaheer Khan	Ian Ward
Barbara Dring	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Mike Ward
Peter Fowler	Chaman Lal	Ken Wood
Jayne Francis	Mike Leddy	Waseem Zaffar

**Against the motion (3)**

Julien Pritchard	Ron Storer	Simon Morrall
------------------	------------	---------------

**Abstentions (5)**

Tahir Ali	Peter Griffiths	Ziaul Islam
Adam Higgs	Charlotte Hodivala	

It was therefore-

19465

**RESOLVED:-**

The recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel on Page 5 of its Annual Report be accepted and implemented with effect from 25 May 2021.

After the result of vote was announced by the Deputy Lord Mayor in accordance with above recorded votes, the following was advised:-

Councillor Bridle was not shown as voting for the motion  
Councillor Zhor Malik was not shown as voting for the motion  
Councillor Safia Akhtar was not shown as voting for the motion  
Councillor Alex Aitken was not shown as voting for the motion  
Councillor Ziaul Islam had abstained in error instead of voting for the motion

---

### **SCRUTINY BUSINESS REPORT**

The following report of the Co-ordinating Overview and Scrutiny Committee was submitted:-

(See document No 4)

Councillor Carl Rice moved the recommendation. Councillor Liz Clements was due to second the report but was having technical issues so at on the suggestion of Councillor Rice, Councillor Ewan Mackey seconded the recommendation. Councillor Liz Clements re-joined the meeting and spoke in support of the recommendation

A debate ensued

Councillor Carl Rice replied to the debate.

The recommendation having been moved and seconded was agreed.

It was therefore-

19466 **RESOLVED:-**

That Full Council endorses the Scrutiny Framework set out in Appendix 1.

---

### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and

19467 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council be adjourned until 1700 hours on this day.

The Council then adjourned at 1645 hours.

At 1700 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

---

**SCRUTINY INQUIRY: INFANT MORTALITY**

The following report of the Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee together with an Executive commentary was submitted:-

(See document No 5)

Councillor Robert Pocock moved the motion, which was seconded by Councillor Peter Fowler.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Robert Pocock replied to the debate.

The Motion having been moved and seconded was agreed.

It was therefore-

19468

**RESOLVED:-**

That recommendations R01 to R05 be approved, and that the Executive be requested to pursue their implementation.

---

**APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The following report of the Council Business Management Committee (Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers Appointments, Dismissals and Service Conditions Sub-Committee) was submitted:-

(See document No 6)

It was noted that the meeting would not need to go into private.

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward in moving the motion indicated that in 2.1.2 of the Motion 'three months' should read 'six months' so that that part of the Motion read 'Notes that the period of notice on either side will be six months'. The Motion as amended was seconded.

A debate ensued

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward indicated he did not wish to reply to the debate.

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 (78)**

Muhammad Afzal	Peter Fowler	Bruce Lines
Akhlaq Ahmed	Jayne Francis	Mary Locke
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Eddie Freeman	Ewan Mackey
Alex Aitken	Fred Grindrod	Zhor Malik
Safia Akhtar	Paulette Hamilton	Karen McCarthy
Deirdre Alden	Kath Hartley	Saddak Miah
Robert Alden	Adam Higgs	Gareth Moore
Tahir Ali	Charlotte Hodiola	Simon Morrall
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Penny Holbrook	John O'Shea
David Barrie	Jon Hunt	David Pears
Baber Baz	Mahmood Hussain	Robert Pocock
Bob Beauchamp	Shabrana Hussain	Julien Pritchard
Kate Booth	Mohammed Idrees	Hendrina Quinnen
Sir Albert Bore	Zafar Iqbal	Carl Rice
Nicky Brennan	Ziaul Islam	Gary Sambrook
Marje Bridle	Morriam Jan	Shafique Shah
Mick Brown	Kerry Jenkins	Mike Sharpe
Tristan Chatfield	Julie Johnson	Sybil Spence
Zaker Choudhry	Brigid Jones	Ron Storer
Debbie Clancy	Josh Jones	Martin Straker Welds
Liz Clements	Nagina Kauser	Paul Tilsley
Maureen Cornish	Mariam Khan	Lisa Trickett
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Ian Ward
Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Mike Ward
Diane Donaldson	Chaman Lal	Ken Wood
Barbara Dring	Mike Leddy	Waseem Zaffar

**Against the motion (0)**

**Abstentions (0)**

It was therefore-

19469

**RESOLVED:-**

That the City Council as required by Part C7.4 of the Constitution:

1. Approves the appointment of Deborah Cadman as Interim Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service for a fixed term period of 18 months initially; and
2. Notes that the period of notice on either side will be six months; and
3. Approves that until commencement, Graeme Betts will act as Acting Chief Executive.

---

The Deputy Lord Mayor was of the opinion that the following matter could be considered as a matter of urgency in view of need to expedite consideration thereof and instruct officers if necessary:-



**URGENT BUSINESS - THE BIRMINGHAM & MIDLAND INSTITUTE -  
DISPOSITION OF 93-95 CORNWALL STREET**

The following report of the Leader was submitted:-

(See document No 7)

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

A debate ensued

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward indicated he did not wish to reply to the debate.

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 (76)**

Muhammad Afzal	Fred Grindrod	Ewan Mackey
Akhlaq Ahmed	Paulette Hamilton	Majid Mahmood
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Roger Harmer	Zhor Malik
Alex Aitken	Kath Hartley	Karen McCarthy
Safia Akhtar	Adam Higgs	Saddak Miah
Deirdre Alden	Penny Holbrook	Gareth Moore
Tahir Ali	Jon Hunt	Simon Morrall
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Mahmood Hussain	John O'Shea
David Barrie	Shabrina Hussain	David Pears
Baber Baz	Mohammed Idrees	Robert Pocock
Bob Beauchamp	Zafar Iqbal	Julien Pritchard
Kate Booth	Ziaul Islam	Hendrina Quinnen
Sir Albert Bore	Morriam Jan	Carl Rice
Marje Bridle	Kerry Jenkins	Gary Sambrook
Mick Brown	Meirion Jenkins	Shafique Shah
Tristan Chatfield	Julie Johnson	Mike Sharpe
Zaker Choudhry	Brigid Jones	Sybil Spence
Debbie Clancy	Josh Jones	Ron Storer
Liz Clements	Nagina Kauser	Martin Straker Welds
Maureen Cornish	Mariam Khan	Paul Tilsley
John Cotton	Zaheer Khan	Lisa Trickett
Diane Donaldson	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Ian Ward
Barbara Dring	Chaman Lal	Mike Ward
Jayne Francis	Bruce Lines	Ken Wood
Eddie Freeman	Mary Locke	Waseem Zaffar
Peter Griffiths		

**Against the motion (0)**

**Abstentions (2)**

Robert Alden	Charlotte Hodivala	
--------------	--------------------	--

It was therefore-

19470

**RESOLVED:-**

- 1 That the consent of the Council to the disposal of 93-95 Cornwall Street be confirmed and that the restriction on the title be removed.
- 2 that the City Solicitor be authorised to negotiate, seal, execute and complete all legal documentation to give effect to the above recommendations."

---

The meeting ended at 1810 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  
MIKE WARD**

**A1      Economic Recovery Post Covid 19**

**Question:**

**Cabinet, at its meeting on 16 March 2021, approved the Covid 19 Economic Recovery with support previously been given to the arts and culture sector during the pandemic. Could the Leader give details of what is proposed in these sectors and how the new strategy will adapt for implementation by the this sector?**

**Answer:**

At the meeting on 9 February 2021 Cabinet agreed to continue with £2.429m revenue funding towards supporting the current funded portfolio of arts organisations in 2021-22. In addition, a further budget of £0.487m is available to commission cultural projects from small scale / independent arts organisations across Birmingham that meet Council Priorities. This budget also includes funding to support the city's Local Arts Forum Network, Local Arts initiatives in communities and, to deliver annual events such as Black History Month and the annual Heritage Week.

The Culture budget has also supported Birmingham's cultural membership organisation (Culture Central) with a small grant and staff resource to assist in delivering support for the city's cultural sector under its 'Culture Response Unit' initiative. This has included delivering key information to the sector via a dedicated website as well as organising on-line advice and guidance webinars and seminars to independent creatives and freelancers.

Despite closure of all the city's heritage premises, the Council has committed the full annual service contract fee to Birmingham Museums Trust (BMT) in 2020-21 and 2021-22 to support the Trust through the Pandemic. In addition, the council facilitated an additional £0.204m in Supplier Relief Funding to BMT in 2020-21 with possible further applications to be assessed in 2021-22.

In the meantime, The Museums Trust and several other cultural organisations across the city have been successful in applying to the council for Business Rates Relief.

In 2020-21 the council allocated some funding from the Major Events Budget to support the Van Gogh Exhibition at The Hippodrome Theatre in Southside – designed to support reopening of city centre spaces / attract visitor traffic. It is hoped that other funding streams such as the Government's recently announced 'Welcome Back Fund' would be able to support similar initiatives going forward in 2021-22.

### **City Council – 13 April 2021**

Finally, the Council has appointed a new Tourism Officer who starts on 12<sup>th</sup> April. This post will lead on the development and implementation of a Visitor Destination Plan for Birmingham which will align with the existing regional Tourism Strategy. One of the main components of the plan will be focusing on attracting visitors to the city's cultural offer and to maximise opportunities presented by the hosting of the forthcoming Commonwealth Games.

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

**A2     Staff – Regeneration**

**Question:**

**Broken down by grade, how many staff worked in the Regeneration Department in March 2012?**

**Answer:**

The breakdown of employees in the Development Planning & Regeneration Service in 2012 is as follows:-

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Number of Employees</b>
GR1	1
GR2	13
GR3	58
GR4	93
GR5	63
GR6	31
GR7	8
LO1	2
LO3	1
LO6	1

Total number of employees is 271.

LO1, LO3 and LO6 are JNC Officers.

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

**A3     Staff – Regeneration 2**

**Question:**

**Broken down by grade, how many staff worked in the Regeneration Department in March 2021?**

**Answer:-**

There is no longer a specific regeneration division within Inclusive Growth.

If Councillor Bennett can provide more detail on the outcome he is hoping to achieve, I will ask officers to provide the appropriate information.

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

**A4     Electric Vehicles 1**

**Question:**

**How many electric vehicles did the Council have in the 1920's?**

**Answer:**

This is unknown. Fleet Management do not have records that go back to the 1920s.

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

**A5     Electric Vehicles 2**

**Question:**

**How many electric vehicles does the Council have as of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021?**

**Answer:**

The Council leases 13 electric small vans.

Birmingham City council is committed to reducing emissions and although electric vehicles will play a part, we are undertaking many initiatives to reduce CO2.

These include our new fleet of 76 cleaner and greener waste and recycling vehicles, our ongoing commitment to hydrogen buses, our commitment to cycling and our support of electric scooters across the city.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

**A6     Former Mayor Joe Anderson**

**Question:**

**Has the Council ever had any financial or other deals, agreements or work with former Liverpool Mayor Joe Anderson or members of his family?**

**Answer:**

Our records show that no transactions have been concluded with the named individual or members his family.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**A7     Dealings**

**Question:**

**Has the Council ever had any dealings with either Flanagan Group or Safety Support Consultants Limited? If so, please provide details including any financial or land transactions.**

**Answer:**

Our records show that no dealings have been concluded with the named companies. Therefore, there have been no financial payments made to Flanagan Group or Safety Support Consultants Limited in any of the 6 years for which records are retained.

The Council received a highways bond from the Flanagan Group in connection with Woodcock Street relating to scaffolding adjacent to the highway.

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

**A8     Pieces of Land**

**Question:**

**How many pieces of land has Birmingham City Council sold for below its estimated value in last ten years?**

**Answer:**

One site has been identified as being sold within the last ten years at below estimated value. Secretary of State consent was granted for this transaction.

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

**A9     Investigations**

**Question:**

**Has any officer or elected Member as yet, been involved in anyway with any of the investigations into Liverpool City Council,/Unite/Flanagan Group etc. or about the development they are doing in Birmingham. In the case of positive answer, also please provide details of the involvement and the names of those involved, e.g. dates interviewed as part of this)?**

**Answer:**

The current Chief Finance Officer and s151 officer is a prosecution witness

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

**A10     Sale of Land**

**Question:**

**As part of their ongoing investigations, have MHCLG and/or Merseyside Police/West Midlands Police been made aware of the sale of land by BCC – on seemingly preferential terms and with no public declarations – to Unite for their new hotel and conference centre being built with involvement from Flanagan Group?**

**Answer:**

Legal have no records to indicate that any communications have taken place with MHCLG, Merseyside Police or West Midlands Police.

For the avoidance of any doubt, it should be noted that the sale of the land to Unite was not on preferential terms. GBR Phoenix Beard had independently assessed value for money for the site as being £1.2 million and the Council received sale proceeds of £1.95m.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
MAUREEN CORNISH**

**A11     Call In**

**Question:**

**Why did yourself and other Members of the Labour Administration including the now MP for Birmingham Yardley, vote on the call in regarding the Unite/Flanagan Development given you declared you had interests (admittedly in private not public as required)?**

**Answer:**

I did **not** vote on the request for call in at the Governance, Resources and Customer Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2014, relating to a decision at Cabinet on 17 March 2014 regarding the Proposed Development at Jennens Road, Eastside, Birmingham.

Non pecuniary interests were declared on the advice of the then monitoring officer.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**A12    Unite Development**

**Question:**

**How much did the Council receive for the site sold to Unite?**

**Answer:**

The Council received sale proceeds of £1.95m for the site sold to Unite. GBR Phoenix Beard had independently assessed value for money for the site as being £1.2 million.

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

**A13     Assets Sold**

**Question:**

**List all sites, including the value of the sale. The value actually received and the value the Council had for the asset on its books, of any asset sold to a Trade Union since 2012?**

**Answer:**

The only site identified as being sold to a Trade Union since 2012 was 5,270 sqm at Jennens Road, Eastside, Birmingham.

The site was sold to Unite in 2015 for sale proceeds of £1.95m and at the time of disposal was held at a value, in existing use, of £0.92m.

GBR Phoenix Beard had independently assessed value for money for the site as being £1.2 million.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ**

**A14     Social Services Funding**

**Question:**

**Would the Leader give clear assurances he is willing to ringfence funding for Social Services following the latest council tax precept for social care?**

**Answer:**

This year like other recent years we will receive funding for Adults and Children's social care in the form of additional government social care grant (ring-fenced for both Adults and Children's social care) and from raising 3% additional precept on our local taxpayers. The precept being ringfenced for Adult Social Care only.

I can assure Councillor Baz that we fully comply with the ringfencing rules around the Social Care Grant and the Social Care Precept. It is a legal requirement.

The Council's grant and precept is £24.1m for 2021/22. The additional budget provided for in Social Care in 2021/22 as approved as part of our Financial Plan 2021 – 2025 is £29m for Adult Social Care and £9.8m for Children's Social Care. Therefore, the additional funding provided in Social Care as part of our 2021/22 budget is in excess of that required to comply with ring-fencing rules.

Table 3.6 in Chapter 3 of our Financial Plan sets out our costs and resources in more details.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR  
ROGER HARMER**

**AA     Additional Restrictions Grant**

**Question:**

**Councils have recently been given the flexibility to determine their own eligibility criteria for Additional Restrictions Grants with this funding used to help those businesses which, while not legally forced to close, have been severely impacted by Covid 19 restrictions. Could the cabinet member give details of the local criteria that has been determined for these awards and confirm how many businesses have successfully been awarded this payment and how many have been refused?**

**Answer:**

We have carefully designed the eligibility criteria for all grant schemes funded through Additional Restrictions Grant (ARG) funding to ensure that we can support the maximum number of businesses with the money available while also ensuring that grants go where they are most needed.

To date, ARG funding has been used to support 7,458 businesses with grant funding of £25,214,321 paid out according to the criteria below. 1,150 applications have not met eligibility criteria for schemes, and have therefore been declined.

**Additional Restrictions Grant Scheme 1**

This scheme operated between 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020 and 15<sup>th</sup> January 2021, according to the following eligibility criteria and payment schedule.

**ARG 1 eligibility criteria**

- Businesses with a trading address/premises which fall within the Birmingham City Council area
- Businesses employing less than 249 employees
- Existing businesses which were actively trading before 4 November 2020
- Businesses that may not be in the business rates system and are also not in one of the specific business sectors identified within the LRSC (Closed) and (Open) schemes, but have been severely impacted by the local restrictions
- Businesses which can demonstrate that they have suffered a significant fall in income due to the COVID-19 crisis and do not qualify for the LRSC (Closed) and (Open) schemes.
- All business sectors

**ARG 1 payment schedule**

The following grant payments were made if a business was open, but severely impacted due to government restrictions:

- Grants of up to £934 per 28-day period for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value of exactly £15,000 or under on the date of the commencement of the local restrictions.
- Grants of up to £1,400 per 28-day period for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value over £15,000 and less than £51,000 on the date of the commencement of the local restrictions.
- Grants of up to £2,100 per 28-day period for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value of exactly £51,000 or above on the date of the commencement of the local restrictions.

For those businesses where the Council were unable to attribute a rateable value to their trading premises of a business, a grant at the lower rate of £934 was awarded.

The following grant payments were made if a business was closed due to government restrictions:

- Grants of up to £1,334 per 28-day period for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value of exactly £15,000 or under on the date of the commencement of the local restrictions.
- Grants of up to £2,000 per 28-day period for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value over £15,000 and less than £51,000 on the date of the commencement of the local restrictions.
- Grants of up to £3,000 per 28-day period for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value of exactly £51,000 or above on the date of the commencement of the local restrictions.

For those businesses where the Council was unable to attribute a rateable value to the trading premises of a business, a grant at the lower rate of £1,334 was awarded.

**Additional Restrictions Grant Scheme 2**

This scheme was launched on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2021 and **is now closed for** applications.

ARG 2 is a one-off grant payment which means only one grant will be awarded per eligible company and not for each of the company's individual business premises. For self-employed/sole traders, only one Additional Restriction Grant will be awarded.

