



**MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM
CITY COUNCIL TUESDAY, 7
FEBRUARY 2022**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD
ON TUESDAY 7 FEBRUARY 2022 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE HOLTE
SUITE, VILLA PARK, TRINITY ROAD, ASTON, BIRMINGHAM**

PRESENT:- Lord Mayor (Councillor Muhammad Afzal) in the Chair.

Councillors

Akhlaq Ahmed	Deborah Harries	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Kath Hartley	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Adam Higgs	Gareth Moore
Deirdre Alden	Charlotte Hodivala	Simon Morrall
Robert Alden	Jon Hunt	Yvonne Mosquito
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Mahmood Hussain	Brett O'Reilly
Mohammed Azim	Shabrana Hussain	John O'Shea
David Barrie	Timothy Huxtable	David Pears
Baber Baz	Mohammed Idrees	Robert Pocock
Matt Bennett	Zafar Iqbal	Julien Pritchard
Kate Booth	Ziaul Islam	Hendrina Quinnen
Sir Albert Bore	Morriam Jan	Carl Rice
Nicky Brennan	Kerry Jenkins	Darius Sandhu
Marje Bridle	Meirion Jenkins	Dominic Stanford
Tristan Chatfield	Brigid Jones	Ron Storer
Zaker Choudhry	Nagina Kauser	Martin Straker Welds
Debbie Clancy	Mariam Khan	Saima Suleman
Liz Clements	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sharon Thompson
Maureen Cornish	Chaman Lal	Paul Tilsley
John Cotton	Mike Leddy	Lisa Trickett
Adrian Delaney	Bruce Lines	Ian Ward
Diane Donaldson	John Lines	Mike Ward
Peter Fowler	Mary Locke	Ken Wood
Jayne Francis	Ewan Mackey	Alex Yip
Fred Grindrod	Majid Mahmood	Waseem Zaffar
Roger Harmer		

NOTICE OF RECORDING

- 19594 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.

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

- 19595 The Lord Mayor reminded members that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests arising from any business to be discussed at this meeting.
-

MINUTES

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

- 19596 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2022 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erdington Parliamentary Constituency By-election

- 19597 The Lord Mayor noted that the Purdah period for the Erdington Parliamentary Constituency by-election started today and ended at the close of polling on 3 March 2022.
-

PETITIONS

Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented before the Meeting

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 1)

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

19598 **RESOLVED:-**

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

Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented at the Meeting

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 2)

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

19599 **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. 3)

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19600 **RESOLVED:-**

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

QUESTION TIME

19601 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.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNCIL

Following nominations from Councillor Martin Straker Welds it was-

19602

RESOLVED:-

That the appointments be made to serve on the Committees and other bodies set out below:-

Neighbourhoods Directorate Departmental Consultative Committee

Councillor Kate Booth (Lab) to fill the vacancy created by the death of Councillor Penny Holbrook (Lab) on the Committee for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022.

WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Mariam Khan (Lab) to fill the vacancy created by the death of Councillor Penny Holbrook (Lab) on the Committee as the Substitute Member for Councillor Kate Booth for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022.

City Housing Liaison Board

Councillor Mary Locke (Lab) to fill the vacancy created by the death of Councillor Penny Holbrook (Lab) on the Committee as the Labour alternative Member for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022.

LEAD MEMBER REPORT: WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

The following report from the Lead Member of the West Midlands Fire and Rescue Authority was submitted:-

(See document No. 4)

Councillor Zafar Iqbal moved the recommendation which was seconded.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Zafar Iqbal replied to the debate.

The recommendation having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19603 **RESOLVED:-**

That the report be noted.

ANNUAL REPORT 2020-21, AUDIT COMMITTEE

The following report from the Chair of Audit Committee was submitted:-

(See document No. 5)

Councillor Fred Grindrod moved the Motion which was seconded.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Meirion Jenkins and Simon Morrall gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 6)

Councillor Meirion Jenkins moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Simon Morrall.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Fred Grindrod replied to the debate.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Meirion Jenkins and Simon Morrall having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The Motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19604 **RESOLVED:-**

That the report be noted.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

19605 **RESOLVED:-**

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

The Council then adjourned at 1621 hours.

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

GAMBLING ACT 2005 - STATEMENT OF LICENSING PRINCIPLES

The following report of the Licensing and Public Protection Committee was submitted:-

(See document No. 7)

Councillor Mike Leddy moved the Motion which was seconded.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Mike Leddy replied to the debate.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19606

RESOLVED:-

That the City Council approves the Statement of Gambling Principles and authorises:-

- (i) the City Solicitor to update the list of Policy Framework Plans to include the same; and
 - (ii) the Interim Assistant Director of Regulation and Enforcement to do what is necessary to publish and comply with the same.
-

APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITOR FROM 2023/24

The following report of the Director of Council Management was submitted:-

(See document No. 8)

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

There being no debate the Lord Mayor put the motion, having been moved and seconded, to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19607

RESOLVED:-

That the Council accepts Public Sector Audit Appointments' invitation to opt into the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

MOTIONS FOR DEBATE FROM INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

The Council proceeded to consider the Motions of which notice had been given in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure (B4.4 G of the Constitution).