The following one-off grant payments will be made if a business is open, but severely impacted due to government restrictions:

- A grant of £3,000 for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value of exactly £15,000 or under
- A grant of £5,000 for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value between £15,000 and £51,000
- A grant of £10,000 for businesses occupying hereditaments with a rateable value of over £51,000

For businesses where the Council are unable to attribute a rateable value to the trading premises of a business, a grant at the lower rate of £3,000 will be awarded.

### **Hospitality Survival Fund**

This scheme, which is now closed, provided one-off grants of £10,000 to hospitality and leisure businesses in Birmingham that did not automatically qualify for previous support schemes due to their size.

In order to be eligible for this scheme, businesses had to meet the following criteria:

- In the hospitality and leisure sector
- Rateable value of over £51,000

421 potentially eligible businesses were identified through business rates records, with businesses being contacted directly by the Council and asked to confirm their details. The scheme was announced on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021, with all businesses contacted and requested to provide information by 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2021.

Following a validation exercise, 288 businesses have now been paid this one-off grant.

### **Taxi Sector Grant Scheme**

This scheme is aimed at supporting Birmingham's hackney carriage and private hire taxi drivers who have been significantly impacted as a result of national government lockdown restrictions.

The scheme went live on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2021, and is still open for applications.

One-off grants of £1000 to drivers are awarded who meet the following eligibility criteria:

- Resident within Birmingham
- Hold a license registered with Birmingham City Council
- Have been significantly impacted by government restrictions

To date 3,300 drivers have now been paid this one-off £1k grant.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

**B1     DPS**

**Question:**

**At Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2021, you stated that the DPS Contract had to be changed to add in the safeguarding elements, please provide a full list of changes made and the dates they came into effect?**

**Answer:**

The Deed of Variation to the Terms and Conditions for P0504 Provision of Home to School Transport was issued on 17 December 2020 and all providers had returned a signed copy by mid January 2021.

A summary of the changes made are as follows:

- Introduction of a DBS Panel – where a provider employee has a positive mark on their DBS, the provider must complete an application with supporting evidence which is submitted to the Council, detailing why they feel the provider employee is suitable to work on the provision of home to school transport. An additional schedule and several forms have been created to assist this process which provides a detailed overview of the process.
- Standard Licence – All licences used on the provision of home to school transport should be a standard licence in accordance with Part II and Sections 12 – 14 of the Public Passenger Vehicles Act 1981.
- Introduction of a DBS Practitioner – a named person within the organisation who has appropriate training, skills and knowledge of DBS Policies and Procedures to make decisions relating to DBS.
- Introduction of three new policies – the providers are required to have a policy on safer recruitment, recruitment of ex-offenders and handling disclosure information.
- Compliance with the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 – The providers shall comply with Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 when making recruitment decisions.
- Consent to share – obtain provider employees consent to share disclosure information with Council.
- Introduction of the DBS Update Service – providers are required to use the DBS Update Service to undertake checks.

- Performance of services – Where a provider employee has a positive DBS the employee must not engage in any part of the services until a decision has been reached at the DBS Panel. Where a provider employee does not provide consent for disclosure information to be shared with the Council, the provider employee shall not be engaged in any part of the services.
- Associated costs – all costs associated with changes made shall be borne by the provider.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

**B2     Recruitment Process**

**Question:**

**Please explain the recruitment process step by step for new staff in Home to School transport?**

**Answer:**

Currently, agency staff are used to cover vacant posts whilst a service restructure within Travel Assist is being undertaken. Once the restructure is complete, the City Council's Recruitment and Selection procedure will be used to fill any vacant posts.

For any new positions a business case is completed in line with the Corporate framework. These are presented to the Directorate Workforce Review Board, which monitors all workforce spend. The business case is considered by the board and either approved or rejected.

If the service needs to fill an existing position quickly in order to meet business needs, it would approach Hays, the council's Managed Service Provider, as follows:

- Obtain agreement to use agency from the Education and Skills Workforce Review Board, as set out above.
- Travel Assist contact Hays in line with the agency requisition process
- Candidates are identified and interviewed by Hays
- A further interview takes place with BCC transport supervisors to assess suitability for the role

For successful workers where required, Hays completes the recruitment process with the candidate including undertaking an enhanced DBS. Until the DBS is completed and returned as "clear", the candidate is not able to commence in the role with the City Council.

- Any 'positive' disclosures are presented to the council's Safer Recruitment Panel for consideration
- Successful agency workers are required to undertake a City Council induction programme to familiarise themselves with the organisation. As part of this induction, workers are asked to complete the City Council's 10 mandatory training modules. Completion is monitored until all the modules have been completed.

Workers supplied by Hays are regularly monitored as part of 1-to-1 meetings to assess their ongoing suitability for the role. Any performance issues are managed by the City Council. Unsuitable workers are returned to the agency as they are the employer.

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

**B3     Data Breach**

**Question:**

**What was the total number of children who had their data exposed in the recent serious data breach with details of families who qualify for free school bus passes?**

**Answer:**

The data file saved to the individual parent accounts for parents who are on the temporary accommodation list did not contain child data, only the lead tenant data for the property.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

**B4     Accessible Data**

**Question:**

**For how long was the data that was mistakenly placed on the website accessible to other people, how long before it was removed? Please note we mean the total time it was exposed for, not how it was removed once discovered?**

**Answer:**

CXM bus pass portal was created in June 2020. Staff within Travel Assist started to save this data onto CXM in January 2021 (for office use), not aware that this data was visible via individuals BRUM accounts. In total the data was saved in 143 individual files.

In order to access the data individuals had to log onto their BRUM account using log in details and passwords. This information was not available to the wider public, it was only accessible via link pages within the 143 accounts.

These link pages were all removed individually once the source of the data breach had been identified and confirmed on Friday 19 February 2021. An additional report was run to ensure that there were no files with the data attached following this exercise.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**B5     Individual Assessment**

**Question:**

**What individual assessment was made of any specific risk factors for each child on the list of exposed data before deciding not to inform them or their families their data had been breached? Eg children escaping domestic abuse.**

**Answer:**

The individuals identified were the lead tenant only. There wasn't any detail regarding children.

This information was about those in temporary accommodation applying for a bus pass for their child(ren) and was only accessible by those other people in temporary accommodation who were also asking for a bus pass for their child(ren).

In respect of informing the data subjects, it was agreed by the council's corporate information governance team that there was limited evidence of any adverse impact upon the rights and freedoms of the data subjects as a result of the breach. Additionally, as the individuals are already in a vulnerable position, notification of the breach is likely to add to their vulnerability, therefore, it was concluded that notification to the data subjects would not take place.

A discussion with the Information Commissioner's Office also took place.

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

**B6     Assessment**

**Question:**

**With what degree of certainty are you able to say that no one who was not entitled to view this information saw it in anyway before it was removed (not just physically downloaded, but also viewed on screen, photographed or screenshot etc)**

**Answer:**

The information was held in a folder attached to the bus pass outcome for office use. The case was raised by a parent who was able to access the information and informed the Council as soon as they noticed this. The parent was asked to delete the evidence immediately which they agreed to do. This has not been raised by anyone else previously and whilst we can never be 100% certain it has not been viewed, it is likely any other affected citizens would have raised concerns with the Council had they have viewed it.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**B7      SEND Service**

**Question:**

You kindly responded to Question B2 on 23rd February but failed to provide details of the supplier of the SEND service you paid for. This failure cannot be justified as in Question A5 & A6 the Council clearly provided the details of the Company/Supplier as well as where they are based.

In line with this, can you as a matter of urgency update the table in Question B2, 23rd February 2021, with cumulative costs to end of March 2021 as well as clear supplier information as follows. Please add the following to the table in B2 (please do not delete any of the columns or rows but add to the same table. This will make it quicker and easier for you as well as provide us with the information we are seeking):

- Name of Company/Sole Trader
- Total spend up to March 2021
- Company/Sole Trader registered in Birmingham

**Answer:**

The attached table has been updated with the cumulative costs to the end of March 2021. Please note that not all of the agencies had provided the invoices for March 2021 at the time this response was drafted.

The table that is used to track and monitor this spend has had a sort applied to it since the February 23<sup>rd</sup> response and as such the new attached table may be slightly out of order to the one previously provided but all the information has been checked to ensure it is the same.

An extra column has been added providing the name of the agency that supplied the interim/consultant but due to the size restrictions of this please see below a list of those agencies, the total spend and if they are registered in Birmingham:

Agency	Spend	Confirmed Address
Baltimore	£745,240	PS21, 21 Princes Street, Bristol, BS1 4PH
Education Futures	£48,322	19 New Street, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4BH

**City Council – 13 April 2021**

Agency	Spend	Confirmed Address
Hays	£135,815	1 Colmore Square, Birmingham, B4 6AJ
Lords	£570,650	Crown House, The Square, Alvechurch, Birmingham B48 7LA
Panoramic	£1,368,785	St Bartholomew's House, Lewins Mead, Bristol, BS1 2NH
Penna	£0	2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, 10 Bishops Square, Spitalfields, London, E1 6EG
Smart Education	£95,333	1-3 The Courtyard, Calvin Street, Bolton, BL1 8PB
Spencer Clarke	£136,675	11 Bartle Court Business Centre, Rosemary Lane, Preston, PR4 0HF
Venn Group	£35,126	Waterloo House, 20 Waterloo Street, Birmingham, B2 5TB

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Guide transformation lead	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Education Futures	27/01/2020		31/08/2020	No	£48,847	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business case to support the reduction of Agency Guides</li> <li>• 1st Draft Business Case in relation to SEND Transport Application process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the service Saving Strategy and improved gatekeeping and application of policy conditions relating to transport eligibility</li> </ul>
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020		11/02/2021	No	£35,160	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Reviewing and actioning 9,197 outstanding annual review paperwork</li> <li>* Reviewing and actioning newly received review paperwork</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5,271 outstanding reviews closed with all action completed</li> <li>• 2,873 outstanding reviews actioned and awaiting issue by Business Support</li> <li>• Reduction in the backlog of assessments from 500 to 200</li> </ul>
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		22/05/2020	No	£8,775		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£37,260		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£40,780		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£10,660		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020		31/07/2020	No	£13,910		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£11,700		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£7,410		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£12,480		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£12,350		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	19/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£12,220		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£18,280		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£14,040		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	11/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£12,740		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020		31/10/2020	No	£17,420		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£11,700		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	09/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£12,220		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Baltimore	04/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£74,669		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	17/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£14,040		
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	03/03/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£23,165		



## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	12/03/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£24,870	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Communication strategy</li> <li>* Communication plan</li> <li>* Communication material including newsletters for schools and parents, and briefings</li> <li>• Proposed Safeguarding and PATS training program to be delivered to 480 guides in the new year.</li> <li>• Driver and Guide handbook to be issues to all guides and then drivers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Improved communication and engagement with PCF</li> <li>As per Compliance Manager and Senior Compliance Officer</li> </ul>
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	16/03/2020		31/05/2020	No	£16,562		
Interim Communication Officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	01/03/2020		30/11/2020	No	£19,075		
Interim Communication officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	30/12/2019		12/02/2020	No	£1,313		
Interim Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	26/10/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£28,333		
Interim Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion		Panoramic	28/10/2020		20/11/2020	No	£5,400		
Interim Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	01/12/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£23,723		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	06/10/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£30,034	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily compliance reports</li> <li>• Supplier check reports</li> <li>• Investigation findings for safeguarding complaints</li> </ul>	
Interim Compliance Performance Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	23/09/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£52,425	<p>Generate information from the Compliance team and Assessment officer to develop and produce accurate information that can provide an overview of the service performance and suppliers, identify trends and areas of improvement. Provide additional support to the Compliance team to carry out site visits and depot audits as required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directors and Heads of service are now understanding the performance of suppliers and identify social, mechanical or performance trends at source and in the coming weeks/ months note an increase in service delivery</li> </ul>
Interim Contracts & Compliance Manager	Home To School Transport	Head of Service - Home to School Transport	Workforce Review Board	Penna	19/04/2021	31/10/2021		Yes	£0.00		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Data Officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	18/03/2020	27/08/2021	18/09/2020	No	£45,560	* EHCP requests tracker and associated reports * EHCP review recovery project database and associated reports * Tracker for new EHCP reviews * Tracker for complaints * Tracker for mediations and appeals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved workflow management</li> <li>*Automated monitoring reports for managers</li> </ul>
Interim Data Officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	18/03/2020		18/12/2020	No	£63,700		
Interim Early Years SEND Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Venn group	01/09/2020		01/09/2021	No	£22,500	* Review of early years service	* Recommendations to improve early years service
Interim Educational Psychologist	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	06/07/2020		18/09/2020	No	£29,910	* Tracker of children awaiting a special school place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consolidated view of children awaiting special school place so placements could be managed</li> </ul>
Interim Finance Project Support Officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	01/11/2019		30/09/2020	No	£21,900	* Review formula funding for specialist provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Established mechanisms for financial reporting for specialist provision</li> <li>New criteria and allocation of top up funding for mainstream</li> </ul>
Interim Head of SEND	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Penna	01/03/2021	29/04/2021		Yes	£0.00		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	28/02/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00	* Responding to contact from parents and schools via email and telephone * Support families through the needs assessment process * Signposting families to relevant support	• Increasing support to families (24 new referrals in Jan 20 > 205 in Dec 20) New satisfaction survey launched in Dec 20 recorded a positive rating of 4.78 / 5
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	07/09/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£12,700		
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	24/07/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£13,685		
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	28/02/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	02/12/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£7,643		
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	05/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	13/03/2020		17/02/2021	No	£19,315		
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	04/03/2020		27/11/2020	No	£15,180		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Smart Education	09/03/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£26,810		
Interim Ops Manager (Transport)	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	24/08/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£62,204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telephone systems – Cirrus</li> <li>• Email system – Cirrus Omni</li> <li>• Bus Pass report</li> <li>• Invoice reports</li> <li>• Staff 1-to-1</li> <li>• Complaints</li> <li>• Restructure operations service</li> <li>• Performance Improvement - guides</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify current telephone system failings resulting in Cirrus implementation. Daily / weekly reports regarding the Cirrus phone system. Calls answered / abandoned. Time taken to answer calls / calls being abandoned in compliance with the BCC KPI's of 90% answered – 10% abandoned. Ensuring the team meet these KPI's</li> <li>• Bus Passes- Identifying hidden issues within the service; identifying the weakness in the service and ensuring new staff are training in the processing of these bus passes.</li> </ul>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
											<p>Identifying improvements with the system to avoid the volume of future applications given the 80% rejection rate.</p> <p>Invoice reports – ensuring the overdue invoices are processed in a timely manner considering value and age of invoices and finding solutions to improve service</p> <p>Redesign of the variation form to provide transparency with the variation form process submitted by contractors asking for price increase/decrease</p>
Interim Performance Lead	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	11/06/2020		31/03/2021	No	£72,202	<p>* HST dashboard</p> <p>* HST immediate fixes plan</p> <p>* HST weekly sit rep</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visibility of data</li> <li>• Improved data reliability</li> </ul>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Performance Lead	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	11/03/2020		12/06/2020	No	£36,500	report * HST contract performance reporting schedule * SEND dashboard * SEND Weekly sit rep report	<div><div>* 5,271 outstanding reviews closed with all action completed</div><div>* 2,873 outstanding reviews actioned and awaiting issue by Business Support</div><div>* Reduction in the backlog of assessments from 500 to 200</div></div>
Interim Performance Lead	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	17/02/2020		13/03/2020	No	£13,600		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Venn group	25/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00	* Reviewing and actioning 9,197 outstanding annual review paperwork * Reviewing and actioning newly received review paperwork *Managing placements	
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021		28/02/2021	No	£4,200		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	28/02/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£1,200		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021		03/02/2021	No	£3,450		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	01/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£21,000		

### City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£7,200		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021		31/03/2021	No	£8,700		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£16,500		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Hays	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	25/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Education Futures	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£17,700		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Spencer Clarke	NA		05/02/2021	No	£21,600		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Spencer Clarke	02/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£30,600		



### City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Education Futures	11/01/2021		26/02/2021	No	£0.00		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Spencer Clarke	Not recorded		31/03/2021	No	£31,800		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021		31/03/2021	No	£16,200		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/02/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£10,500		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£14,925		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	01/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£4,200		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£9,600		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Venn group	07/12/2020		12/03/2021	No	£5,400		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Venn group	25/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£21,300		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	Not recorded		30/10/2020	No	£28,250		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Hays	13/07/2020		20/10/2020	No	£63,817		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	30/09/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£21,280		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	31/08/2020		18/12/2020	No	£40,360		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	30/10/2020		28/02/2021	No	£21,300		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	04/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£40,350		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	20/04/2020		13/11/2020	No	£55,650		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Panoramic	26/05/2020		31/08/2020	No	£4,200		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	02/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£15,900		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	31/01/2020		31/07/2020	No	£24,054		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	04/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£39,850		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	30/09/2020		12/11/2020	No	£24,300		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	04/10/2020		30/10/2020	No	£48,030		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	17/08/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£26,025		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	30/10/2020		28/02/2021	No	£26,100		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	30/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£39,370		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Panoramic	01/04/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£56,100		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	02/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£44,475		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Hays	29/04/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£13,873		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	Not recorded		Not recorded	No	£25,674		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Hays	13/07/2020		26/02/2021	No	£42,900		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	02/10/2020		18/12/2020	No	£20,475		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	31/01/2020		31/07/2020	No	£3,726		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	13/07/2020		22/08/2020	No	£9,920.00		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Lord	02/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£23,850		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	02/10/2020		28/02/2021	No	£44,633		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	01/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£62,688		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	31/01/2020		31/07/2020	No	£66,969		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	04/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£42,900		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	Not recorded		Not recorded	No	£47,291		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	30/10/2020		31/03/2021	No	£6,000		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	30/10/2020		28/02/2021	No	£20,700		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	31/01/2020		31/07/2020	No	£44,903		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Not recorded	31/01/2020		31/07/2020	No	£72,127		
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	04/05/2020		31/08/2020	No	£21,000.00		
Interim Post 16 SEND Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	Not recorded		18/12/2020	No	£22,840		
Interim Programme mgr	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion		Lord	21/01/2020		01/04/2021	No	£79,905	* Developing & managing local provision project plan and associated governance	* DLP project launched
Interim Project Lead - Local Offer Website	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Education Futures	20/08/2020		31/10/2020	No	£21,038	Local offer website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New local offer website launched in Jan 2021</li> <li>• Online booking system in final stages of development to be launched in the spring</li> </ul>
Interim Project Manager	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	13/07/2020	30/06/2021		Yes	£64,250	* Developing & managing local provision project plan and associated governance	* DLP project launched
Interim Project Manager - 365	Home To School Transport	Head of Service - Home to School Transport	Workforce Review Board	Hays	06/04/2021	31/10/2021		Yes	£0.00	* Developing & managing local provision project plan and associated governance	* DLP project launched

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Project Support Officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	11/03/2020	31/03/2021		Yes	£79,560	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* School Planning meeting documentation</li> <li>* Local offer website upload</li> <li>* Weekly report and liaison with special schools</li> <li>* Consolidation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local offer website launched in Jan 2021</li> <li>• Improved communication with special school transport leads</li> <li>• Input to Home to school transport improvement programme</li> </ul>
Interim Project Support Officer	Transformation & Project Support	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Hays	01/04/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£15,224		

**City Council – 13 April 2021**

Interim Safeguarding & Compliance SEND Transport Manager	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	21/07/2020		27/02/2021	No	£49,716	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Weekly &amp; monthly performance reports</li> <li>* Safeguarding process for complaints</li> <li>* data analysis from supplier returns (monthly)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robust compliance team who apply safeguarding checks at schools and supplier premises to ensure vehicles and staff are compliant.</li> <li>• Vehicle inspections carried out to ensure vehicles transporting clients are fully roadworthy and feedback given to supplier they additional checks to ensure compliance.</li> <li>• Supplier performance has improved as a result of the checks and visits made to schools and suppliers, once concerns are identified and improvement plans are agreed.</li> <li>• Depot Audits at supplier premises to ensure policies are being applied throughout the operation against their contract.</li> <li>• Regular supplier meetings to ensure</li> </ul>
--	--------------------------------	---	--	-----------	------------	--	------------	----	---------	--	---



**City Council – 13 April 2021**

											<p>performance issues are identified and actioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding tracker to capture safeguarding complaints ensure escalated to LADO and managed appropriately in a timely way.</li> <li>• Supplier monthly reporting processes are accurate and identify DBS applications so they are processed as quickly as possible to ensure supplier has sufficient staff to delivery service.</li> <li>• Improved communication and feed back to suppliers is carried out in a timely was to ensure failings identified are rectified.</li> </ul>
Interim Safeguarding & QA Lead	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	18/11/2019		06/03/2020	No	£25,200	<p>* initial safeguarding audit of suppliers</p> <p>* DPS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts confirmed with suppliers</li> <li>• Baseline safeguarding reports</li> </ul>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim SEMH Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Penna	08/03/2021	08/09/2021		Yes	£0.00	* Review of SENAR administration services * Draft review recovery project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5,271 outstanding reviews closed with all action completed</li> <li>2,873 outstanding reviews actioned and awaiting issue by Business Support</li> </ul>
Interim SEMH Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Penna	01/03/2021	01/09/2021		Yes	£0.00		
Interim SEN Coordinator - EHCP Reviews	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	SEND Improvement Programme	Panoramic	05/03/2020		28/02/2021	No	£21,000		
Interim SEND Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	22/11/2019		14/01/2020	No	£4,463		
Interim SEND Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable		Yes	£0.00		
Interim SEND Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Education Futures	26/02/2020		26/02/2020	No	£0.00		
Interim SEND Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Education Futures	Feb-20		Feb-20	No	£9,585		
Interim SEND Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not recorded	Nov-19		Dec-19	No	£11,310		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim SEND Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Panoramic	10/03/2020		25/09/2020	No	£30,575	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* DfE bid for COVID funding</li> <li>* Deed variation for supply of guides</li> <li>* Deed variation for alteration of DBS process</li> <li>* Communication &amp; Implementation plan</li> <li>* Org chart for restructure</li> <li>* Summer operations plan</li> <li>* Draft revised risk assessment process</li> <li>* Contribution to immediate fixes plan, weekly and daily sit rep, monthly covid plan, service dashboard and revised implementation plan</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The service has had improved leadership and structure in order to achieve a number of significant improvement key tasks. This development has worked in partnership with the recommendations outlined in the Service Investigation Report.</li> <li>• The service is now able to ensure early identification of operational concern and introduce strategies in order to improve performance and administration across the service as a whole</li> </ul>	
Interim SEND Transport manager	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	20/07/2020		17/01/2021	No	£13,000		
Interim SEND Transport Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	09/11/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£40,455		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Senior Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	17/09/2020	31/10/2021		Yes	£42,738	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplier performance figures on a daily and weekly basis</li> <li>• Carry out record and report on Supplier Audit.</li> <li>• Daily engagement with suppliers to address any issues identified within compliance checks.</li> <li>• Recognize training needs for drivers and suppliers relating to compliance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robust and engaging compliance team in place.</li> <li>• Robust procedures implemented to improve supplier /driver compliance</li> <li>• Implemented a revised parking plan at 2 schools to date (Calthorpe &amp; Dame Ellen Pinsent)</li> <li>• Allocate work to the compliance team to ensure work is completed and prioritised.</li> <li>• Advise suppliers on compliance matters i.e. procedures and technique to improve performance.</li> <li>• Improved communication with suppliers, schools and internal teams to ensure concerns are addressed and</li> </ul>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
											<p>recorded in a timely way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support other service areas to address any safeguarding /compliance issues and resolve in a timely way.</li> </ul>
Interim Special School Provision Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Spencer Clarke	07/12/2020		24/02/2021	No	£8,750		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Transport Manager Operations, Commissioning & Contracts	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	01/06/2020		01/04/2021	No	£92,240	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed system requirements for the Home to school transport database</li> <li>Procurement Business case for the purchase of the new system (365 Response chosen)</li> <li>Implementation Plan for 365</li> <li>Communications Plan for the implementation of 365</li> <li>Mobile Phones for Guides requirements document</li> <li>CXM Bus Pass Administration requirements</li> <li>Also developed the daily route report which underpins the Daily SitRep reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taken the request for a new transport system from concept, through requirements definition and procurement to commencement of operational roll out and live testing.</li> <li>Defined additional costs to cover data requirements for BCC in the absence of a legacy database and revised the business case to justify new requirements.</li> <li>Revised business case includes the cost of project management.</li> </ul>
Interim Transport Operations Manager	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	11/03/2020		31/07/2020	No	£82,660	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Mobility Assessment Risk Assessment Process.</li> <li>Review of Current</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved Risk Assessments are being carried out.</li> <li>Engage with</li> </ul>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Interim Transport Operations Manager	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Baltimore	17/08/2020		01/04/2021	No	£0.00	Assessment Process and recommendations • Provide guidance on improving safer accurate assessments.	relevant service areas to obtain all relevant information to produce accurate information and assessments.
Interim Transport Operations Manager	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	04/11/2020		29/01/2021	No	£8,065		
Interim Tribunal Officer	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Spencer Clarke	20/10/2020	27/08/2021		Yes	£42,925		
Interim Tribunal Officer	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Baltimore	01/06/2020		31/08/2020	No	£6,450	Managing the throughput of mediations, appeals and tribunals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of compliance with statutory timelines.</li> <li>• Robust mediation process to ensure resolution</li> </ul>
Interim Tribunal Officer	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Panoramic	30/06/2020		30/09/2020	No	£19,200		
Interim Tribunal Officer	Senar - Case Work	Head of SENAR	Head of SENAR	Baltimore	01/06/2020		14/08/2020	No	£30,500		
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	10/02/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£3,550	* Reviewing and actioning 9,197 outstanding annual review paperwork * Reviewing and actioning newly received review paperwork * Managing placements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5,271 outstanding reviews closed with all action completed</li> <li>• 2,873 outstanding reviews actioned and awaiting issue by Business Support</li> </ul>
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	07/12/2020		24/02/2021	No	£12,853		
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	07/12/2020		11/03/2021	No	£9,500		

## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	11/01/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£24,620		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in the backlog of assessments from 500 to 200</li> </ul>
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	07/12/2020		24/12/2020	No	£5,000		
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Venn group	07/12/2020		11/01/2021	No	£7,226		
Provision Manager	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	01/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£19,060		
Provision Manager	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	01/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£25,500		
Provision Manager	Senar - Case Work	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Panoramic	01/03/2021	27/08/2021		Yes	£35,100		
Sensory Consultant	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	01/09/2019	Not Applicable		Yes	£42,709	* Review of sensory resource bases * Review of FAMS * Supporting implementation of recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of more inclusive provision for children with physical difficulties</li> <li>Improved use of resources through use of sensory resource bases</li> </ul>



## City Council – 13 April 2021

Role	Area	Commissioned By	Approved by	Agency	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Actual End Date	Is assignment still 'active' Yes or No	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	A high-level list of activities they've been involved with	A summary of the improvements they've made (bullet points of what has improved since the consultants have been here).
Strategic lead for ASC	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Lord	29/10/2020	28/10/2021		Yes	£35,100	* Funding comparison for special schools to inform the special school funding review * Preparatory work for the DLP project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLP project launched</li> <li>• Special school funding review in progress</li> </ul>
Strategic Lead for SEND Commissioning	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Workforce Review Board	Penna	01/03/2021		01/04/2021	No	£0.00		
Strategic SEND Consultant	SEND Strategic Transformation	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	Sep-19		Dec-20	No	£15,836		
Transport Recovery Consultant	Home To School Transport	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Assistant Director SEND & Inclusion	Not Applicable	01/09/2019		01/10/2019	No	£0.00		

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

**B8      Webinar Costs**

**Question:**

**The Barrister Tom Cross, was engaged to do another Webinar on 15th March 2021. How much did this cost the Council? What date did the City Solicitor approve the spend on this Barrister and who commissioned his services and why?**

**Answer:**

Barrister Tom Cross was invited by the Assistant Director SEND and Inclusion to provide a second webinar for schools entitled, 'The Right of Inclusion in Mainstream Settings'. The webinar provided information on "the right to inclusion" in mainstream for the majority of SEN children in light of current legislation. In the webinar, Tom outlined what this meant in relation to the duties of schools and local authorities and the relationship with reasonable adjustments under equality law. Tom was able to share his experience in leading case law and provided examples in practice. Almost 150 attended the webinar and positive feedback was received from attendees.

The webinar is part of a series for schools to ensure they understand their duties within the SEND legislation.

Currently Birmingham has one of the lowest performance in the country for the number of children with an EHCP attending a mainstream school, with numbers continuing to rise year on year for those children with an EHCP attending a special school.

The use of the barrister for the webinar was approved on 4th February 2021 by the Head of Law (Education) on behalf of the City Solicitor.

Costs for the webinar were £1,800 + VAT.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

**B9     Letter**

**Question:**

**In response to Question B3, 23rd February 2021, you failed to include the letter you compiled for parents at the first lockdown last year (March 2020). Please provide a copy of the letter?**

**Answer:**

As confirmed in the answer to B3 on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021, an individual letter to families was not sent out during the first lockdown.

[Information for parents was posted on the council's Local Offer website](#) which is the approach that local authorities across the region took.

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

**B10     Phase Transfer**

**Question:**

**Question B4, 23rd February indicates that there will be ongoing monitoring activity to ensure compliance with the law and requirements contained in the SEND Code of Practice as well as work underway to fully document the decision making process. Please provide evidence of how you have accomplished this with the Phase Transfer (Reception, Secondary) 15th February statutory requirement and Post 16, 31st March statutory requirement, including full details of compliance with the law, the decision making process with dates, and number of EHCPs involved for both.**

**Answer:**

As stated above, all children and young people who are transitioning/changing school placements each September need to have their new placement named on their EHC Plan by 15th February for children starting Reception, Yr 2 (if in an infant school) and Yr 6 in September 2021. For those young people leaving school/college in Yr11, Yr13 & Yr 14, their placement needs to be secured by 31st March for September 2021.

In order for the LA to meet this target, all children/young people need to have a Transition Annual Review in the Summer Term prior to their transition year (Summer term in -1yr, Yr.1, Yr. 5, Yr.10, Yr.12 & Yr.13). This review should be person centred and should cover the aspirations for the future for the young person (particularly for those Yr.5 students moving into secondary education)

The school should then ensure that the paperwork is submitted to the SEN service within 2 weeks to ensure that the LA can complete its review of the paperwork and advise if the EHC plan needs to be updated.

Parent/Carers should be asked for their preference for a future school placement in readiness to start the consultation process early in the Autumn term.

Consultations should be sent to the Parental Preference school and the schools that are suitable and are nearest to the child's home address. Schools can take up to 15 days to respond to the consultation request and must submit a legal response which complies with the Code of Practice.

If the school response states they are unable to offer a place but does not contain a legal reason, the LA can challenge this decision. If on challenge it is felt that the decision to admit is still not compatible with the Code of Practice, the LA can direct a school to admit a child.

Where possible, the LA should look to name the Parental Preference for a school/college placement unless:

- It would be unsuitable for the age, ability, aptitude or SEN of the child or young person,  
or

- The attendance of the child or young person there would be incompatible with the efficient education of others, or the efficient use of resources.

Once a placement is confirmed then an amended final EHC plan should be issued naming the current placement and the proposed placement from September. These plans can be issued as soon as the decision has been made and do not have to wait until the deadline dates.

If parent/carers are unhappy with the decisions made, they have the right to request Mediation to try to resolve their concerns or can lodge a Tribunal to appeal against the decision made.

### **How did Birmingham apply the legal requirements for Phase Transfer in 2020/21?**

Birmingham City Council maintains around 10,500 EHC plans and had around 650 children going through the Secondary Transfer process and around 1900 students who were going through the Post 16 Transfer process.

414 families received their phase transfer placement decision by the 15<sup>th</sup> February and all (around 1900) post 16 students received a letter of intent, proposing the placement that the LA was intending to name by the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021. All remaining updated final EHC plans will be issued as soon as possible.

Where the LA did not receive a request for a future placement and where it was proposing to cease EHC plans, due to students moving into work rather than education (around 722) a letter was sent advising families of this and encouraged them to get in touch if they wanted to reconsider their decision.

Not all students needed a change of placement (i.e. if they were planning to stay in their current school and move to 6<sup>th</sup> form provision) however they did need to go through the transition process and have their future placement named in their EHC plan.

There were many challenges that faced the LA, and which meant that some children/ young people did not receive their future placement by the deadline dates. These challenges are all being addressed to ensure that this process works well in future years.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

**B11     Independent Places**

**Question:**

**Please provide the following numbers for children and young people (CYP) with EHCPs in Independent placements:**

- **How many CYP, with EHCPs in September 2018 were in Independent Schools.**
- **How many CYP, with EHCPs in September 2019 were in Independent Schools.**
- **How many CYP, with EHCPs in September 2020 were in Independent Schools.**

**Answer:**

The data below illustrates the number of pupils with an EHCP where Birmingham LA were funding a place at an Independent setting in September each year:

<b>Type of Setting</b>	<b>SEPT 2020</b>	<b>SEPT 2019</b>	<b>SEPT 2018</b>
<b>Independent Mainstream</b>	173	207	151
<b>Independent Special</b>	184	201	206
<b>Non Maintained Special</b>	6	6	8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>365</b>
<b>Special Post 16 Independent</b>	473	427	374
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>841</b>	<b>739</b>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**B12     Question B6**

**Question:**

**In Question B6, 23rd February 2021, you failed to answer the question. Please state the number of children with EHCPs who are accessing Home Based learning or attending school on a part time basis. Please answer yes or no to: is this lawful practice that fulfils statutory Section F and I requirements?**

**Answer:**

Home based learning is not proposed as long-term alternative to a named school in Part I of an EHCP for a child who requires a school place. The child's EHCP will usually name the type of placement required in Part I and home tuition will then be arranged on an interim basis while an appropriate school in accordance with the type of placement specified is secured and agreed with families.

Home based learning will not meet all the requirements of Part F as that section may refer to specific class-based interventions, group sizes, school staffing and support arrangements etc. Nor will it meet the requirements of Part I where a school placement is specified. However, this does not mean that home-based learning is unlawful when used as a short-term arrangement while a school place is being secured, provided it is suitable full-time education.

Officers are in the process of updating and assuring the precise number of pupils who are accessing home-based learning or attending school on a part time basis. I will make this data available to elected members by Friday 23rd April 2021.

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

**B13     SEND Decisions**

**Question:**

**Please state the number of cases awaiting SEND Decisions by each of the 7 DMGs (along with a list of the people who sit on the DMG) specifying how many have been waiting for:**

- Longer than 1 month
- Longer than 3 months
- Longer than 6 months
- 1 year or longer

**Answer:**

The number of awaiting decisions at the scheduled DMGs are detailed in the table below. We are holding regular weekly DMGs to ensure that the decisions are made timely:

Decision making group	Outstanding Decisions				
	Within 1 Month	Longer than 1 month	Longer than 3 months	Longer than 6 months	1 Year or Longer
Assessment	0	0	0	0	0
Issue	0	0	0	0	0
Funding	27	0	0	0	0
Provision Placements (4)	57	8	0	0	0

Decision Making Group members are as follows:

Advisory teams Heads of Service  
Advisory teachers  
Educational Psychologists  
Health & Social care representatives  
Special School Head Teachers  
Case Officers  
Finance officer  
Assistant Director (Funding DMG)



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

**B14     Developing Local Provision**

**Question:**

**Please provide the project plans and spend details for the Developing Local Provision**


**Answer:**

The project plan and spend details have been attached with this response.