A. Councillors Robert Alden and Matt Bennett have given notice of the following motion.

(See document No. 9)

Councillor Robert Alden moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Matt Bennett.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Ian Ward and Jayne Francis gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 10)

Councillor Ian Ward moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Jayne Francis.

A debate ensued.

PROCEED TO THE NEXT BUSINESS

Councillor Jon Hunt proposed to proceed to the next business which was seconded.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and on a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The debate continued.

THE QUESTION NOW BE PUT

Councillor Ewan Mackey proposed that the Question now be put which was seconded.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and on a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The debate continued.

THE QUESTION NOW BE PUT

Councillor Gareth Moore proposed that the Question now be put which was seconded.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and on a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The debate continued.

PROCEED TO THE NEXT BUSINESS

Councillor Roger Harmer proposed to proceed to the next business which was seconded.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and on a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The debate continued.

THE QUESTION NOW BE PUT

Councillor Gareth Moore proposed that the Question now be put which was seconded.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and on a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The debate continued.

Councillor Robert Alden replied to the debate.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Ian Ward and Jayne Francis having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The motion as amended having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

19608 **RESOLVED:-**

This Council calls for a Festival of Birmingham each year to celebrate our shared heritage and history.

This Council notes that:

Birmingham's bid for the Commonwealth Games has resulted in a record level of investment for the city, with around a billion pounds being leveraged into the city, and £3 of Government investment for every £1 that the Council is spending.

The Commonwealth Games cultural programme has attracted £12 million of investment into the arts which will continue to put our city onto the cultural map.

The Council calls on the Executive to:

Begin a conversation with arts and cultural stakeholders across the city on an annual Birmingham Festival that will be a meaningful legacy for the Games.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ITEM

19609 Councillor Alex Yip proposed that the time for consideration of the item be extended which was seconded.

The motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and on a show of hands was declared to be lost.

B. Councillors Morriam Jan and Baber Baz have given notice of the following motion.

(See document No. 11)

Councillor Morriam Jan moved the Motion during which as a Point of clarification, Councillor John O'Shea noted that he had been in post 3 years and requested that Councillor Jan withdraw her remark that he was a liar Councillor Jan acknowledged that Councillor O'Shea had been in post 3 years and withdrew the use of the word liar.

The Lord Mayor in noting that there was no further time left for consideration of the item asked that the motion be formally seconded, and the amendment be formally moved and seconded.

Councillor Baber Baz formally seconded the Motion.

City Council – 1 February 2022

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Deirdre Alden and Simon Morrall gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 12)

Councillor Deirdre Alden formally moved the amendment which was formally seconded by Councillor Simon Morrall.

The Lord Mayor requested Councillor Morriam Jan to sum up.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Deirdre Alden and Simon Morrall having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be lost.

Here upon a poll being demanded the voting was as follows:-

For the amendment (29)

Deirdre Alden	Roger Harmer	David Pears
Robert Alden	Deborah Harries	Julien Pritchard
David Barrie	Adam Higgs	Darius Sandhu
Baber Baz	Jon Hunt	Dominic Stanford
Matt Bennett	Timothy Huxtable	Ron Storer
Zaker Choudhry	Morriam Jan	Paul Tilsley
Debbie Clancy	Bruce Lines	Mike Ward
Maureen Cornish	Ewan Mackey	Ken Wood
Adrian Delaney	Gareth Moore	Alex Yip
Peter Fowler	Simon Morrall	

Against the amendment (44)

Akhlaq Ahmed	Kath Hartley	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Shabrina Hussain	Yvonne Mosquito
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Mohammed Azim	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Kate Booth	Ziaul Islam	Robert Pocock
Sir Albert Bore	Kerry Jenkins	Hendrina Quinnen
Nicky Brennan	Brigid Jones	Carl Rice
Marje Bridle	Nagina Kauser	Martin Straker Welds
Tristan Chatfield	Mariam Khan	Saima Suleman
Liz Clements	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sharon Thompson
John Cotton	Chaman Lal	Lisa Trickett
Diane Donaldson	Mike Leddy	Ian Ward
Jayne Francis	Mary Locke	Waseem Zaffar
Fred Grindrod	Majid Mahmood	

Abstentions (0)

The Motion having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be lost.

Here upon a poll being demanded the voting was as follows:-

For the Motion (28)

Deirdre Alden	Roger Harmer	Simon Morrall
Robert Alden	Deborah Harries	David Pears
David Barrie	Adam Higgs	Julien Pritchard
Baber Baz	Jon Hunt	Darius Sandhu
Matt Bennett	Timothy Huxtable	Dominic Stanford
Zaker Choudhry	Morriam Jan	Ron Storer
Debbie Clancy	Bruce Lines	Paul Tilsley
Maureen Cornish	Ewan Mackey	Ken Wood
Adrian Delaney	Gareth Moore	Alex Yip
Peter Fowler		

Against the Motion (44)

Akhlaq Ahmed	Kath Hartley	Karen McCarthy
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Alex Aitken	Shabrana Hussain	Yvonne Mosquito
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Mohammed Azim	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Kate Booth	Ziaul Islam	Robert Pocock
Sir Albert Bore	Kerry Jenkins	Hendrina Quinnen
Nicky Brennan	Brigid Jones	Carl Rice
Marje Bridle	Nagina Kauser	Martin Straker Welds
Tristan Chatfield	Mariam Khan	Saima Suleman
Liz Clements	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Sharon Thompson
John Cotton	Chaman Lal	Lisa Trickett
Diane Donaldson	Mike Leddy	Ian Ward
Jayne Francis	Mary Locke	Waseem Zaffar
Fred Grindrod	Majid Mahmood	

Abstentions (0)

The meeting ended at 1925 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 ROGER HARMER

A1 Lobbying of Government

Question:

Could the Leader provide clear details of how the Council will lobby Government to push for a change in legislation ensure schools cooperate with local authorities and police in response to the health and safety risks posed to pupils and pedestrians outside school gates?

Answer:

On 11 January 2022, a motion was passed by full council noting multiple overlapping reasons for improving traffic management and road safety around schools. The motion resolved to identify Clean Air Zone resources to support effective measures, to increase effectiveness of partnership work with the Police around stationary vehicles with idling engines and to lobby Government and MPs for changes to legislation as set out in the question above.

The motion notes that partnership work between the Council, schools and parents/carers is essential to deliver reductions in traffic at the school gate.

We have many examples of how such strong collaboration can deliver real change. A [recent report in the Independent](#) highlighted the activities undertaken by Holy Cross Primary School, in conjunction with their Car Free School Street scheme, and the results they have seen.

Many more schools are keen to take steps to address how their children travel to school and will welcome the additional resource mentioned in the motion at a time when school budgets and staff time are facing extreme pressures. It is important that any change in legislation enables schools to respond and act positively rather than imbuing additional burden and administration.

As we expand the resource available for school travel planning support, in response to this motion, officers from transport and education will have greater opportunity to engage with headteachers to ascertain the most appropriate changes to national guidance and legislation. From this, the specifics of a lobby to Government can be determined.

The motion also calls on Government to expand the range of powers available to local authorities to enforce moving traffic offences include options for creating and enforcing Car Free School Streets schemes; and to provide funding to schools and local authorities to support sustainable and active travel to school.

In addition, measures such as default 20mph speed limits on local streets would increase safety outside many local schools. Birmingham City Council has lobbied Government to make this legislative change and will continue to do so.

The Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment is tasked with reporting plans and progress against the motion to the Sustainability and Transport O&S Committee, allowing for these issues to be further explored and this question further answered in future.

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

A2 Community Areas

Question:

I understand that Geranium Grove POD and skateboarding park, a community area in Bordesley Green, is being put on the market by the Council. This includes a skateboard park that cost £150,000 in 2009. Can the Leader explain what is being done to protect this facility?

Answer:

The Pod at Geranium Grove, Bordesley Green and the adjacent skateboard park/BMX track has been closed since late 2018.

As the Pod and the adjacent land have not been used for some time, Council officers considered it necessary to undertake a consultation exercise on the future of this site, so that the current views of the community could be ascertained.

The Council has sent 222 letters to the local community. In our letter we have asked local residents whether they would like to see The Pod re-opened for young people in the area. For this to occur the Council would have to identify a suitable community group to run this facility.

As an alternative, we have asked residents whether they wish to see the site sold at auction, possibly for new housing.

We have also invited residents to make additional comments on the future of this site, and the views of the community have been sought in this respect.

In the letter we have stressed that the views of the local community are important, and that the Council will take any comments received fully into account in deciding the future of this site. No firm decision has been made on the future of The Pod.

A deadline for completion of the consultation has been set for 11th February 2022. After this date officers will, in consultation with local Councillors, consider all the responses received in determining the future for the site.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

A3 Games Shortfall

Question:

Please list the dates of all meetings of the Council with partners, other than those already contributing, where attempts were made to fill the £25m shortfall in partner contributions for the Commonwealth games and please indicate which of those meetings you attended as Leader?

Answer:

Conversations and meetings with potential Funding Partners commenced in 2017 prior to the submission of the Host City bid. These meetings were both formal and informal and discussions were both dedicated to the bid and were also as part of wider agendas. Both councillors, senior officers and members of the CWG delivery team took part, including former CEOs and Directors, some of whom no longer work with the council.

As Leader, I have maintained close scrutiny over progress and have attended numerous meetings, both formal and informal and it would not be possible to list every occasion.

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

A4 Delegated Key Decisions

Question:

Section 9 of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 states that

“(1) Where a decision maker intends to make a key decision, that decision must not be made until a document has been published in accordance with paragraph (2), which states—

- (a) that a key decision is to be made on behalf of the relevant local authority;**
- (b) the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made;**
- (c) where the decision maker is an individual, that individual’s name, and title if any and, where the decision maker is a decision-making body, its name and a list of its members;**
- (d) The date on which, or the period within which, the decision is to be made;**
- (e) a list of the documents submitted to the decision maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the key decision is to be made;**
- (f) the address from which, subject to any prohibition or restriction on their disclosure, copies of, or extracts from, any document listed is available;**
- (g) that other documents relevant to those matters may be submitted to the decision maker; and**

**(h)
the procedure for requesting details of those documents (if any) as they become available.**

(2) At least 28 clear days before a key decision is made, the document referred to in paragraph (1) must be made available for inspection by the public—

- (a)
at the offices of the relevant local authority; and**
- (b)
on the relevant local authority’s website, if it has one.”**

In answer to questions A12 and A13 of written questions to September 21 full council, you stated that delegated key decisions taken by officers did not require to be published in the forward plan, despite other councils doing so. Given delegated key decisions are clearly still ‘executive decisions’ as defined by the local government act and subsequent regulations such as the one stated above, can you explain how you currently meet the above regulations in respect of key decisions taken by individual officers?