		<b>Allocated Funding</b>
1	<b>DLP</b>	<b>£7,000,000</b>
2A	<b>AREAS</b>	<b>£4,549,500.00</b>
	<b><i>East Total</i></b>	<b><i>£970,087.31</i></b>
	East Proposal 1	£418,202.09
	East Proposal 2	
	Eastwards	£213,147.91
	Cole Heath A + B	£208,989.60
	FAYS*	£171,270.73
	Saltley Plus*	£125,084.61
		-
	<b><i>Central Total</i></b>	<b><i>£641,592.81</i></b>
	Central Proposal 1	£249,696.37
	Central Proposal 2	£120,096.37
	Cole Heath B	
	Sparklers	£225,288.81
	<b><i>South Total</i></b>	<b><i>£639,770.15</i></b>
	South Literacy	£322,301.46
	South SEMH	
	South SEND Transformation	
	Hall Green	£182,159.42
	Kings Norton	£135,309.27
		-
	<b><i>South West Total</i></b>	<b><i>£640,567.68</i></b>
	South West	£323,313.20
	South West 2	
	Senneleys Park	£84,363.12
	Quinbourne	£93,002.50
	Northfield	£139,888.86


## City Council – 13 April 2021

		-
<b>North Total</b>		<b>£793,258.77</b>
North		£374,578.11
North (Sutton)		
Sutton Coldfield		£144,682.60
Sutton Coldfield 2		
Sutton Coldfield 3		
Erdington		£135,721.51
Erdington 2		
Perry Barr		£138,276.55
		-
<b>North West Total</b>		<b>£864,223.28</b>
North West Proposal 1		£411,408.77
North West Proposal 2		
North West Proposal 3		
Handsworth		£212,134.97
Aston Nechells*		£142,183.25
Ladywood Soho		£98,496.28
2B <b>CENTRAL COSTS</b>		<b>£2,450,500.00</b>
Central Costs & Contingency		£650,500.00
PVI & Nursery		£250,000
POST 16		£350,000
Panel - EY		£700,000
Panel - Secondary		£500,000



Red = Proposal in with SG  
 Amber = Approved by Steering Group  
 Green = Approved by Ref Grp

## Developing Local Provision Plan-on-a-Page



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

**B15     DfE Data Return**

**Question:**

**Please provide the DfE data return for the 'SEN2 Return' for 2019 and the data for the 'SEN2 Return' 2020.**

**Answer:**

The 2019, 2020 and 2021 SEN2 returns have been provided with this response.

SEN2 data is published at the following link and 2021 data will be published in the summer 2021:

<https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/education-health-and-care-plans>

## SEN2 (2019) Form

Census date: 17 January 2019

### Overview

The information collected via the annual SEN2 survey form provides the major source of data collected on children and young people with statements of special educational need or Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans. It is the only source of data on the totality of statements and EHC plans maintained by individual local authorities.

Local Authority Number	1	Birmingham City Council
Completion time:	2	60
Amount of time spent completing this form (to the nearest hour)		
Contact forename:	2A	Saadhia
Contact surname:	2B	Kamran
Telephone number:	2C	0121 303 2440
Email address:	2D	<a href="mailto:saadhia.kamran@birmingham.gov.uk">saadhia.kamran@birmingham.gov.uk</a>

### **PART 1: Education arrangements for all children and young people for whom the authority maintains a statement or an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan.**

- 1.1 Please state the number of children and young people as at 17 January 2019, for whom the authority maintains an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan under the Children and Families Act 2014.

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2018.

a.	Under age 5	3	423
b.	Aged 5 to 10	4	3008
c.	Aged 11 to 15	5	3121
d.	Aged 16 to 19	6	2176
e.	Aged 20 to 25	7	709
f.	<b>TOTAL (a + b + c + d + e)</b>	8	<b>9437</b>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

1.2 a Of the children and young people entered in 1.1, please state the number:

(i) On the roll of the following establishments. **This should be the type of establishment named on the EHC plan.** Include children and young people whose EHC plan is under appeal.

a.	Non-maintained early years settings in the private and voluntary sector	9	36
b.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	10	997
c.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (SEN Unit)	11	0
d.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (resourced provision)	12	189
e.	Mainstream school: academy	13	824
f.	Mainstream school: academy (SEN Unit)	14	0
g.	Mainstream school: academy (resourced provision)	15	385
h.	Mainstream school: free school	16	38
i.	Mainstream school: free school (SEN Unit)	17	2
j.	Mainstream school: free school (resourced provision)	18	0
k.	Mainstream school: independent school	19	209
l.	Special school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	20	2962
m.	Special school: academy/free	21	1288
n.	Special school: Non-maintained	22	4
o.	Special school: Independent special schools	23	204
p.	AP/PRU: LA maintained	24	9
q.	AP/PRU: Academy	25	0
r.	AP/PRU: Free school	26	7
s.	Hospital schools (including foundation schools)	27	0
t.	Post 16: General FE and tertiary colleges/HE	28	1171
u.	Post 16: Other FE	29	41
v.	Post 16: Sixth form college	30	41
w.	Post 16: Specialist post-16 Institutions	31	489
(ii)	Total of 1.2 a (i)	32	8896

## City Council – 13 April 2021

(iii)	Educated elsewhere		
a.	Pupils permanently excluded at 17 January 2019 and not yet placed elsewhere	33	9
b.	Other - arrangements made by the LA in accordance with Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 or Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014	34	36
	<b>NOTE:</b> Include children and young people who are within Secure units or Young offenders institutions within 1.2 (iii) (b)		
c.	Other - arrangements made by parents in accordance with Section 7 of the Education Act 1996	35	50
d.	Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged under 16) or below who are in a school and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another school	36	112
e.	Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school age who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	37	0
f.	Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged under 16) or below who are not in school and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in an education setting	38	88
g.	Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school age who are not in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in a setting	39	26
h.	NEET – Young people who have an EHC plan but are not in employment, education or training	40	220
i.	Other – Including those who have been issued a notice to cease (for example, after taking up of employment) and the decision is currently subject to an appeal to the Tribunal	41	0

## City Council – 13 April 2021

1.2 b Of the young people entered in 1.1, please state the number undertaking:

a.	Apprenticeships	42	<input type="text" value="0"/>
b.	Traineeships	43	<input type="text" value="0"/>
c.	Supported Internships	44	<input type="text" value="44"/>

1.2 c Of all children and young people with an EHC Plan at 17 January 2019, how many were placed in residential special schools or colleges:

The age breakdown refers to age as at **31 August 2018**

(i) 38 to 51 weeks per year

a.	Under age 5	45	<input type="text" value="0"/>
b.	Aged 5 to 10	46	<input type="text" value="23"/>
c.	Aged 11 to 15	47	<input type="text" value="65"/>
d.	Aged 16 to 19	48	<input type="text" value="19"/>
e.	Aged 20 to 25	49	<input type="text" value="11"/>
f.	<b>TOTAL</b> (a + b + c + d + e)	50	<input type="text" value="118"/>

(ii) 52 weeks per year

a.	Under age 5	51	<input type="text" value="0"/>
b.	Aged 5 to 10	52	<input type="text" value="1"/>
c.	Aged 11 to 15	53	<input type="text" value="5"/>
d.	Aged 16 to 19	54	<input type="text" value="13"/>
e.	Aged 20 to 25	55	<input type="text" value="0"/>
f.	<b>TOTAL</b> (a + b + c + d + e)	56	<input type="text" value="19"/>

### **PART 2: New Assessments and placements by the local authority during the 2018 calendar year.**

2.1 Please state the number of children and young people for whom an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan under the Children and Families Act 2014 was made for the **first time** during the 2018 calendar year.

The age breakdown refers to age as at **31 August 2018**.

**NOTE:** These do not include reassessments of EHC plans.

Please refer to the guide for information on **transfers between local authorities**.

a.	Under age 5	57	<input type="text" value="318"/>
b.	Aged 5 to 10	58	<input type="text" value="323"/>
c.	Aged 11 to 15	59	<input type="text" value="131"/>
d.	Aged 16 to 19	60	<input type="text" value="31"/>
e.	Aged 20 to 25	61	<input type="text" value="2"/>
f.	<b>TOTAL</b> (a + b + c + d + e)	62	<input type="text" value="805"/>



2.2 a Of the children and young people entered in 2.1, please state the number:

(i) On the roll of the following establishments. **This should be the type of establishment named on the EHC plan.** Include children and young people whose EHC plan is under appeal.

a.	Non-maintained early years settings in the private and voluntary sector	63	38
b.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	64	233
c.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (SEN Unit)	65	0
d.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (resourced provision)	66	26
e.	Mainstream school: academy	67	127
f.	Mainstream school: academy (SEN Unit)	68	0
g.	Mainstream school: academy (resourced provision)	69	20
h.	Mainstream school: free school	70	2
i.	Mainstream school: free school (SEN Unit)	71	0
j.	Mainstream school: free school (resourced provision)	72	0
k.	Mainstream school: independent school	73	19
l.	Special school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	74	132
m.	Special school: academy/free	75	75
n.	Special school: Non-maintained	76	0
o.	Special school: Independent special schools	77	10
p.	AP/PRU: LA maintained	78	5
q.	AP/PRU: Academy	79	0
r.	AP/PRU: Free school	80	1
s.	Hospital schools (including foundation schools)	81	1
t.	Post 16: General FE and tertiary colleges/HE	82	11
u.	Post 16: Other FE	83	1
v.	Post 16: Sixth form college	84	0
w.	Post 16: Specialist post-16 Institutions	85	2
(ii)	Total of 2.2 a (i)	86	703

## City Council – 13 April 2021

(iii)	Educated elsewhere		
a.	Pupils permanently excluded at 17 January 2019 and not yet placed elsewhere	87	<input type="text" value="0"/>
b.	Other - arrangements made by the LA in accordance with Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 or Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014	88	<input type="text" value="2"/>
	<b>NOTE:</b> Include children and young people who are within Secure units or Young offenders institutions within 1.2 (iii) (b)		
c.	Other - arrangements made by parents in accordance with Section 7 of the Education Act 1996	89	<input type="text" value="7"/>
d.	Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged under 16) or below who are in a school and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another school	90	<input type="text" value="65"/>
e.	Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school age who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	91	<input type="text" value="0"/>
f.	Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged under 16) or below who are not in school and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in an education setting	92	<input type="text" value="22"/>
g.	Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school age who are not in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in a setting	93	<input type="text" value="3"/>
h.	NEET – Young people who have an EHC plan but are not in employment, education or training	94	<input type="text" value="3"/>
i.	Other – Including those who have been issued a notice to cease (for example, after taking up of employment) and the decision is currently subject to an appeal to the Tribunal	95	<input type="text" value="0"/>
2.2 b	Of the young people entered in 2.1, please state the number undertaking:		
a.	Apprenticeships	96	<input type="text" value="0"/>
b.	Traineeships	97	<input type="text" value="0"/>
c.	Supported Internships	98	<input type="text" value="0"/>

## City Council – 13 April 2021

- 2.3 Please state the number of children and young people assessed under Section 36 of the Children and Families Act 2014 for whom it was decided not to issue an EHC plan during the 2018 calendar year.

99 87

**NOTE:** Do not include children and young people who are still being assessed or those where assessment has been completed by 17 January 2019 but no decision taken on whether to issue an EHC plan. Do not include reassessments of statements or EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

- 2.4 Please state the number of children and young people assessed for an EHC plan during the 2018 calendar year who are still being assessed or where assessment has been completed by 17 January 2019 but no decision taken for an EHC plan.

100 142

**NOTE:** These do not include: reassessments of EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

- 2.5 Please state the number of initial requests for assessment for an EHC plan that were refused during the 2018 calendar year.

101 339

**NOTE:** These do not include: reassessments of EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

Please also include cases where the initial request for assessment was made during 2017, but the request was refused during 2018.

- 2.6 For children and young people with a statement of special educational needs (A) or an EHC plan (B) made prior to 1 January 2018:

- a. Please state the number of children who transferred during the 2018 calendar year:

		(A)		(B)
i.	from mainstream settings to special settings	102A	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">3</span>	102B <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">177</span>
ii.	from special settings to mainstream settings	103A	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">2</span>	103B <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">80</span>

- b. Please state the number, during the 2018 calendar year, who were taken out of school by their parents to be home

i.	from mainstream settings	104A	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">0</span>	104B <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">10</span>
ii.	from special settings	105A	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">1</span>	105B <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 10px;">4</span>

**NOTE:** Only include in year transfers and not end of academic year phase transfers.

Mainstream settings refer to the establishment types (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), (u), (v) and special settings refer to the establishment types (l), (m), (n), (o), (w), detailed in Item 1.2a.

## City Council – 13 April 2021

- 2.7 Please state the number of statements of special educational needs (A) or EHC plans (B) that have been reviewed and discontinued in the 2018 calendar year. Only include children of compulsory school age.

For pupils who have:

	(A)	(B)
a. Transferred to another LA	106A 14	106B 175
b. Special needs being met without an EHC plan	107A 61	107B 290
c. Other	108A 1	108B 9

**NOTE:** Please do not include pupils whose statement was assessed for an EHC plan (whether an EHC plan was issued or not) or whose statement/ EHC plan has ended because they have left school at the end of compulsory schooling. Please see the guide for a link to school leaving age information.

- 2.8 Please state the number of statements of special educational needs (A) or EHC plan (B) that have been discontinued in the 2018 calendar year because pupils have left school at the end of compulsory schooling or after.

(A)	(B)
109A 27	109B 24

- 2.9 Please state the number of initial requests that were made for assessment for an EHC plan during the 2018 calendar year.

110 1458

**NOTE:** These do not include: reassessments of EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

- 2.10 Please state the number of initial requests for assessments for an EHC plan during the 2018 calendar year that were made when the child or young person was detained in

111 0

**NOTE:** Relevant youth accommodation includes Young Offenders Institutions, Secure Training Centres and Secure Children's Homes.

### **PART 3: Education, Health and Care plans issued within 20 weeks**

Data should only cover EHC plans issued for the **first time** (not reassessments) in the 2018 calendar year.

Please refer to Annex B of the guide for details of exceptions to the time limits.

Please refer to guide for information on **transfers between local authorities**.

- 3.1 Please state for the 2018 calendar year:

a. the total number of EHC plans issued including exception cases	112 805
b. of which, the number of EHC plans including exception cases issued within 20 weeks	113 645

- 3.2 Please state for the 2018 calendar year:

a. the total number of EHC plans issued excluding exception cases	114 713
b. of which, the number of EHC plans excluding exception cases issued within 20 weeks	115 605

## City Council – 13 April 2021

### **PART 4: Progress transferring children and young people with statements of special educational needs to the new system**

This should only count EHC plans that have been converted from **existing** statements.

4.1 Please state:

- |    |   |     |                                  |
|----|---|-----|----------------------------------|
| a. | the number of children and young people with statements who were issued with an EHC plan in the period 19 January 2018 to 31 March 2018   | 116 | <input type="text" value="784"/> |
| b. | the number of children and young people with statements who were assessed for an EHC plan and a decision not to issue an EHC plan made in the period 19 January 2018 to 31 March 2018 | 117 | <input type="text" value="1"/>   |

### **PART 5: Number of personal budgets and direct payments**

- |     |   |     |                                  |
|-----|---|-----|----------------------------------|
| 5.1 | Please state the number of personal budgets in place for all EHC plans as at 17 January 2019. | 118 | <input type="text" value="218"/> |
|-----|---|-----|----------------------------------|

**NOTE:** Please record the number of personal budgets for EHC plans maintained at the census date. This item replaces the number of EHC plans issued or reviewed during the year as per previous year's collections.

5.2 Of those in 5.1, please give the number of personal budgets that have:

- |      |  |     |                                  |
|------|--|-----|----------------------------------|
| a.   | organised arrangements where the local authority or partner retains the funding and commissions the support specified in the plan (sometimes called notional arrangements) | 119 | <input type="text" value="3"/>   |
| b.   | direct payments (including payment to nominees and third parties) and whether these are for:   |     |                                  |
| i.   | education  | 120 | <input type="text" value="7"/>   |
| ii.  | social care  | 121 | <input type="text" value="209"/> |
| iii. | health   | 122 | <input type="text" value="0"/>   |
| iv.  | integrated payment for a combination of the above  | 123 | <input type="text" value="0"/>   |

**NOTE:** A personal budget can be a mixture of organised arrangements and direct payments. Such cases should be counted under both 5.2a and 5.2b. Therefore, it is possible for the sum of 5.2a and 5.2b to be greater than 5.1.

### **PART 6: Effectiveness of mediation**

- |     |  |     |                                  |
|-----|--|-----|----------------------------------|
| 6.1 | (i) Please state for the 2018 calendar year, the number of mediation cases that have been held i.e. where a mediation meeting has occurred, regardless of the outcome. | 124 | <input type="text" value="100"/> |
|     | (ii) Of those in 6.1 (i), please state the number of cases which were followed by appeals to the Tribunal.   | 125 | <input type="text" value="9"/>   |

## City Council – 13 April 2021

### **PART 7: Designated Medical / Clinical Officer (DMO / DCO)**

7.1 Does your local authority area have a Designated Medical Officer (DMO) in place on 17 January 2019?

(i) Yes

**\*Yes/No/Recruitment in**

126 Yes

(ii) No

126

(iii) Recruitment in progress

126

7.2 Does your local authority area have a Designated Clinical Officer (DCO) in place on 17 January 2019?

(i) Yes

**\*Yes/No/Recruitment in**

127

(ii) No

127 No

(iii) Recruitment in progress

127

7.3 Is the function of the DMO/DCO carried out by another member of staff on 17 January 2019?

(i) Yes

**\*Yes/No Drop Down Box**

128 Yes

(ii) No

128

# Special educational needs survey 2020

## 1.1 Age

(a) Under age 5	414
(b) Aged 5 to 10	3028
(c) Aged 11 to 15	3234
(d) Aged 16 to 19	2068
(e) Aged 20 to 25	425
(f) Total (sum of (a) to (e)).	9169

## 1.2a Establishment

(a) Non-maintained early years settings in the private and voluntary sector	15
(b) Mainstream school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	1272
(c) Mainstream school: LA maintained (SEN Unit)	0
(d) Mainstream school: LA maintained (resourced provision)	319
(e) Mainstream school: academy	548
(f) Mainstream school: academy (SEN Unit)	0
(g) Mainstream school: academy (resourced provision)	252
(h) Mainstream school: free school	65
(i) Mainstream school: free school (SEN Unit)	0
(j) Mainstream school: free school (resourced provision)	0
(k) Mainstream school: independent school	188
(l) Special school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	3006
(m) Special school: academy/free	1358
(n) Special school: Non-maintained	8
(o) Special school: Independent special schools	191
(p) AP/PRU: LA maintained	14
(q) AP/PRU: Academy	0
(r) AP/PRU: Free school	5
(s) Hospital schools (including foundation schools)	0
(t) Post 16: General FE and tertiary colleges/HE	925
(u) Post 16: Other FE	67
(v) Post 16: Sixth form college	0
(w) Post 16: Specialist post-16 Institutions	435
Total of 1.2a(i)	8668

**(iii) Educated elsewhere**

(a) Pupils permanently excluded at 16 January 2020 and not yet placed elsewhere	10
(b) Other – arrangements made by the local authority in accordance with Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 or Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014	25
(c) Elective home education – the number of children with EHC plans who are subject to elective home education	59
(d) Other – arrangements made by parents in accordance with Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, excluding those who are subject to elective home education	0
(e) Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are attending an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	21
(f) Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	97
(g) Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	1
(h) Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	10
(i) Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	97
(j) Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are not in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	72
(k) NEET – Young people who have an EHC plan but are not in employment, education or training	109
(l) Other – Including those who have been issued a notice to cease (for example, after taking up of	

***Include children and young people who are within secure units or young offenders institutions within 1.2 a (iii) (b)***

***Children and young people who are applicable to (d) should not also be counted in (c)***

***Include cases where the child/young person is attending education but having been issued an EHC plan are awaiting confirmation on the establishment to be named on the plan***

***1.2a (iii) (h to l) should not include any children or young people currently in education. Please include cases where the child/young person has moved in to the LA and are awaiting placement***

**1.2b Apprenticeships, traineeships and supported internships**

**All young people recorded in this section should also be counted against an establishment type in section 1.2a. This should be the establishment type of the further education or post-16 setting to which the work based learning is attached, for example establishment types t), u), v), w) in section 1.2a) i).**

(a) Apprenticeships	1
(b) Traineeships	0
(c) Supported Internships	41



**Item 1.2c Residential settings**

a) For 38-51 weeks:

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2019.