Answer:

For clarity, and as previously reported, in line with the Constitution, all key decisions are taken by Cabinet (B3.1vii) unless they fall under one of the following exemptions:

- Specific exemptions set out in B3.1 of the Constitution – these are reported as per the Constitution;
- A key decision may also be delegated specifically by Cabinet report to a Cabinet Member or officer (see section B3.1). These are set out in each Cabinet report.
- Decisions taken under the Planned Procurement arrangements – as reported to Cabinet via the Planned Procurement Activity Report each meeting;
- Urgent Decisions taken by the Chief Executive (E4.2 of the Constitution).

B6.2 of the Constitution (Rules of Procedure) sets out the rules of procedure that need to be followed when it is impracticable to comply with the publication requirements as set out in Section 9 of the Regulations. The arrangements that need to be followed by the Chief Executive in relation to urgent decisions is set out under sections B6.6, E4.2 and E4.3 of the Constitution.

If further information is required, the Assistant Director Governance (Deputy Monitoring Officer) and Interim Head of Scrutiny and Committee Services would be happy to meet with Councillor Higgs to discuss.

**An urgent decision is defined as one which could not reasonably have been foreseen or anticipated prior to the most recent Cabinet meeting, and which needs to be considered before the next meeting of the Cabinet.*

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

A5 A34 Perry Barr Highway Improvement Scheme

Question:

In answer to question A4 to last month's written questions, you claimed that the risk register for the a34 Perry Barr highway 'improvement' scheme was commercially sensitive. The risk register was included in the public report to Cabinet when the full business case was presented to Cabinet in 2019. Can you explain what has changed since then to make those risks commercially sensitive such that an updated copy of that risk register cannot be reported, including exactly whose commercial interests would be prejudiced by publishing the update?

Answer:

The Full Business Case for the A34 Perry Barr Highway Improvement scheme included a risk register that was a high level summary of the position as expected at that time.

Since then, the detailed design work has been completed and construction work commenced. The construction work is being undertaken by a contractor and the management of the construction contract is ongoing by BCC officers.

As a project moves from the outline design through to the detailed design and construction, the risk register evolves and becomes more detailed as more knowledge is gained about the various risks that might be encountered in the scheme delivery. By the time the scheme moves into the construction phase, most of the risks have a commercial impact in terms of being potential compensation events for the construction contract. The anticipated extent of BCC's commercial exposure is recorded in the risk register and regularly updated throughout the contract.

It can therefore be seen that risks to Birmingham City Council could be considered as opportunities for the Contractor as they naturally seek to maximise their commercial position. This is the same for all construction contracts, not just the A34 Perry Barr Highway scheme.

Therefore, the reason that the risk register is commercially sensitive at this time is that it contains sensitive information that could be exploited by a contractor at a significant cost to Birmingham City Council.

The scheme budget includes for a risk allowance as indicated in the FBC and the project remains on track to deliver within this budget.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

A6 Community Infrastructure Levy 2

Question:

Please list all projects/works funded or earmarked to be funded by Community Infrastructure Levy funds.

Answer:

There is currently a commitment of £10m for the infrastructure to support the legacy of the Commonwealth Games (e.g. contributions to local highway improvements and Perry Barr Railway Station) and a further £640,000 for Ward End Park and the Dolphin Women's Centre. There are a number of other projects which have requested a CIL contribution, but no decisions have been made regarding funding to date.

A further £95,000 has been committed from Local CIL to fund a civic crowd funding project with specialists, Spavehive.

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

A7 Games

Question:

It has been reported that there is a deficit of £25 million in partnership funding for the Commonwealth Games. Could the Cabinet Member report on where that will come from, indicating if it is from an existing budget allocation or a new one?

Answer:

This funding is being provided from the overall Corporate Capital Contingency that was established as a part of the Financial Plan 2021-25 as approved at the Council Meeting held on 23 February 2021. This was most recently explained in further detail at the Informal Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee Meeting that took place on 20 January 2022.

To be clear, the council and its local partners are still contributing a total of £184million towards the overall Games budget (equivalent to 25 per cent of the overall budget). This overall figure has not changed since the Games budget was announced in 2019.

If we had not been bold, bid for the Games and won the right to host them, we would not have unlocked further outside investment worth at least an extra £750million to the city and wider region. The Games, as a result of our 25 per cent share of the budget, are delivering new sporting and community facilities, improved public transport, upgraded infrastructure for the city and giving us an opportunity to put the city on the global stage and help bring the people together to show off the best of Birmingham.

For every £1 that Birmingham is investing the Government is investing £3. This is an extremely good deal for Birmingham.

Longer-term all of this will combine to create further opportunities and investment, and it is all down to the decision to bid for, and financially back the Games.

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

A8 Total Projected Borrowing Costs

Question:

What is the total projected borrowing cost of the £145m Council contributions towards the capital costs of the Commonwealth games (including annual cost and over how many years?)

Answer:

- Of the overall CWG capital programme of £145million, only £50million is anticipated to be funded from borrowing.
- Based on current interest rates, it is estimated that the overall costs arising from a combination of **both repayment** of the initial borrowing and associated **interest costs** will be £1.9million per annum over a period of 40 years.

To be clear, the council and its local partners are still contributing a total of £184million towards the overall Games budget (equivalent to 25 per cent of the overall budget). This overall figure has not changed since the Games budget was announced in 2019.

If we had not been bold, bid for the Games and won the right to host them, we would not have unlocked further outside investment worth at least an extra £750million to the city and wider region. The Games, as a result of our 25 per cent share of the budget, are delivering new sporting and community facilities, improved public transport, upgraded infrastructure for the city and giving us an opportunity to put the city on the global stage and help bring the people together to show off the best of Birmingham.

For every £1 that Birmingham is investing the Government is investing £3. This is an extremely good deal for Birmingham.

Longer-term all of this will combine to create further opportunities and investment, and it is all down to the decision to bid for, and financially back the Games.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR DARIUS SANDHU**

B1 Freedom of Information Requests

Question:

Of the 492 FOI requests that were not responded to within the statutory time limits between 1 January and 30 November 2021 (as per written question B2 to January 22 full Council), what was the average number of working days taken to respond to them?

Answer:

The average number of working days taken to respond was 39 days.

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

B2 Freedom of Information Requests Timescales

Question:

Of all currently unresolved FOI/EIR requests, how many working days has the longest one been open for?

Answer:

As at 26/1/2022, the longest request has been open for 330 days. There are some complexities in respect of this request that relate to the ownership of the data as it is held by external third parties and involves an assessment of commercial sensitivity of the information which is under consideration and is part of ongoing negotiations.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN

C1 COVID Testing Kits in City Schools

Question:

Following the widely reported shortage of Lateral Flow Tests earlier in the year, could the Cabinet Member confirm kits will be made available to City pupils and staff as well as providing details of contingency plans should this supply run out?

Answer:

The council has been supporting schools to access supplies of lateral flow tests where they have had issues in accessing them through the government's priority route for schools. This has included making supplies available from the council's stock.

Education and Skills and Public Health officers have raised this issue with senior officials at the Department for Education. There has been an improvement in the supply of tests to schools recently so fewer schools have required support from the council.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD

C2 Staff absences due to COVID

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide details of the number of teaching staff absent since the start of the new school term with COVID?

Answer:

The council does not hold data on teaching staff absence across all maintained, academies and free schools in Birmingham.

Officers work closely with the chairs of school consortia who have confirmed that staff absence due to COVID has been a significant challenge for Birmingham schools. In recent weeks the rate of cases in the city has been extremely high which has impacted on school staffing.

Officers are in regular contact with senior officials at the Department for Education and have alerted them to schools' concerns about this issue.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR DEBORAH HARRIES**

D1 Effective Traffic Management

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide details of the resources that the administration intends to deploy from the Clean Air Zone income to support effective traffic management measures around schools?

Answer:

Details regarding the deployment of Clean Air Zone resources will be brought to March Cabinet.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

D2 Financial Monitoring Report

Question:

The financial monitoring report shows a £400k pressure this year for waste fleet as a result of non-compliant vehicles within the CAZ area, what provision has been made within each year of the MTFS for paying CAZ charges and penalty notices for each service that operates non-compliant fleet?

Answer:

There is no provision in the MTFP for the payment of CAZ charges. The £400k spend reported in the 2021/22 financial monitoring report is being met from overall management of the Council's bottom line. From 2022/23 it is expected that this cost will be mitigated by the capital investment in new vehicles.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC STANFORD**

D3 Quarter 3 Contract Register

Question:

The October 2020 procurement intentions report indicated a plan to review the 29 individual contracts covering all aspects of the Northgate software estate, with a decision planned for November 2020 and a contract period of 5 years. The quarter 3 contract register on open data shows one contract called 'Northgate Software Estate' worth £4.1m for a period of just 2 and a half years. Please detail the procurement route used for the award of this contract and if it covers all 29 individual contracts references in the October report (and if not which ones it does not cover and the current contract status of each of these)?

Answer:

Procured via Crown Commercial Services – RM3821 as a Direct Award to NEC Software Solutions Ltd (formerly Northgate Public Services (UK) Limited) with a Start Date 01.07.2020 for a 3+2 year Term. This covers the entire BCC estate (29 contracts previously) with the exception of the 'Kirona Intelligent mobile solution for housing' which is contracted separately with NEC Software Solutions

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

D4 Draft Budget Plan

Question:

Table 2.1 of the draft budget plan presented to scrutiny suggests that £27.4m of savings were projected to be delivered this year. How many of these are being delivered on a one off basis only?

Answer:

In 2021/22 £27.9m of savings are forecast to be delivered (Please note these total savings are £0.5m more than reported in table 2.1 as further savings have been identified since the report was written).

Of these savings £12.739m are one off and relate to workforce savings.