The age categories are:

(a) Under age 5	
(b) Aged 5 to 10	
(c) Aged 11 to 15	4
(d) Aged 16 to 19	5
(e) Aged 20 to 25	1
(f) Total (sum of (a) to (e)).	10

b) For 52 weeks:

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2019.

The age categories are:

(a) Under age 5	0
(b) Aged 5 to 10	0
(c) Aged 11 to 15	3
(d) Aged 16 to 19	8
(e) Aged 20 to 25	2
(f) Total (sum of (a) to (e)).	13

**Part 2: Assessments and placements**

*Please state the number of children and young people for whom an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan under the Children and Families Act 2014 was made for the first time during the 2019 calendar year. Note: Do not include reassessments of EHC plans.*

**Item 2.1 Age**

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2019

The age categories are:

(a) Under age 5	300
(b) Aged 5 to 10	337
(c) Aged 11 to 15	219
(d) Aged 16 to 19	38
(e) Aged 20 to 25	4
(f) Total (sum of (a) to (e)).	898

**Item 2.2a Establishment**

*(i) Of the children and young people entered in Item 2.1, please state the number on the roll of the following establishments. This should be the type of establishment named on the EHC plan. Include children and young people whose EHC plan is under appeal.*

(a) Non-maintained early years settings in the private and voluntary sector	12
(b) Mainstream school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	301
(c) Mainstream school: LA maintained (SEN Unit)	0
(d) Mainstream school: LA maintained (resourced provision)	39
(e) Mainstream school: academy	87
(f) Mainstream school: academy (SEN Unit)	0
(g) Mainstream school: academy (resourced provision)	13
(h) Mainstream school: free school	4
(i) Mainstream school: free school (SEN Unit)	0
(j) Mainstream school: free school (resourced provision)	0
(k) Mainstream school: independent school	14
(l) Special school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	141
(m) Special school: academy/free	89
(n) Special school: Non-maintained	1
(o) Special school: Independent special schools	12
(p) AP/PRU: LA maintained	12
(q) AP/PRU: Academy	0
(r) AP/PRU: Free school	0
(s) Hospital schools (including foundation schools)	0
(t) Post 16: General FE and tertiary colleges/HE	16
(u) Post 16: Other FE	3
(v) Post 16: Sixth form college	0
(w) Post 16: Specialist post-16 Institutions	6
 Total of 2.2a(i)	 750

**(iii) Educated elsewhere**

(a) Pupils permanently excluded at 16 January 2020 and not yet placed elsewhere	5
(b) Other – arrangements made by the local authority in accordance with Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 or Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014	1
(c) Elective home education – the number of children with EHC plans who are subject to elective home education	8
(d) Other – arrangements made by parents in accordance with Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, excluding those who are subject to elective home education	0
(e) Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are attending an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	20
(f) Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	55
(g) Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	0
(h) Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	9
(i) Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	23
(j) Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are not in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	5
(k) NEET – Young people who have an EHC plan but are not in employment, education or training	5
(l) Other – Including those who have been issued a notice to cease (for example, after taking up of	17

*Include children and young people who are within secure units or young offenders institutions within 2.2 a*

*(iii) (b)*

*Children and young people who are applicable to (d) should not also be counted in (c)*

*Include cases where the child/young person is attending education but having been issued an EHC plan are awaiting confirmation on the establishment to be named on the plan*

*2.2a (iii) (h to l) should not include any children or young people currently in education. Please include cases where the child/young person has moved in to the LA and are awaiting placement*

## 2.2b Apprenticeships, traineeships and supported internships

All young people recorded in this section should also be counted against an establishment type in section 1.2a. This should be the establishment type of the further education or post-16 setting to which the work based learning is attached, for example establishment types t), u), v), w) in section 1.2a) i).

(a) Apprenticeships	0
(b) Traineeships	0
(c) Supported Internships	0

## 2.3 Decisions not to issue

Please state the number of children and young people assessed under Section 36 of the Children and Families Act 2014 for whom it was decided not to issue an EHC plan during the 2019 calendar year.	153
--	-----

## 2.4 Currently being assessed

Please state the number of children and young people assessed for an EHC plan during the 2019 calendar year who are still being assessed or where assessment has been completed by 16 January 2020 but no decision taken for an EHC plan.	357
---	-----

## 2.5 Assessments refused

Please state the number of initial requests for assessment for an EHC plan that were refused during the 2019 calendar year.	467
---	-----

## 2.6 In year transfers between establishments

(a) Please state the number of children and young people with an EHC plan made before 1 January 2019 who transferred during the 2019 calendar year:

(i) from mainstream settings to special settings	311
(ii) from special settings to mainstream settings	66

(b) Please state the number, during the 2019 calendar year, who were taken out of school by their parents to be home educated:

(i) from mainstream settings	24
(ii) from special settings	6

*Note: Only include in year transfers and not end of academic year phase transfers.*

*Mainstream settings refer to the establishment types (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), (u), (v) and special settings refer to the establishment types (l), (m), (n), (o), (w) in Annex A.*

**2.7 Discontinued plans (compulsory school age)**

Please state the number of EHC plans that have been reviewed and discontinued in the 2019 calendar year. Only include children of compulsory school age. For pupils who have:

(a) Transferred to another LA	155
(b) Special needs being met without an EHC plan	4
(c) Other	13

**2.8 Discontinued plans (school leavers)**

Please state the number of EHC plans that have been discontinued in the 2019 calendar year because pupils have left school at the end of compulsory schooling or after. 1083

**2.9 Initial requests for EHC plan assessments**

Please state the number of initial requests that were made for assessment for an EHC plan during the 2019 calendar year. 1589

**2.10 Initial requests for assessments made whilst in relevant youth accommodation**

Please state the number of initial requests for assessments for an EHC plan during the 2019 calendar year that were made when the child or young person was detained in relevant youth accommodation (RYA). 0

Note: Relevant youth accommodation includes Young Offenders Institutions, Secure Training Centres and Secure Children's Homes.

**3.1 EHC plans issued within 20 weeks (including exception cases)**

(a) Total number of EHC plans issued including exception cases. All EHC plans issued in the calendar year 2019. 898

(b) Of which, the number of EHC plans including exception cases issued within 20 weeks. All EHC plans issued in the calendar year 2019 which were issued within 20 weeks, including those where one or more of the allowable exceptions to the time limits have been called upon. 572

**3.2 EHC plans issued within 20 weeks (excluding exception cases)**

(a) Total number of EHC plans issued excluding exception cases. The total number of EHC plans issued within the calendar year 2019 excluding exception cases. This figure should be the sum of 3.2(b) and any non-exception cases produced outside the 20 weeks' timescale. 768

(b) Of which, the number of EHC plans excluding exception cases issued within 20 weeks. The number of EHC plans issued within the calendar year 2019 which were issued within 20 weeks, where none of the allowable exceptions to the time limits have been called upon. 550

#### **4.1 Personal budgets**

Please state the number of personal budgets in place for all EHC plans maintained at 16 January 2020 340

#### **4.2 Personal budget types**

Of those in Item 4.1, please give the number of personal budgets that have:

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| a) Organised arrangements where the local authority or partner retains the funding and commissions the support spec | 33  |
| b) Direct payments (including payments to nominees and third parties) and whether these are for                     |     |
| (i) education,  | 10  |
| (ii) social care,   | 297 |
| (iii) health, or  | 0   |
| (iv) integrated payment for a combination of the above.   | 0   |

*Note: Only direct payments or organised arrangements from the personal budgets stated in 4.1 should be included. Direct payments received from other providers should not be included in 4.1 or 4.2. A personal budget can be a mixture of organised arrangements and direct payments. Such cases should be counted under both 4.2 (a) and 4.2 (b). Therefore it is possible for the sum of 4.2 (a) and 4.2 (b) to be greater than 4.1.*

#### **5.1 Effectiveness of mediation**

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| (i) Please state, for the 2019 calendar year, the number of mediation cases that have been held; i.e. where a mediation meeting has occurred, regardless of the outcome. | 107 |
| (ii) Of those in 5.1(i), please state the number of cases which were followed by appeals to the Tribunal.  | 15  |

#### **Item 6.1 Designated Medical Officer**

Does your local authority area have a Designated Medical Officer (DMO) in place on 16 January 2020? Yes  
Yes / No / Recruitment in progress

#### **Item 6.2 Designated Clinical Officer**

Does your local authority area have a Designated Clinical Officer (DCO) in place on 16 January 2020? Yes  
Yes / No / Recruitment in progress

#### **Item 6.3 DMO/DCO Function**

Is the function of the DMO or DCO carried out by another member of staff on 16 January 2020? No  
Yes / No

# City Council – 13 April 2021

## SEN2 (2021) Form

Census date: 14 January 2021

### Overview

The information collected via the annual SEN2 survey form provides the major source of data collected on children and young people with Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans. It is the only source of data on the totality of EHC plans maintained by individual local authorities.

Without this information it would be very difficult for Ministers, Parliament, central and local government, external organisations and the public at large to monitor government policies and their effectiveness, and to see how many children and young people with EHC plans there are in individual local authorities.

Local Authority Number	1	330
Completion time:	2	70
Amount of time spent completing this form (to the nearest hour)		
Contact forename:	2A	Saadhia
Contact surname:	2B	Kamran
Telephone number:	2C	7864927227
Email address:	2D	saadhia.kamran@birmingham.gov.uk

### PART 1: Education arrangements for all children and young people for whom the authority maintains an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan.

- 1.1 Please state the number of children and young people as at 14 January 2021, for whom the authority maintains an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan under the Children and Families Act 2014.

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2020.

- a. Under age 5
- b. Aged 5 to 10
- c. Aged 11 to 15
- d. Aged 16 to 19
- e. Aged 20 to 25
- f. TOTAL (a + b + c + d + e)

3	307
4	3080
5	3352
6	2502
7	698
8	9939

## City Council – 13 April 2021

1.2 a Of the children and young people entered in 1.1, please state the number:

(i)	On the roll of the following establishments. This should be the type of establishment named on the EHC plan. Include children and young people whose EHC plan is under appeal.	
a.	Non-maintained early years settings in the private and voluntary sector	9 <input type="text" value="20"/>
b.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	10 <input type="text" value="1189"/>
c.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (SEN Unit)	11 <input type="text" value="0"/>
d.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (resourced provision)	12 <input type="text" value="452"/>
e.	Mainstream school: academy	13 <input type="text" value="553"/>
f.	Mainstream school: academy (SEN Unit)	14 <input type="text" value="0"/>
g.	Mainstream school: academy (resourced provision)	15 <input type="text" value="167"/>
h.	Mainstream school: free school	16 <input type="text" value="59"/>
i.	Mainstream school: free school (SEN Unit)	17 <input type="text" value="0"/>
j.	Mainstream school: free school (resourced provision)	18 <input type="text" value="0"/>
k.	Mainstream school: independent school	19 <input type="text" value="192"/>
l.	Special school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	20 <input type="text" value="2797"/>
m.	Special school: academy/free	21 <input type="text" value="1609"/>
n.	Special school: Non-maintained	22 <input type="text" value="7"/>
o.	Special school: Independent special schools	23 <input type="text" value="181"/>
p.	AP/PRU: LA maintained	24 <input type="text" value="22"/>
q.	AP/PRU: Academy	25 <input type="text" value="0"/>
r.	AP/PRU: Free school	26 <input type="text" value="6"/>
s.	Hospital schools (including foundation schools)	27 <input type="text" value="0"/>
t.	Post 16: General FE and tertiary colleges/HE	28 <input type="text" value="880"/>
u.	Post 16: Other FE	29 <input type="text" value="45"/>
v.	Post 16: Sixth form college	30 <input type="text" value="0"/>
w.	Post 16: Specialist post-16 Institutions	31 <input type="text" value="444"/>
(ii)	Total of 1.2 a (i)	32 <input type="text" value="8623"/>
(iii)	Educated elsewhere	
a.	pupils permanently excluded at 14 January 2021 and not yet placed elsewhere	33 <input type="text" value="0"/>
b.	other - arrangements made by the LA in accordance with Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 or Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014	34 <input type="text" value="45"/>

NOTE: Include children and young people who are within Secure units or Young offenders institutions within 1.2 (iii) (b)

## City Council – 13 April 2021

c.	Elective home education – the number of children with EHC plans who are subject to elective home education	35	58
d.	other – arrangements made by parents in accordance with Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, excluding those who are subject to elective home education	36	1
NOTE: Children and young people who are applicable to (c) should not also be counted in (d)			
e.	Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are attending an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	37	26
f.	Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	38	125
g.	Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting	39	0
h.	Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	40	10
i.	Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	41	129
j.	Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are not in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement	42	26
k.	NEET – Young people who have an EHC plan but are not in employment, education or training	43	896
l.	Other – Including those who have been issued a notice to cease (for example, after taking up of employment) and the decision is currently subject to an appeal to the Tribunal	44	0
1.2 b Of the young people entered in 1.1, please state the number undertaking:			
a.	Apprenticeships	45	0
b.	Traineeships	46	0
c.	Supported Internships	47	0



## City Council – 13 April 2021

1.2 c Of all children and young people with an EHC Plan at 14 January 2021, how many were placed in residential special schools or colleges:

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2020

(i) 38 to 51 weeks per year

- a. Under age 5
- b. Aged 5 to 10
- c. Aged 11 to 15
- d. Aged 16 to 19
- e. Aged 20 to 25
- f. TOTAL (a + b + c + d + e)

48	0
49	0
50	3
51	2
52	0
53	5

(ii) 52 weeks per year

- a. Under age 5
- b. Aged 5 to 10
- c. Aged 11 to 15
- d. Aged 16 to 19
- e. Aged 20 to 25
- f. TOTAL (a + b + c + d + e)

54	0
55	0
56	2
57	6
58	2
59	10

### PART 2: New Assessments and placements by the local authority during the 2020 calendar year.

2.1 Please state the number of children and young people for whom an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan under the Children and Families Act 2014 was made for the first time during the 2020 calendar year.

The age breakdown refers to age as at 31 August 2020.

NOTE: These do not include reassessments of EHC plans.

Please refer to the guide for information on transfers between local authorities.

- a. Under age 5
- b. Aged 5 to 10
- c. Aged 11 to 15
- d. Aged 16 to 19
- e. Aged 20 to 25
- f. TOTAL (a + b + c + d + e)

60	228
61	329
62	188
63	55
64	2
65	802

## City Council – 13 April 2021

2.2 a Of the children and young people entered in 2.1, please state the number:

(i)	On the roll of the following establishments. This should be the type of establishment named on the EHC plan. Include children and young people whose EHC plan is under appeal.	
a.	Non-maintained early years settings in the private and voluntary sector	66 18
b.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	67 241
c.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (SEN Unit)	68 0
d.	Mainstream school: LA maintained (resourced provision)	69 40
e.	Mainstream school: academy	70 98
f.	Mainstream school: academy (SEN Unit)	71 0
g.	Mainstream school: academy (resourced provision)	72 13
h.	Mainstream school: free school	73 4
i.	Mainstream school: free school (SEN Unit)	74 0
j.	Mainstream school: free school (resourced provision)	75 0
k.	Mainstream school: independent school	76 19
l.	Special school: LA maintained (including foundation schools)	77 107
m.	Special school: academy/free	78 66
n.	Special school: Non-maintained	79 1
o.	Special school: Independent special schools	80 9
p.	AP/PRU: LA maintained	81 20
q.	AP/PRU: Academy	82 0
r.	AP/PRU: Free school	83 4
s.	Hospital schools (including foundation schools)	84 0
t.	Post 16: General FE and tertiary colleges/HE	85 20
u.	Post 16: Other FE	86 2
v.	Post 16: Sixth form college	87 0
w.	Post 16: Specialist post-16 Institutions	88 8
(ii)	Total of 2.2 a (i)	89 670
(iii)	Educated elsewhere	
a.	pupils permanently excluded at 14 January 2021 and not yet placed elsewhere	90 0
b.	other - arrangements made by the LA in accordance with Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 or Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014	91 5

NOTE: Include children and young people who are within Secure units or Young offenders institutions within 1.2 (iii) (b)

## City Council – 13 April 2021

- c. Elective home education – the number of children with EHC plans who are subject to elective home education 92
- d. other – arrangements made by parents in accordance with Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, excluding those who are subject to elective home education 93
- NOTE: Children and young people who are applicable to (c) should not also be counted in (d)
- e. Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are attending an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting 94
- f. Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting 95
- g. Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement in another setting 96
- h. Awaiting provision – children below compulsory school age (aged under 5) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement 97
- i. Awaiting provision – children of compulsory school age (aged 5 to 15) who are not attending any education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement 98
- j. Awaiting Provision – young people over compulsory school leaving age (aged 16 and over) who are not in an education setting and have been issued an EHC plan but are awaiting placement 99
- k. NEET – Young people who have an EHC plan but are not in employment, education or training 100
- l. Other – Including those who have been issued a notice to cease (for example, after taking up of employment) and the decision is currently subject to an appeal to the Tribunal 101

2.2 b Of the young people entered in 2.1, please state the number undertaking:

- a. Apprenticeships 102
- b. Traineeships 103
- c. Supported Internships 104

## City Council – 13 April 2021

- 2.3 Please state the number of children and young people assessed under Section 36 of the Children and Families Act 2014 for whom it was decided not to issue an EHC plan during the 2020 calendar year.