And £15.165m are permanent, broken down by workforce savings £3.454m and other departmental savings £11.711m.

	Workforce	Other	Total
Savings	£m	£m	£m
permanent	3.454	11.711	15.165
one-off	12.739		12.739
Total	16.193	11.711	27.904

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

D5 Contracts

Question:

Of the 307 contracts that expired between April and December 2021, how many

- were renewed or replaced using a competitive process**
- renewed or replaced using single contractor negotiations**
- extended with existing supplier after the contract had expired**
- allowed to lapse, but arrangements continued with supplier outside of a contract?**

Answer:

Of the 266 contracts that are currently showing as expired during the period between April and December 2021 the following response is below

Renewed or replaced using competitive process	16
Renewed or replaced using single contractor negotiation	4
Extended with existing supplier after contract has expired	29 have been extended but we will need to do further analysis as to whether this was after contract had expired
Allowed to lapse, but arrangements continued with supplier outside of contract	6

There are 98 contracts that have expired, these are being investigated by Corporate Procurement Services.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

D6 Procurement Strategy

Question:

In October 2019, Cabinet approved a procurement strategy for a new 4 year contract to replace the Highways and Infrastructure Works Framework Agreement which was due to expire in March 2020. That procurement exercise was never completed, and the contract was allowed to lapse. In June 2020 the cabinet procurement intentions report noted an officer delegated decision to pursue 12 month membership of Sandwell's Civil Engineering and Highways Framework to plug the gap for smaller schemes (up to £200k) starting on 1 July 2020. Can you please detail what has happened since that date to progress a new framework agreement to cover all required works (including those over £200k but under £10m that were covered by the old framework but not that 12 month Sandwell one), what contract the council has been operating under since July 2021 and what contract is in place as of today. Please include copies of all decision reports?

Answer:

The procurement for the replacement framework that was approved in October 2019 was put on hold in March 2020 due to the Covid pandemic when a number of likely bidders contacted officers to say they were putting their staff on furlough so would not be able to return a tender. Soft market testing was undertaken in May 2020 to see if there was an appetite to tender the framework and the decision was taken not to progress at that time. Due to the time that has lapsed and current projected pipeline, a new works framework strategy is currently being developed and will presented to Cabinet for a decision during 2022.

All projects have since presented their own procurement strategy for approval at the various governance levels. Smaller value works (up to the threshold) have been approved using delegated authorities and have used either the Black Country Framework or been advertised using the Find It In Birmingham / Contracts Finder route. Works contracts above the threshold have been presented to Cabinet either the Planned Procurement Activities Report (PPAR) and the Delegated Procurement Route, or have been presented to Cabinet via their own Project decision making report.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN LINES**

D7 Quarter 3 Contracts

Question:

The quarter 3 contracts award schedule lists 6 apparently live contracts with North Birmingham Travel which commenced on 27 April 2020 and are due to expire in 2024. 27 April was after NBT had been asked to sign the contract variation to ensure compliance with safer recruiting requirements, but two months before they actually did apparently sign this. Why were new contracts awarded without this variation in place and what is the current status of these 6 contracts?

Answer:

The dates that are listed on Q3 contracts award schedule appear to be incorrect. Contracts to NBT were awarded in January 2020 and services commenced in February half-term 2020.

It should be noted that the original terms and conditions contained safer recruitment practices, the variation that further strengthen safeguarding requirements was issued in 2021.

All contracts with NBT were terminated in August 2021 following an emergency decision report signed by Chief Executive.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BARRIE**

D8 Quarter 3 Contract Register

Question:

Which contract, on the quarter 3 contract register, covers the mobile HRCs, as required by the government's transparency code?

Answer:

There is no specific contract for mobile HRCs. Vehicles are hired through existing spot-hire arrangements.

**E NO WRITTEN QUESTIONS WERE SUBMITTED
TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR MEIRION JENKINS**

F Payments to Social Housing Tenants

Question:

In each of the last 5 financial years, including year to date, on how many occasions, and at what total value, has the Council made payments to social housing tenants (or those on the waiting list) as a result of findings by the Ombudsman or courts, or as part of a pre-court settlement.

Answer:

Due to paper based recording up until 2021 I cannot give a full answer to this question in the timeframe given.

The table below shows the total amount paid in each year to housing tenants or those on waiting lists as a result of findings by the ombudsman or courts. It does not include cases which were part of repossession proceedings.

Financial Year	£
2021/22 to 27/01/22	2,007.30
2020/21	5,653.71
2019/20	736.45
2018/19	675.00
2017/18	1,946.90

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL INCLUSION,
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN**

G Partnership Working with West Midlands Police

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide details of how they will work in more effective partnership with West Midlands Police to ensure effective enforcement of existing rules around stationary vehicles with idling engines?

Answer:

The City Council is willing to work with all partners in undertaking any enforcement action and we already work with the Police on joint enforcement operations. The visual presence alone of Police Officers and Civil Enforcement Officers actively discourages the contravention of road traffic and parking regulations, together with other unacceptable or anti-social behaviours.

In line with our present enforcement policy, we take enforcement action in the event an individual does not respond to requests to conform to legislation.

Work to educate drivers about the dangers posed by engine idling already takes place, particularly in our guidance and work around workplace and school travel planning. The Council has developed an excellent [Switch Off School Streets toolkit](#), used by schools to run anti-idling campaigns. When using this toolkit, we encourage schools to contact their local PCSO for support, particularly if they are in an area with a Junior PCSO programme. An early success of the toolkit was the competition to design a Switch Off poster, won by West Hill Primary School.

We also offer wider resources around air pollution, including regular training sessions for school staff to use our Clean Air Cops teaching materials.

In addition to interventions in schools, our workplace travel planning support includes information about reducing emissions and the dangers of air pollution, and we take every opportunity to remind people about the difference they can make.

There is more to be done around educating drivers about both engine idling and reducing car use overall, and we will continue to take opportunities to do this, and to work collaboratively with organisations and citizens across Birmingham.

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

H1 Staff absences due to COVID

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide details of the number of Waste Management staff who have been absent since the start of the new year because of COVID, indicating how many have been off through sickness and how many through self-isolation?

Answer:

The number of staff off due to COVID changes day by day. Numbers were close to 100 at the start of the year but there are currently 27 off due to COVID. The number relates to sickness only, we have no staff in self-insolation.

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

H2 Waste Collections

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide details of how he expects to maintain a full waste management service to City residents and businesses should Covid cause further instances of staff absence?

Answer:

Since the start of the pandemic the service has been operating to a number of Covid measures, both statutory and advisory, to try and protect the staff and residents we provide services for. Birmingham was one of the only authorities to maintain all three collection streams all the way through the pandemic.

That's not to say that there have not been challenges that by and large we have overcome. Our collection crews have been affected by Covid and it's through the collaborative work with the Trade Unions and the flexibility and hard work of the staff that services have been maintained.

Since the end of December to date there has been a sharp increase in Covid amongst the workforce, a typical reflection of the high transmission of the Omicron variant. There were just over 100 cases of Covid in collection crews alone in the first week of January. That resulted in an increase in dropped work but the crews worked hard to clear all the outstanding work by the end of each week. I am pleased to report that our crews are recovering and returning to work and therefore the amount of dropped work is reducing, however any rise in Covid cases amongst our workforce is likely to negatively affect collection rates again.

I have to pay tribute to the flexibility of the workforce over the last 2 years to maintain the service during this unprecedented pandemic and recognise that at times services were only maintained by using street cleansing staff. This has adversely affected street cleansing in some areas, but the decision was taken at the start of the pandemic to prioritise maintaining waste collections. We will continue to respond to the challenging and changing situation by following our business continuity plan.

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

H3 CCTV Cameras

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member comment on the number of CCTV cameras that have been deployed at fly tipping hotspots, by ward, and how successful they have been during the last three years?

Answer:

Over the last three years the Council has used CCTV camera surveillance, authorised by Birmingham magistrates court, at 30 fly-tipping hotspots, across the wards shown in the table below. Information from camera observation can be critical to the success of fly-tipping investigations, particularly in situations where there are likely to be no eyewitnesses to fly-tippers criminal behaviour. As cameras often only form part of investigation enquiries and other forms of, and sources of evidence are gathered it is often not possible to directly link 'camera usage' to 'successful outcomes'. However, for typical investigations involving the use of cameras and camera evidence the success rate, for example the percentage of offences detected that lead to an enforcement sanction, such as prosecution or issue of a fixed penalty fine, ranges from 25% to 33%.

- Alum Rock
- Balsall Heath West
- Birchfield
- Bournbrook & Selly Park
- Brandwood & Kings Heath
- Bromford & Hodge Hill
- Druids Heath & Monyhull
- Edgbaston
- Erdington
- Hall Green North
- Hall Green South
- Harborne
- Ladywood
- Longbridge & West Heath
- Nechells
- North Edgbaston
- Small Heath

- Soho & Jewellery Quarter
- Stinchley
- Tyseley & Hay Mills
- Ward End

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

H4 Waste Management Staff

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member report on the number of additional waste and fly tipping enforcement staff, wardens and officers have been recruited since July?

Answer:

The Waste Enforcement Unit has recruited 12 additional staff to support enforcement activities, comprising 6 full-time establishment and 4 agency officers (2 recent vacancies to be recruited to). In addition, there are 3 new 'back office' staff who support the team which enables Enforcement Officers to spend their time in the wards. there are 3 new 'back office' staff who support the team which enables Enforcement Officers to spend their time in the wards.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ

H5 Enforcements

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member give details of actions that have been taken against fly tippers in the City during over the last year confirming how many these have been successfully enforced?

Answer:

The Council's enforcement officers undertake action directed against fly-tipping offenders and against non-compliant waste disposal practices which contribute to fly-tipping defacement. The successful waste enforcement outcomes for the last year are shown in the following table:

	January - December 2021
Fixed penalty notice fines issued to offenders who committed fly-tipping, legally defined as small-scale	73
Fixed Penalty Notice fines issued to businesses with inadequate or absent waste management arrangements	21
Business waste disposal compliance inspections conducted (and statutory production of records notices issued)	809 (595)
Waste crime investigation files submitted to the council's Legal Services for vetting, with a recommendation of commencing prosecution proceedings	46
Prosecution trials concluded by the Courts with convictions [This includes trials for cases prior to 2021, but heard in 2021]	48
Fly-tipping vehicles seized as part of investigation	8

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

H6 Rental Cost – Mobile HRC

Question:

What is the rental cost of the Mobile HRCs each week?