105

**NOTE:** Do not include children and young people who are still being assessed or those where assessment has been completed by 14 January 2021 but no decision taken on whether to issue an EHC plan. Do not include reassessments of statements or EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

- 2.4 Please state the number of children and young people assessed for an EHC plan during the 2020 calendar year who are still being assessed or where assessment has been completed by 14 January 2021 but no decision taken for an EHC plan.

106

**NOTE:** These do not include: reassessments of EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

- 2.5 Please state the number of initial requests for assessment for an EHC plan that were refused during the 2020 calendar year.

107

**NOTE:** These do not include: reassessments of EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

Please also include cases where the initial request for assessment was made during 2019, but the request was refused during 2020.

- 2.6 For children and young people with an EHC plan made prior to 1 January 2020:

a. Please state the number of children who transferred during the 2020 calendar year:

i. from mainstream settings to special settings

108

ii. from special settings to mainstream settings

109

b. Please state the number, during the 2020 calendar year, who were taken out of school by their parents to be home educated:

i. from mainstream settings

110

ii. from special settings

111

**NOTE:** Only include in year transfers and not end of academic year phase transfers.

Mainstream settings refer to the establishment types (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), (u), (v) and special settings refer to the establishment types (l), (m), (n), (o), (w), detailed in Item 1.2a.

## City Council – 13 April 2021

2.7 Please state the number of EHC plans that have been reviewed and discontinued in the 2020 calendar year. Only include children of compulsory school age.

For pupils who have:

- |    |   |     |                                  |
|----|---|-----|----------------------------------|
| a. | Transferred to another LA                   | 112 | <input type="text" value="160"/> |
| b. | Special needs being met without an EHC plan | 113 | <input type="text" value="2"/>   |
| c. | Other                                       | 114 | <input type="text" value="17"/>  |

**NOTE:** Please do not include pupils whose statement was assessed for an EHC plan (whether an EHC plan was issued or not) or whose statement/ EHC plan has ended because they have left school at the end of compulsory schooling. Please see the guide for a link to school leaving age information.

2.8 Please state the number of EHC plans that have been discontinued in the 2020 calendar year because pupils have left school at the end of compulsory schooling or after.

115

2.9 Please state the number of initial requests that were made for assessment for an EHC plan during the 2020 calendar year.

116

**NOTE:** These do not include: reassessments of EHC plans; or transitions from statements to EHC plans.

2.10 Please state the number of initial requests for assessments for an EHC plan during the 2020 calendar year that were made when the child or young person was detained in relevant youth accommodation.

117

**NOTE:** Relevant youth accommodation includes Young Offenders Institutions, Secure Training Centres and Secure Children's Homes.

### **PART 3: Education, Health and Care plans issued within 20 weeks**

Data should only cover EHC plans issued for the first time (not reassessments) in the 2020 calendar year.

Please refer to Annex B of the guide for details of exceptions to the time limits.

Please refer to guide for information on transfers between local authorities.

3.1 Please state for the 2020 calendar year:

- |    |  |     |                                  |
|----|--|-----|----------------------------------|
| a. | the total number of EHC plans issued including exception cases                     | 118 | <input type="text" value="802"/> |
| b. | of which, the number of EHC plans including exception cases issued within 20 weeks | 119 | <input type="text" value="388"/> |

3.2 Please state for the 2020 calendar year:

- |    |  |     |                                  |
|----|--|-----|----------------------------------|
| a. | the total number of EHC plans issued excluding exception cases                     | 120 | <input type="text" value="632"/> |
| b. | of which, the number of EHC plans excluding exception cases issued within 20 weeks | 121 | <input type="text" value="252"/> |

# City Council – 13 April 2021

## PART 4: Number of personal budgets and direct payments

4.1 Please state the number of personal budgets in place for all EHC plans as at 14 January 2021.

122

**NOTE:** Please record the number of personal budgets for EHC plans maintained at the census date. This item replaces the number of EHC plans issued or reviewed during the year as per previous years collections.

4.2 Of those in 4.1, please give the number of personal budgets that have:

a. organised arrangements where the local authority or partner retains the funding and commissions the support specified in the plan (sometimes called notional arrangements)

123

b. direct payments (including payment to nominees and third parties) and whether these are for:

i. education

124

ii. social care

125

iii. health

126

iv. integrated payment for a combination of the above

127

**NOTE:** A personal budget can be a mixture of organised arrangements and direct payments. Such cases should be counted under both 4.2a and 4.2b. Therefore it is possible for the sum of 4.2a and 4.2b to be greater than 4.1.

## PART 5: Effectiveness of mediation

5.1 (i) Please state for the 2020 calendar year, the number of mediation cases that have been held i.e. where a mediation meeting has occurred, regardless of the outcome.

128

(ii) Of those in 5.1 (i), please state the number of cases which were followed by appeals to the Tribunal.

129

## PART 6: Designated Medical / Clinical Officer (DMO / DCO)

6.1 Does your local authority area have a Designated Medical Officer (DMO) in place on 14 January 2021?

(i) Yes

\*Yes/No/Recruitment in progress Drop Down

130

(ii) No

130

(iii) Recruitment in progress

130

6.2 Does your local authority area have a Designated Clinical Officer (DCO) in place on 14 January 2021?

(i) Yes

\*Yes/No/Recruitment in progress Drop Down

131

(ii) No

131

(iii) Recruitment in progress

131

6.3 Is the function of the DMO/DCO carried out by another member of staff on 14 January 2021?

(i) Yes

\*Yes/No Drop Down Box

132

(ii) No

132

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

**B16     Company Sole Trader**

**Question:**

**In Question B10 of 23rd February 2021, you failed to provide details of the Company/Sole Trader you have paid for services, using the High Needs Block money. As per question A5 & A6, 23rd February 2021, please provide details of the Company/sole trader; total spend; and if the supplier is based in Birmingham. Detail the spend since September 2019**

**Answer:**

As per the answer provided in February 23<sup>rd</sup> and the further requirement for the company information please see below a table of the providers and the registered company address, along with the total spend:

Agency	Spend	Confirmed Address
Baltimore	£745,240	PS21, 21 Princes Street, Bristol, BS1 4PH
Education Futures	£48,322	19 New Street, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4BH
Hays	£135,815	1 Colmore Square, Birmingham, B4 6AJ
Lords	£570,650	Crown House, The Square, Alvechurch, Birmingham B48 7LA
Panoramic	£1,368,785	St Bartholomew's House, Lewins Mead, Bristol, BS1 2NH
Penna	£0	2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, 10 Bishops Square, Spitalfields, London, E1 6EG
Smart Education	£95,333	1-3 The Courtyard, Calvin Street, Bolton, BL1 8PB
Spencer Clarke	£136,675	11 Bartle Court Business Centre, Rosemary Lane, Preston, PR4 0HF
Venn Group	£35,126	Waterloo House, 20 Waterloo Street, Birmingham, B2 5TB

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

**B17    EHCP'S Reviews and Placements**

**Question:**

**Please provide details of the EHCPs Reviews and Placements that have been undertaken for the students that were on the roll at Hunters Hill College as of September 2020. Include the current provision they are receiving.**

**Answer:**

There were 85 students on roll at Hunters Hill College as at September 2020. This number has since reduced to 71. The 14 students that have come off roll in the intervening period have all had their EHCP reviews undertaken and moved to permanent placements elsewhere – either in local authority maintained provision (Lindsworth School), independent provision (VASE), or provision sourced by their home local authorities where they are not the responsibility of Birmingham.

The school carried out outstanding Annual Review meetings for the students currently on roll by a deadline of 31 March 2021. Paperwork is being submitted to the LA to enable all remaining Annual Review processes to be completed ready for the permanent change of placements required as a result of the decision to close the school at the end of this academic year.

Of the 71 students currently on roll, interim placements have been confirmed for 53 in response to the more recent temporary closure of the school site. These interim placements have been sourced via maintained, free school, independent and alternative providers. For the remaining 18 (two in Year 9, four in Year 10 and the remaining 12 in Year 11), appropriate interim provision is being discussed with students and families and they are currently being provided with remote education from Hunters Hill.



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

**B18     SEND Interim and Agency Workers**

**Question:**

**Please provide a breakdown of the SEND interims and SEND agency workers who have been working on any SEND related activity, since 1st September 2019, specifying how many of these have had their DBS status vetted and how many have completed the City Council's Mandatory training, including GDPR training.**

**Answer:**

All the interim staff and agency workers that are completing work related to SEND are undertaking non-regulated activity and are therefore not required to have an Enhanced DBS check. At any point should the work they do become regulated activity, they will be subject to Enhanced DBS checks through the DBS update service in line with BCC policy.

The interim and agency staff working on SEND activity are currently in the process of completing BCC's mandatory training.

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

**B19    DPS**

**Question:**

**When the DPS was signed, what was added into the contract at that point before signing to address the concerns of the Audit report into home to school transport? The existence of which was already known within the Council.**

**Answer:**

Documents on the DPS were uploaded at the start of October 2019 which included the Terms and Conditions of the DPS.

Recommendation 4 was included in the Deed of Variation referred to in the response to B1.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING  
FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

**B20     Self-Harm**

**Question:**

**The rate of self-harm among young children in the UK has doubled over the last six years, according to a new analysis with the number of children aged nine to 12 admitted to hospital having hurt themselves intentionally rising from 221 in 2013/14 to 508 in 2019/20. Could the Cabinet Member give details of how this sensitive issue will be tackled by the City?**

**Answer:**

Thank you for the question. This is indeed a sensitive issue.

The Children's Trust has not yet seen a rise in referrals for its services where self-harm is the key factor. But it is widely accepted that the last 12 months have put particular strain on the emotional health of many young people.

The online mental and emotional health tool, called Kooth, has been rolled out and has been accessed by over 5000 young people across the city. In addition, the Stick programme, providing emotional and mental health support to children and young people in our schools, is expanding. This is delivered by Forward Thinking Birmingham

Our Early Help offer is also increasing, wrapping support earlier around young people, and providing 'teams around schools' to support them to meet the needs of their young people.

All of these developments, plus the great work being done in our schools and across our services mean we are as well placed as we can be to respond to any rises we see in self-harm among our young people.

# B21

CITY COUNCIL – 13 APRIL 2021

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**B21     Children in Care**

**Question:**

The Government has recently announced children in care under the age of 16 will not be placed in unregulated accommodation from September which could create a “two-tier” system, with over 16s left neglected and unprotected. Although the move to increase children’s home provision was a positive step, this funding would not be available immediately so could the Cabinet Member provide details of how this issue is going be addressed by the City?

**Answer:**

The term unregulated placement refers to those residential settings that are not inspected by OFSTED. These providers will in the main offer supported accommodation to young people over the age of 16. It is lawful for young people over 16 to live within these settings and many providers across the city are well known to the City Council and offer high quality provision. St Basils for example is a reputable provider in the city of supported accommodation.

There is a Regional Supported Accommodation framework in place. Providers have been through due diligence as part of the tender process and have to meet quality thresholds in order to join the framework and this provides assurance of all of the providers that are used.

It is therefore not the case that children over 16 will be left neglected and unprotected as the provision that is commissioned is quality assured. The main difference is the age at which the accommodation is suited. For children over 16 they require support, for those under 16 they require care. It is the providers of care that are currently regulated via Ofsted. The new law seeks to sanction against children under 16, requiring care, being placed in a supported living environment.

It is already an existing policy within the Children’s Trust not to place children under 16 in supported accommodation. In the rare, emergency situations where this has occurred the provision used has been robustly quality assured and then monitored, while an appropriate alternative placement is sourced.

In order to strengthen the Trust position, an analysis of sufficiency has been undertaken that describes the provision required across the city. This has driven a number of initiatives that are underway including –

- A market development exercise that will build and secure exclusive access to emergency regulated provision

**City Council – 13 April 2021**

- The development of a specialist facility to provide urgent residential care for young people with mental health issues
- A Trust-run, registered emergency care provision for children 11-16.

These developments were underway prior to the proposed changes in legislation.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS  
& CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**C1     Learning Loss**

**Question:**

**It has been recently reported in the Guardian that Year 1 pupils at primary schools in England have been the worst affected by learning loss due during the COVID-19 pandemic with over 1.5 million pupils nationally experiencing a steep drop in reading, writing and maths levels compared to expectations at the end of last summer. Could the Cabinet Member explain fully how this deficit will be addressed within City schools?**

**Answer:**

Staff in schools across the city have shown tremendous commitment to their pupils and have worked hard to ensure that children were able to access education throughout the periods of lockdown.

However, I have huge concerns about the impact of the pandemic on children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable and those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Studies are also showing that the youngest pupils were the slowest to catch up when schools fully reopened.

Schools are making use of government catch-up funding and are putting in place targeted support for pupils. Schools have been using the guide published by the Education Endowment Foundation for evidence-based approaches to catch up for all students and we have also been encouraging take up of the National Tutoring Programme by schools in Birmingham.

Approaches taken by schools in Birmingham include providing catch-up sessions and masterclasses for pupils, holding before and after school tuition session as well as specific interventions for pupils who need additional support.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS  
& CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**C2     Pupil Premium**

**Question:**

**There has been a move by the Government to change the date of the school census, which is used to calculate the pupil premium. This will have an adverse effect on the number of children in families receiving the means-tested benefits, with the census being taken before the end of furlough scheme, so those families that see their major bread winner made unemployed and are forced to go onto benefits will not be taken into account, meaning their schools will lose out on Pupil Premium money for them, not just this year but for six further years. Could the Cabinet Member give full details of how much our schools and local communities will lose by this back door cut in schools funding?**

**Answer:**

The Government has stated that it has changed the date of the school census used for calculating pupil premium from the January census count to the October census count.

This change brings pupil premium in line with how the rest of the core schools' budget is calculated.

It is true to say that this shift will miss those pupils in families that are subsequently made unemployed after the census date. However, it is incorrect to state that the October 2020 count occurred just before the end of the furlough scheme. The furlough scheme has been extended to September 2021.

It's also not currently possible to calculate by how much this shift in timing may detrimentally impact on funding levels - the DfE don't publish the details of the January school census as official statistics until the summer. However, if Pupil Premium had been calculated using January 2021 data rather than October 2020 data then we estimate that Birmingham schools would have received an additional £3.9 million in the 21/22 financial year.

Pupil premium funding is a much bigger factor in more disadvantaged areas, such as Birmingham (where 40% of pupils are eligible for some form of deprivation funding). When the official statistics are published (in the summer) we can then provide a more rigorous analysis.

It is not correct to say that schools will miss out for a further six years. Pupils recorded as eligible for free school meals at the time of the October census, or at any point in the previous six years, will continue to attract Ever 6 funding.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND  
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**D      Ernst And Young**

**Question:**

**Listed by year, how much money in total on anything have the Council spent with Ernst and Young since 2015, broken down by Directorate?**

**Answer:**

We have paid to date the following amounts per Directorate

Financial Year	Directorate	Spend to date incl VAT
2015-2016	Finance & Governance	£129,834
	Inclusive Growth	£348
2016-2017	Finance & Governance	£348
2017-2018	Finance & Governance	£232,800
2018-2019	Finance & Governance	£32,400
2019-2020		Nil Spend
2020-2021	Education & Skills	£204,000
	Total Spend	£599,730



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND  
SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**E1      Vaccine Hesitancy**

**Question:**

**Further to the success of the national vaccination campaign by the Government and NHS, could the Cabinet Member give an update of vaccine hesitancy in Birmingham, setting out if there have been any improvements among black and Asian communities in the city following recent national advertising and awareness campaigns?**

**Answer:**

I am acutely aware of vaccine hesitancy within our BAME communities and I continue to promote wherever possible and I know that colleagues across the Chamber continue to support efforts to increase vaccination take up.

The Covid vaccination roll out is led by the NHS and the Council has supported this through engagement, communication and where needed facilities and staff. The Council has supported the CCG by collaborating on a series of community webinars and live Question and Answer sessions chaired by myself and with support from our Director of Public Health and local GP's.

The Council has also supported the CCG in dissemination of vaccination information and awareness, including promoting translated materials on the Council website and media channels.

The Council works with the two local NHS clinical commissioning groups to publish weekly data on uptake across the city by ward, deprivation, gender and ethnicity through the CMIS platform under our Local Outbreak Engagement Board.

The latest reports are available at:

<https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/birmingham/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/11697/Committee/415/Default.aspx>

Uptake has in general improved although there is still some way to go in some ethnic groups, particularly those with smaller populations where a small number of people make a large difference in the % coverage.

	Over 80yr olds		Count of eligible people un-vaccinated
	23/02	06/04	06/04
Not recorded	68.17%	69.7%	1,575
African	60.15%	65.5%	136
Any other Asian background	74.25%	80.0%	97
Any other Black background	65.59%	74.6%	99

**City Council – 13 April 2021**

	Over 80yr olds		Count of eligible people un-vaccinated
Any other ethnic group	68.38%	74.9%	112
Any other mixed background	80.21%	81.9%	17
Any other White background	89.72%	92.9%	231
Arab	77.78%	71.9%	9
Bangladeshi or British Bangladeshi	68.48%	79.4%	109
British, Mixed British	93.83%	96.1%	1,961
Caribbean	66.64%	74.0%	892
Chinese	80.77%	82.0%	38
Indian or British Indian	86.40%	89.8%	324
Irish	91.77%	93.9%	141
Pakistani or British Pakistani	68.21%	77.0%	813
Traveller	0.00%	0.0%	0
White and Asian	68.75%	75.0%	8
White and Black African	66.67%	69.2%	12
White and Black Caribbean	65.74%	72.3%	69

Both CCGs are working with the Council to deliver local vaccine inequalities plans to address the gaps and this includes initiatives to increase clinical time for clinician conversations with patients who are uncertain, increasing pop-up and mobile vaccination clinics working with community organisations including faith settings and community groups and increasing the span of translated materials on vaccine information available.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND  
SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

**E2     Supermarket Visits**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give an update on the work of officers visiting City Supermarkets to ensure they are Covid compliant, which was scheduled to start on 8 February 2021 and confirm if a report will be taken to the next Licensing and Public Protection Committee?**

**Answer:**

A report on this initiative was presented to the Local Outbreak Engagement Board on the 24<sup>th</sup> March by Enforcement (item 9).

<https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/birmingham/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/11697/Committee/415/Default.aspx>

The Covid enforcement Supermarket project was undertaken between Monday 8th and Friday 19th February 2021

- In total 208 supermarkets were visited by officers as part of the project.
- A risk based approach was taken in the first week whereby visits were prioritised towards 15 wards with the highest infection rate per 100,000 with the majority of major supermarkets and independent supermarkets being inspected.
- The second week of the project the majority of the supermarkets within the remaining wards were inspected plus any missed from the 1st week (as well as urgent revisits).
- Supermarkets were rated using traffic light system. Green most or all controls in place, amber – some controls in place, red – little or no controls in place.
- Most Primary Authorities and Area Managers have welcomed the feedback and are keen to rectify any issues/take on board our recommendations.
- Most common issue were incorrect cleaning chemicals being available that were effective against COVID and allowing multiple households to shop together (inappropriately).
- Officers are currently working with all premises risk rated Amber and Red (17) during the project to improve mitigations against COVID and bring these premises up to a Green standard.

A report on this area will be presented to Licensing and Public Protection Committee

**CITY COUNCIL – 13 APRIL 2021**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ**

**F1      Cemeteries**

**Questions:**

**Data shows that one in four local authorities around the UK have 10 years or less before their existing council-owned cemeteries are full to capacity, while almost one in six have five years or less. Could the Cabinet member give full details of the City plans to counteract this?**

**Answer:**

The City Council has invested significantly in its cemeteries with the provision at Sutton New Hall. Further plans are being made with the proposed adoption of a service strategy which will outline the City Council's approach 2021-2036. This will include provision for providing cemetery capacity beyond 2036.

There is current capacity at Sutton New Hall Cemetery for approximately 11,000 graves, with the provision of a further 18 acres of cemetery land, which is currently farmland, that is part of the full planned development. The further development will require future capital funding in order to develop the drainage and road system to deem it suitable for burials in the future.

Kings Norton and Quinton Cemeteries also have land available to be developed in the future that will require capital funding for the development of their infrastructure.

The three cemeteries combined have enough land that, with ongoing development, is expected to provide burial space for the citizens of Birmingham for the next thirty to fifty years, dependent upon usage.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**F2      Kitchen and Bathroom Modernisations**

**Question:**

**How many kitchen and bathroom modernisations have been done on BCC owned homes each year for the past 10 years?**

Answer:

Year	Kitchen	Bathroom
2010-11	109	44
2011-12	788	406
2012-13*	n/a	n/a
2013-14	609	544
2014-15	303	306
2015-16	360	378
2016-17	789	704
2017-18	407	355
2018-19	609	513
2019-20	1015	507
2020-21	22	14

\*2012/13 Data is not available due to the change in contractual arrangements for Constructing West Midlands framework which resulted in a loss of data.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**F3      Cladding**

**Question:**

**It has been estimated 30,000 people in Birmingham are still living in buildings with potentially dangerous cladding with the Government saying it will cover the cost of removing cladding for buildings taller than 18 metres, but those living in shorter buildings will have to pay up to £50 per month to have it removed. Could the Cabinet Member give details of how the City plans to resolve this issue?**

**Answer:**

All BCC owned High-Rise Residential Blocks (HRRBs), regardless of height, have been assessed and where necessary remediation works have been completed or programmed with no additional funding provided from Central Government.

BCC has collated data on HRRBs over 18m in the private sector on behalf of MHCLG. The building owners have had the opportunity to apply for government funding to remediate dangerous cladding for buildings over 18m and to install alarms reducing the costs of waking watch. BCC has not been involved in identifying any residential buildings in the private sector under 18m.

The biggest issue for those residents lies at the hands of the government who we have consistently lobbied on behalf of leaseholders over the last year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

**F4      Prospect Housing**

**Question:**

**It has been recently announced Prospect Housing, which currently provides accommodation for 1,600 people in Birmingham, is set to close down after the Regulator for Social Housing deemed it 'non-compliant'. Could the Cabinet Member provide a full update on progress and give assurances no vulnerable resident will be left homeless as a result of the closures?**

**Answer:**

We have been working with Prospect and the Regulator of Social Housing prior to and since the announcement that they (Prospect) will be going through a managed closure up to July of this year. We continue to liaise regularly with Prospect on the progress they are making with the transition of properties to other Registered Providers and they have provided details of all tenants potentially at risk including their needs assessments. Officers have been involved in detailed discussions with Prospect to mitigate against any impact on homelessness services.

As part of our current work on Exempt Accommodation we are progressing well with getting providers signing up to Birmingham's Quality Standards and will be looking to engage accredited providers to ensure there is enough 'quality' accommodation to meet the needs of those individuals requiring supported accommodation. This will help ensure that we have enough quality provision in the City and so reduce any negative impact of something like the Prospect closure.

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

**G1     Litter Picking**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give details of how many street cleansing staff have been redeployed to refuse collection work, giving a full breakdown of the numbers by Depot, by month, since the start of the Pandemic?**

**Answer:**

With the current Pandemic in place we have used Street Cleansing staff to back up the refuse collection service to ensure that the refuse is collected in line with schedules. The amount of staff used has varied across depots and has been governed by the amount of staff that have had to self-isolate due to having symptoms or contacting the virus. Thankfully this has been very few in number as health and safety steps put in place at depots has meant that staff shortages have been kept to a minimum. There is a high proportion of agency staff currently within Street Cleansing and it is those staff that have been utilised to support refuse collections. Street Cleansing have also been used to collect side waste in roads at certain times over the last 12 months as and when required.

We do not have the breakdown of agency staff redeployed within the service to fully respond to the specific question.

Street Cleansing have also seen staff shortages during the last 12 months and this has also impacted on the service's ability to cover all work.



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

**G2     Public Rubbish Bins**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give full details by ward of (a) all public waste bins that have been removed from city streets as well as (b) details of those public waste bins that have been installed in the City from 2019 onwards, explaining, if the information is not available, why?**

**Answer:**

The service, from an operational perspective, does not have the need to maintain a record of the number of bins removed nor the location from where they have been installed / removed. However, since 2018 596 public rubbish bins have been purchased and installed giving rise to an approximate total of 6,500 bins across the city.

The service is constantly reassessing priorities and need and if there are locations where the local bin requirement does need reassessment a manager would be available for a site visit.

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

**G3     Litter Picking**

**Question:**

**The Cabinet member has stated volumes of litter picked from the City's Parks, which has increased significantly. How much litter has been picked from the City's streets by month since the start of 2020?**

**Answer:**

We do not individually weigh waste specifically from litter picking on the city's streets as a separate waste stream. Please see the tonnages for Street Cleansing activity as a whole below.

	Street Cleansing – Dry (tonnes)	Street Cleansing – Wet (Road Sweepings) (tonnes)
Jan	1461.17	504.04
Feb	1182.69	1137.82
March	1150.75	273.62
April	1295.32	860.18
May	1370.84	448.44
June	1653.64	642.22
July	1622.36	506.32
Aug	1505.3	299.62
Sept	1518.2	127.44
Oct	1434.03	705.88
Nov	1463.09	986.58
Dec	1570.29	691.92
Jan	1244.05	519.26
Feb	1209.92	371.88
Est March	11952.3	600

Financial year-to-date (April 2020 to February 2021) street cleansing dry waste tonnages are 4% higher than the same period last year.

Year-to-date (April 2020 to February 2021) street cleansing wet (road sweepings) waste tonnages 5% lower than the same period last year. This figure fluctuates month to month as the individual loads are not weighed as inputs, but the tonnage is taken from the outputs of the wet bays at each of the three transfer stations to allow for water to be drained away before accurate recordings of the weights are taken.

**CITY COUNCIL – 13 APRIL 2021**

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

**G4     Bulky Collections**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member provide full details of the number of bulk collections that have been requested, by Ward, and also the income these generated for the financial year 2020/21?**

**Answer:**

The quantity of bulky collections carried out between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2021 by ward is shown in the table below. Note that this is not totally representative of a typical year as there were periods with no collections and periods where there were a reduced number of collection slots offered.

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Non-electrical collections</b>	<b>WEEE collections</b>	<b>Total collections</b>
Acocks Green	522	120	642
Allens Cross	161	38	199
Alum Rock	258	43	301
Aston	218	41	259
Balsall Heath West	174	56	230
Bartley Green	452	116	568
Billesley	277	79	356
Birchfield	128	34	162
Bordesley & Highgate	115	36	151
Bordesley Green	127	33	160
Bournbrook & Selly Park	251	71	322
Bournville & Cotteridge	275	85	360
Brandwood & Kings Heath	325	108	433
Bromford & Hodge Hill	357	80	437
Castle Vale	152	38	190
Druids Heath & Monyhull	131	39	170
Edgbaston	192	73	265
Erdington	442	99	541
Frankley Great Park	134	30	164
Garretts Green	238	51	289
Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	466	101	567
Gravelly Hill	198	47	245
Hall Green North	377	102	479
Hall Green South	123	36	159
Handsworth	129	30	159
Handsworth Wood	169	37	206
Harborne	338	108	446

## City Council – 13 April 2021

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Non-electrical collections</b>	<b>WEEE collections</b>	<b>Total collections</b>
Heartlands	173	34	207
Highters Heath	143	50	193
Holyhead	105	26	131
Kings Norton North	174	51	225
Kings Norton South	167	49	216
Kingstanding	423	95	518
Ladywood	187	37	224
Longbridge & West Heath	278	94	372
Lozells	105	20	125
Moseley	290	77	367
Nechells	136	33	169
Newtown	102	19	121
North Edgbaston	273	71	344
Northfield	148	51	199
Oscott	410	95	505
Perry Barr	318	73	391
Perry Common	271	45	316
Pype Hayes	310	70	380
Quinton	326	73	399
Rubery & Rednal	155	51	206
Shard End	279	67	346
Sheldon	410	106	516
Small Heath	183	55	238
Soho & Jewellery Quarter	288	64	352
South Yardley	198	54	252
Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East	255	52	307
Sparkhill	267	64	331
Stirchley	183	59	242
Stockland Green	345	70	415
Sutton Four Oaks	208	41	249
Sutton Mere Green	242	55	297
Sutton Reddicap	221	47	268
Sutton Roughley	263	58	321
Sutton Trinity	214	44	258
Sutton Vesey	408	99	507
Sutton Walmley & Minworth	296	96	392
Sutton Wylde Green	172	40	212
Tyseley & Hay Mills	242	73	315
Ward End	164	35	199
Weoley & Selly Oak	398	116	514
Yardley East	207	60	267
Yardley West & Stechford	156	35	191

The charge for a bulky waste is £33 if booked online and £35 if booked via the contact centre. This charge can be for either or both bulky collections. The total amount of income received for the collections that took place between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2021 was £588,791.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

**G5     Public Rubbish Bins**

**Question:**

**Would the Cabinet Member give details of the number of public rubbish bins in the City by depot?**

**Answer:**

Public rubbish bins are not attributed to depots. Since 2018 596 public rubbish bins have been purchased and installed giving rise to an approximate total of 6,500 bins across the city.

The service is constantly reassessing priorities and need and if there are locations where the local bin requirement does need reassessment a manager would be available for a site visit.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

**G6     Litter Pick Central Reservations**

**Question:**

**How many staff did the Council have certificated to litter pick central reservations as of the 1st Jan 2021, including what percentage that made up of the total street cleansing workforce?**

Answer:

**Waste Management**

All Waste Management staff are trained to carry out operations including litter picks on central reservations.

Some roads require additional traffic management training to enable staff to close lanes or install other traffic measures to carry out work on the highway.

Due to Traffic Management qualification expiry in 2020 and the impact of Covid, there were 25 staff trained across the Waste Management Service as of the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021. This represented 12.63% of the total Street Cleansing FTE workforce, although not all of the Street Cleansing roles are required to carry out this responsibility.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

**G7     Litter Pick Central Reservations 2**

**Question:**

**How many staff did the Council have certificated to litter pick central reservations as of the 1st April 2021, including what percentage that made up of the total street cleansing workforce?**

Answer:

**Waste Management**

All Waste Management staff are trained to carry out operations including litter picks on central reservations.

Some roads require additional traffic management training to enable staff to close lanes or install other traffic measures to carry out work on the highway.

Due to traffic management qualification expiry in 2020 and the impact of Covid, there were 38 staff trained across the Waste Management Service as of the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021. This represented 19.49% of the total Street Cleansing FTE workforce, although not all of the Street Cleansing roles are required to carry out this responsibility.

Further training sessions have been scheduled and the most recent was held on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2021.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

**G8      Certification of Staff**

**Question:**

**How many staff have been certificated to litter pick central reservations each year since 2012?**

**Answer:**

All Waste Management staff are trained to carry out operations including litter picks on central reservations.

Some roads require additional traffic management training to enable staff to close lanes or install other traffic measures to carry out work in the highway.

The qualification prior to 2016 was: Signing, Lighting & Guarding with Scottish Qualification Authority (SQA) qualifications:

2012    43 trained (5 year expiration – expired in 2017)  
2013    18 trained (reduced to 3 year expiration – expired in 2016)

NHSS Lantra Qualifications/Awards Training with Up to Speed Training commenced from 2016. This reflects all with T1/T2 qualification:

2016    35 trained (2 year expiration – expiring 2018)  
2017    6 trained – in addition to the 35 in 2016 (2 year expiration – expiring 2019)  
2018    43 trained (2 year expiration, some of these were requalification and new participants – expiring 2020)  
2019    7 trained (requalification and 1 new. 2 year expiration, expires in 2021)  
2020    16 trained (requalification – expire in 2022)  
2021    15 trained so far up to 07/04/21 (6 to attend on 08/04) and currently arranging more to be trained May 2021 onwards.

Numbers fluctuate as people choose not to renew their qualification or leave the service.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

**G9     Recycling Figures**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give a full breakdown of recycling levels in the City from 2010 to 2020?**

**Answer:**

Please see the table below. Note that figures for 2020 have greatly been affected by the current pandemic.

**Table 1: The total amount of waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting**

Year	Total Waste Recycling (Weight in Tonnes)		
	Waste recycled or reused	Waste composting	Total household waste reused, recycled or composted
2010/11	67,634	63,367	131,001
2011/12	71,744	52,794	124,537
2012/13	66,195	63,840	130,035
2013/14	71,446	56,374	127,819
2014/15	69,233	42,359	111,593
2015/16	66,910	39,433	106,343
2016/17	68,438	42,592	111,030
2017/18	53,167	37,901	91,068
2018/19	58,286	41,405	99,692
2019/20	66,897	39,644	106,540
2020/21 (Estimated)	66,548	31,789	98,337

**Table 2: The amount of recycling collected directly from households**

Year	Kerbside Collected Recycling (Weight in Tonnes)				
	*Kerbside multi-material (bottles, cans & plastic)	Kerbside paper and card	Kerbside garden green waste	Total kerbside collected recycling	**Kerbside multi-material rejects (contamination)
2010/11	16,279	27,004	36,081	79,364	1,628
2011/12	16,297	25,202	31,718	73,217	1,630
2012/13	16,633	25,034	41,349	83,016	1,663
2013/14	17,690	22,577	35,937	76,204	1,919
2014/15	17,632	21,480	13,294	52,406	1,913
2015/16	23,358	23,440	15,493	62,291	2,534
2016/17	28,135	23,612	17,435	69,181	3,053
2017/18	21,466	16,995	16,156	54,618	1,680
2018/19	24,343	18,016	17,681	60,040	2,245
2019/20	28,190	17,837	17,967	63,995	2,646
2020/21 (Estimated)	33,962	17,094	18,954	70,010	6,167

\* This is the amount collected and sent to the recycling facility.

\*\*A proportion of the multi-material waste collected is unsuitable for recycling (contamination) and is rejected at the recycling plant

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**G10    Sickness rates**

**Question:**

What have the sickness rates been for (a) Waste Management staff and (b) Council staff as a whole, by month, since the start of 2019?

**Answer:**

The table below shows the average sickness days per full time equivalent (fte) in that month, from January 2019 onwards.

Year	Month	Waste Management average sickness days per fte	BCC average sickness days per fte
2019	January	2.1	0.9
	February	2	0.9
	March	1.7	0.8
	April	1.5	0.7
	May	1.3	0.7
	June	1.4	0.7
	July	1.2	0.7
	August	1.1	0.7
	September	1	0.8
	October	1.3	0.9
	November	1.5	0.9
	December	1.5	0.9
2020	January	1.4	0.9
	February	1.4	0.8
	March	1.2	0.9
	April	1	0.8
	May	0.8	0.6
	June	0.6	0.6
	July	0.8	0.6
	August	0.9	0.6
	September	0.9	0.6
	October	1	0.7
	November	1.1	0.7
	December	1	0.7
2021	January	1.2	0.8
	February	1.1	0.7
	March	0.9	0.7

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ**

**H1     Potholes**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give details of what's happening with Keir's interim contract including an update as to whether the company is on top of repairing potholes that blight our City's roads?**

**Answer:**

Birmingham Highways Ltd (BHL) has given notice to extend the interim contract between BHL and Kier Highways Ltd to 31 December 2021.

This is a step towards a longer extension (preferred by the council) that will be necessary to cover the period until long term arrangements are expected to be in place. A full explanation of this is provided in the Exempt Appendix (C) to Cabinet's decision of 16 March 2021.

With regard to Kier being "on top of repairing potholes", I have consistently been clear that there is no quick fix to this issue and that sustained investment over a number of years will be required to bring the council's roads to a stable and managed condition.

The council's approach is therefore twofold:

- i. A programme of investment in larger schemes to begin the rehabilitation of the city's roads; and
- ii. Smaller repairs, prioritised by risk, to ensure that roads are kept safe in the meantime.

A £50m programme is underway regarding the former and Kier is undertaking smaller repairs alongside this programme. This will continue to be the case until longer term arrangements are in place for maintenance and management.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

**H2     Potholes**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member provide reassurances that the finance allocated by the Government to maintain the Cities roads is being ringfenced for highway repairs and not proportioned to other budgets?**

**Answer:**

I can confirm that since June 2010 as part of its business case for its Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract:

- i. The council has ringfenced its revenue budget for Highway Maintenance and Management; and
- ii. The PFI grant from Government is added to this to provide the resources for the council's Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contracts.

This continues to be the case.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL EUSTACE**

**H3      2020/21 Highway Maintenance Works Programme**

**Question:**

**In June 2020, Highways issued Councillors with details of all the roads in their wards that would receive resurfacing work (2020/21 Highway Maintenance Works Programme). Could the Cabinet Member provide full details, by ward, of work that is outstanding from the original list as well as giving an estimation as to when this is likely to be completed?**

**Answer:**

The attached spreadsheet below shows the update of the 2020/21 Highway Maintenance Works Programme which provides the full details by ward with indicative implementation dates and actual completion dates.

Over the programme period several changes have been made due to Covid constraints and clashes with utilities, Commonwealth Games, the SPRINT project etc. The status of completion or deferment on each scheme has been captured on the 'Comments column' on the attached spreadsheet.

In summary, to date we have delivered 161 schemes (102 carriageway and 59 footway schemes). A further 25 schemes are being delivered on site.

There are a further 146 outstanding schemes which are to be delivered by end of July 2021 in line with the works programme submitted in June 2020. The deferred schemes (186 No) will be prioritised for completion as soon as possible in the next works programme commencing July 2021.

Full details are provided in the attached spreadsheet and with a summary given in table below.

<b>2021 Programme Scheme Status</b>	<b>No of schemes</b>
1. Schemes Completed	161
2. Ongoing/Live	25
3. Outstanding schemes to be delivered before July 21 as part of the current programme	146
4. Deferred due to be completed on the 2021/22 Works Programme.	186
<b>List of Sections in Programme</b>	<b>518</b>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

**H4      Public Transport Issues**

**Question:**

**Members have been receiving more complaints from concerned citizens regarding the lack of social distancing on public transport, especially buses, now schools have fully reopened to pupils. Can the Cabinet Member feed back on concerns that he took to the West Midlands Bus Alliance and confirm what measures have been agreed to reinforce health and safety which will give passengers confidence in public transport?**

**Answer:**

Having taken concerns on social distancing on buses to the Bus Alliance, I am assured that there are sufficient controls in place to monitor and mitigate this issue with both operators and Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) as the Local Transport Authority.

The reports from bus operators through the West Midlands Alliance show that there is currently only a very small number of trips that are showing up as being at, or approaching, the revised capacity limits on buses.

The latest data shows that on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2021 just 5 bus trips out of a total of over 13,000 had reached their capacity limit. However, it is recognised that the data isn't wholly reflective of the real world and isn't able to pick up local conditions such as fluctuations around busy local centres or major employers.

TfWM and bus operators, including National Express, are monitoring the data, undertaking local checks and monitoring passenger feedback to then take action where possible.

The options available include but are not limited to:

- Increasing the frequency of services to provide additional capacity.
- Introducing additional dedicated vehicles at peak times into identified hotspots.
- Deploying dynamic spare vehicles to provide immediate additional capacity where required.
- Providing passengers with accurate information to enable them to make the decision about the best time to travel when this is an option. This includes timetable information but also data on likely bus loadings at different times of day by route.



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

**H5     Birmingham Transport Plan**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give full details of why the responses from the public consultation remain unpublished?**

**Answer:**

The end of the formal consultation period on the Birmingham Transport Plan (BTP) was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic; as such, certain elements of the consultation are to be concluded in 2021. The results of the consultation are planned to be published alongside the final version of the BTP during the summer.

The small team responsible for the BTP have been deployed on other priorities during the last year including the Emergency Transport Plan; Active Travel Fund bidding, delivery and review; Reopening High Streets Safely Fund public realm programme; and preparations to support the hospitality sector as the current lockdown restrictions are eased from 12 April.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

**H6      A457 Dudley Road Improvements”**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member comment on the increase in prudential borrowing attributed to this scheme and although there is a £16m gap in funding, include full details on how he sees both this sum and the increased prudential borrowing repaid?**

**Answer:**

In March 2021, Cabinet approved the revised Dudley Road proposals, which included delivery of advanced works at the Western Road junction, which expands and aligns with developer led proposals and avoids future abortive costs.

Following detailed design, the developer’s contribution to the Western Road junction has reduced by £0.200m resulting in a need to increase the overall amount of Prudential Borrowing (PB) required to deliver the entire scheme.

There is a requirement to complete delivery of the Western Road junction ahead of the Commonwealth Games so as to avoid major works on the highway during the event. In the absence of approved funding for the wider scheme, this has required PB to be brought forward in respect of an earlier expenditure profile, which is subsequently offset by a reduction in the amount of PB required in future years.

All PB required for the scheme will be repaid from Bus Lane Enforcement (BLE) net surplus income, which has been incorporated within the current BLE financial model and has been shown to be affordable.

It is planned to seek capital resources to deliver the wider scheme through the various relevant funding mechanisms for such projects announced by Government as part of the March budget.

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

**H7      CAZ Support Measures**

**Question:**

**As of the 1st April, listed by each category of grant/exemption etc of the CAZ support measures, how many applications for support have been received, how many approved, what is the value of them and what percentage of the available support for that category does that make up so far?**

**Answer:**

All information is at 08 April 2021

**LOCAL EXEMPTIONS (BY APPLICATION)**

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>No of accounts created*</b>	<b>No of applications approved</b>
<b>RESIDENT</b>	1270	718
<b>WORKER</b>	2818	928
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>	221	54
<b>RECOVERY</b>	41	70
<b>COMMUNITY USE</b>	68	11
<b>SHOWMANS' VEHICLES</b>	N/A	12

\* Accounts created has been used as a proxy for number of applications received as this is the start of the application process i.e. an applicant is required to create an 'account' on the exemption application system. It should also be noted that an applicant is able to create multiple accounts before submitting a final application with supporting evidence.

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>No of applications received</b>	<b>No of applications approved</b>	<b>Grant value awarded</b>	<b>% of grant funding</b>	<b>Expected lifetime of scheme*</b>
<b>Hackney carriage and private hire vehicles</b>	1,718	816	£1.13m	7.5%	Up to 3 years
<b>Heavy Duty Vehicle Fund</b>	28	5	£0.285m	2.85%	Up to 3 years

**City Council – 13 April 2021**

<b>Vehicle scrappage and travel credits**</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Up to 3 years</b>
---	------------	----------	----------	----------	--------------------------

\* Indicative lifetime for the scheme. Actual duration will depend on how quickly the funds are exhausted.

\*\* Indicates expressions of interest in the scheme as it is not open for full applications. Eligible applicants to this scheme would also be eligible for the temporary worker exemption

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

**H8     Surface Replacing**

**Question:**

**What would the cost to the Council be of replacing the average 300m road surface with new surface?**

**Answer:**

There is no such thing as “the average 300m road surface”.

Highway maintenance costs vary greatly and depend on a number of factors (including, but not limited to):

- The condition of the road before treatment and type of treatment required (i.e. its depth and application method).
- The area of the road (i.e. length and width, including numbers of lanes).
- When the work can be carried out (due to the traffic classification of roads).
- Any specific requirements (e.g. other apparatus located in the section – powered apparatus, gullies, traffic control equipment, etc.).
- The physical layout of the road and the traffic management requirements (i.e. the number of junctions).
- The degree of risk that the contractor(s) are asked to take in respect of different elements of the works (e.g. design and delivery).

For this reason, tenders for works contain a number of different rates that apply to the particular circumstances involved

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

**H9      Costs of Surface Replacing**

**Question:**

**What would the cost be to the Council of replacing the road surface of the first 80m in a road then leaving 20m, then replacing the next 200m of a road?**

**Answer:**

The response to question H8 (Cllr Deirdre Alden) applies here:

Highway maintenance costs vary greatly and depend on a number of factors (including, but not limited to):

- The condition of the road before treatment and type of treatment required (i.e. its depth and application method).
- The area of the road (i.e. length and width, including numbers of lanes).
- When the work can be carried out (due to the traffic classification of roads).
- Any specific requirements (e.g. other apparatus located in the section – powered apparatus, gullies, traffic control equipment, etc.).
- The physical layout of the road and the traffic management requirements (i.e. the number of junctions).
- The degree of risk that the contractor(s) are asked to take in respect of different elements of the works (e.g. design and delivery).

For this reason, tenders for works contain a number of different rates that apply to the particular circumstances involved.

Additionally, the availability of funding to undertake maintenance needs to be taken into account.

The cost to the council of replacing an 80m section and a 200m section with a 20m section in between would therefore depend upon the specific circumstances applicable to the section.

If this relates to specific works, then if further detail can be provided on the specific section then an explanation can be provided as to the specific circumstances.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MAUREEN CORNISH**

**H10     Road Resurface**

**Question:**

**What percentage of a road would need resurfacing before it is cheaper to resurface the whole road?**

**Answer:**

The response to question H8 (Cllr Deirdre Alden) applies here:

Highway maintenance costs vary greatly and depend on a number of factors (including, but not limited to):

- The condition of the road before treatment and type of treatment required (i.e. its depth and application method).
- The area of the road (i.e. length and width, including numbers of lanes).
- When the work can be carried out (due to the traffic classification of roads).
- Any specific requirements (e.g. other apparatus located in the section – powered apparatus, gullies, traffic control equipment, etc.).
- The physical layout of the road and the traffic management requirements (i.e. the number of junctions).
- The degree of risk that the contractor(s) are asked to take in respect of different elements of the works (e.g. design and delivery).

For this reason, tenders for works contain a number of different rates that apply to the particular circumstances involved.

Additionally, the percentage of a road that needs resurfacing before it becomes cheaper to resurface the whole road therefore depends upon the condition and area of the road that is and is not proposed to be resurfaced.

This is not an exact science and is an exercise of judgement on the part of the designer. This exercise of judgement will take into account a number of factors, including anticipated deterioration, likely costs of maintaining and the availability of funding.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

**H11    Vivacity Labs**

**Question:**

**Has Birmingham City Council used any of its cameras including traffic analysis cameras from Vivacity Labs to monitor social distancing?**

**Answer:**

**No.**



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN LINES**

**H12    CAZ Cameras**

**Question:**

**What does the contract for the CAZ cameras allow for in terms of their conversion to alternative uses?**

**Answer:**

The cameras can only be used for their intended and consulted upon use, which is the enforcement of the Clean Air Zone. Any change or conversion to alternative uses would require formal consultation and appropriate decision making via the Council's gateway and related financial approval framework. This would include policy decisions if required.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

**H13     Alternative Use**

**Question:**

**What discussions have the Council had regarding alternative uses for the CAZ cameras?**

**Answer:**

The Clean Air Zone programme is focused on ensuring the successful launch of the zone on 1 June 2021. As such, there are no current plans for possible alternative uses of the Clean Air Zone cameras beyond their immediate intended purpose i.e. the enforcement of the Clean Air Zone. As per the response to City Council question H12, any change or conversion to alternative uses would require formal consultation and appropriate decision making via the Council's gateway and related financial approval framework. This would include policy decisions if required.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MEIRION JENKINS**

**H14    Future Use**

**Question:**

**What plans have the council considered for future uses for the CAZ cameras?**

**Answer:**

The Clean Air Zone programme is focused on ensuring the successful launch of the zone on 1 June 2021. As such, there are no current plans for possible alternative uses of the Clean Air Zone cameras beyond their immediate intended purpose i.e. the enforcement of the Clean Air Zone. As per the response to City Council question H12, any change or conversion to alternative uses would require formal consultation and appropriate decision making via the Council's gateway and related financial approval framework. This would include policy decisions if required.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

**H15    Capital Works 1**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of capital works done in roads/pavements/street lights in 2020/21 including names of locations?**

**Answer:**

Please see the following tabs in the attached spreadsheet:

- Carriageway:                      CW & FW 2020-21 marked as CW in column A
- Footway:                      CW & FW 2020-21 marked as FW in column A
- Street Lighting:    SL 2020-21

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

**H16    Capital Works 3**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of capital works done in roads/pavements/street lights in 2018/19 including names of locations?**

**Answer:**

Please see the following tabs in the attached spreadsheet:

- Carriageway:                      CW 2018-19
- Footway:                      N/A
- Street Lighting:    SL 2018-19

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**H17     Capital Spend**

**Question:**

**Listed by year since 2009/10, what is the total capital spend per financial year on improvements to roads, pavements and street lights?**

**Answer:**

Actual spend on capital improvements to roads, pavements and street lighting in 2009-10 and 1 April to 6 June 2010-11 was as follows:

- 2009-10: £8.778m
- 2010-11: £1.513m

It should be noted that:

- i. 2010-11 is a partial year from 1 April 2010 to 6 June 2010 because the council entered into its PFI contract on 7 June 2010.
- ii. As per the question, the above figures do not include all capital expenditure on highway infrastructure. Other assets such as drainage, Structures, Bridges and Tunnels and UTC / traffic signals have been excluded.

Since the Council entered into a PFI contract in June 2010 it has paid for highway maintenance and management services received under the contract via a single Unitary Charge payment. This payment covers the provision of all services under the contract, together with the cost to the Council's partner of managing and financing those services. It is not subdivided by service.

It is not therefore possible to separate the specific element that is capital from this Unitary Charge payment. A list of Unitary Charge payments by year since 2010-11 can be provided if requested.

Since June 2019 the Council has paid directly for capital expenditure by Birmingham Highways Ltd. For roads, pavements and street lighting this has been as follows:

- 2019-20 (partial year): Nil
- 2020-21: £15.540m

It should be noted that payment is for certified completed works and the 2020-21 figure includes works completed in 2019-20 that were paid for on certification in 2020-21.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

**H18    Capital Works 2**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of capital works done in roads/pavements/street lights in 2019/20 including names of locations?**

**Answer:**

Please see the following tabs in the attached spreadsheet:

- Carriageway:                      CW & FW 2019-20 marked as CWP in column A
- Footway:                      CW & FW 2019-20 marked as FWP in column A
- Street Lighting:    SL 2019-20

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

**H19     Budgeted Capital Spend**

**Question:**

**What is the current budgeted capital spend on roads, pavements and street lights for 2021/22**

**Answer:**

Since the Council entered into a PFI contract in June 2010 it has paid for highways services received under the contract via a Unitary Charge payment. This payment covers the provision of all services under the contract, together with the cost to the Council's partner of managing and financing those services. The Council budgets for this Unitary Charge payment and it is not possible to separate the specific element that is capital from this.

The council budget for all services under the Unitary Charge for 2021-22 is £101.8m.

The 16 March 2021 decision by Cabinet acknowledged that investment in highway infrastructure must continue and was clear that proposals beyond June 2021 would need to be developed. Future proposals for capital expenditure on highway infrastructure will be brought forward to a future meeting of Cabinet for decision.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

**H20    CAZ Car Scrappage Scheme**

**Question:**

**Did you consider greater choice and finalising on more than one company for the position of Clear Air Zone car scrappage scheme partner?**

**Answer:**

The Clean Air Zone vehicle scrappage scheme partner was selected on its ability to provide applicants to the scheme with a wide choice of new and used vehicles (currently over 6,000 vehicles). All of these vehicles will meet the emission standards for the Clean Air Zone so would not be subject to the daily fee when the zone is launched on 1 June 2021.

The successful bidder was able to demonstrate a clear commitment to a high level of customer satisfaction and a robust scrappage process which will ensure that the most polluting vehicles are removed from the road.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

**H21     Criteria**

**Question:**

**What criteria was used when choosing dealers for the position of the Clean Air Zone car scrappage scheme partner?**

**Answer:**

The following criteria were used to assess tenders in relation to the scheme, as published through an open tender process advertised to any interested party through the Official Journal of the European Union:

- Economic and financial standing of the bidding organisation(s)
- Technical and professional ability of the bidding organisation including relevant experience.
- Levels of insurance held (or to be obtained) by the bidding organisation(s).
- Service delivery and capacity of the bidding organisation(s) including how they would achieve the service requirements detailed in the specification, provision of compliant vehicles, the process for the scrappage of non-compliant vehicles, and business continuity plans.
- Organisation and resources to be made available by the bidding organisation(s), in relation to the scheme, including the delivery team structure, summary profiles of those involved and their relevant experience, and how changes to the delivery team would be managed.
- How customer satisfaction would be achieved by the bidding organisation(s) including a detailed 'customer journey' with timescales and narrative.
- Post contract award mobilisation and implementation by the bidding organisation(s), including a mobilisation plan for the delivery of the scheme in accordance with the contract including risk management, key milestones, supply chain requirements, marketing, and staff training.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND  
ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

**H22    Motor Dealers**

**Question:**

**How many motor dealers were considered for the position of Clean Zone scrappage scheme partner?**

**Answer:**

The opportunity to be considered for the scrappage scheme partner was advertised to any interested party through the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) as part of an open tender process. There were 10 expressions of interest in the opportunity and two bidders.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND  
ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**H23     Social Distancing**

**Question:**

**Has Birmingham City Council used any of its cameras including traffic analysis cameras to monitor social distancing?**

**Answer:**

**No.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM  
COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**I      Peer Review**

**Question:**

**Please provide a copy of the Peer Review into Planning?**

**Answer:**

The report of the LGA PAS peer review carried out in November 2019 is available on the BCC website:

[https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/18735/birmingham\\_planning\\_peer\\_review\\_final\\_report](https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/18735/birmingham_planning_peer_review_final_report)

The latest report to committee on progress is available here:

<https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/birmingham/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/11940/Committee/4/Default.aspx>