Answer:

The vehicle hire is £10,000 per week - £1,250 per vehicle, for 8 vehicles.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

H7 Mobile HRC 1

Question:

Does the Council pay for the Mobile HRC's whether they are working or not?

Answer:

No, the Council does not pay for hire when vehicles are due for maintenance by the hire company, or if unavailable due to a fault.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

H8 Mobile HRC 2

Question:

How many weeks have any of the Mobile HRCs not been working since the contract was signed?

Answer:

Vehicles are hired on a weekly basis. There were two weeks over the Christmas period where the vehicles were not used (W/c 27th December and W/c 3rd January), otherwise they have been used each week of hire.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

H9 Mobile HRC Contract

Question:

What date was the contract for the Mobile HRCs signed?

Answer:

The current use of mobile HRCs is a pilot initiative that is being trialled and therefore there is no current requirement for a formal contract for mobile HRCs. Vehicles are hired through existing spot-hire arrangements.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY

H10 HRCs Waste Collected

Question:

Please provide a breakdown of the final destination of all waste collected by the mobile HWRCs since their introduction, including total tonnage and percentage sent for incineration, landfill, recycling, or reuse.

Answer:

	July 21 Total	Aug 21 Total	Sep 21 Total	Oct 21 Total	Nov 21 Total	Dec 21 Total
MHRC (Recycling)	4.17	5.32	7.39	6.44	11.78	5.18
MHRC (Residual)	46.19	62.77	100.60	134.17	143.09	89.6

Materials collected by the Mobile Recycling Centre are taken to BCC Waste Transfer Stations (WTS) and BCC Household Recycling Centres (HRC). The residual materials are combined with all residual materials at BCC WTS and the recycling is combined with materials at BCC HRC sites. This is to ensure that we maximise the vehicle movements of all BCC waste and materials. It is not possible to identify individual input streams, but we do collate information on the end destinations for all municipal waste streams

Paper, Cardboard & Paper	Paper, cardboard and paper is recycled at Smurfit Kappa paper Mill in the centre of Birmingham
Co-mingled Materials - Plastics, Glass & Tins	Co-mingled materials are delivered to a Materials Recycling Facility at Four Ashes, Wolverhampton where they are sorted and bailed into separate material streams for processing into new products.
Textiles	This material is sorted and cleaned and then sold on to relevant international markets
Reuse	Any item that is able to be reused is taken to the Reuse shop at Tyseley where it is sorted and where necessary refurbished and is then offered for sale in the reuse shop
Batteries	The batteries are recycled through GP Batteries in Walsall West Midlands
Tetra Pak	Tetra Pac containers are collected by Sonic Cores and Paper Ltd Based in Yorkshire, who work closely with the Tetra Pac manufacturers and these items are recycled

City Council – 1 February 2022

Residual Waste	Residual waste is processed through the Council's Energy from Waste Facility. A small percentage (8.30% in 2020/21 and 2021/22 YTD 6.49%) of overall municipal waste goes to to landfill
----------------	--

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

H11 Waste Collected – Kerbside

Question:

Please provide a breakdown of the final destination of all waste collected at kerbside in each of the last 5 years, including total tonnage and percentage sent for incineration, landfill, recycling, or reuse.

Answer:

For clarity, this answer includes all the waste collected directly from households irrespective of the collection receptacle/method used: wheelie bins, sacks, boxes, or large containers.

Most collected kerbside waste materials are firstly taken to waste transfer stations where they are combined with materials of a similar type, be it residual waste or separated recycling materials, which have arisen from different waste streams: street cleansing activities, household recycling centres, and trade waste collections. These materials from the combined waste streams are bulked-up for transfer to various sorting, processing, and disposal facilities. Thus, it is not possible to give exact tonnages or percentages for the final destinations of individual waste streams collected at the kerbside. Estimations have been made which are based on the actual amounts of residual and recycling materials collected at the kerbside and the percentages of the total waste material that was sent to the various processing and disposal methods.

To give as clear and full as possible answer to this question, the kerbside collections have been broken down to their individual material types: co-mingled Dry Mixed Recycling (DMR) (which are bottles, cans, and plastics), paper and card, green garden, and non-segregated residual materials.

Processing and Disposal Routes

Green Garden

The kerbside collected green garden material is firstly taken to waste transfer stations where it is bulked-up for final transfer to various composting facilities where it is composted.

Paper and Card

The kerbside collected paper and card is firstly taken to waste transfer stations where it is bulked-up for final transfer to a paper mill within Birmingham.

Co-mingled Dry Mixed Recycling (DMR)

The kerbside collected DMR is firstly taken to waste transfer stations where it is bulked-up for transfer to a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) in Wolverhampton. At the MRF the DMR is sorted into separate material streams: glass, metals, recyclable plastics, and rejected/unsuitable materials. The recyclable materials are transferred to various recycling facilities within the UK, except for a proportion of the aluminium that is sometimes sent to a recycling facility in Germany. The rejected/unsuitable materials are sent to either Energy Recovery Facilities (ERF) or to facilities that convert this rejected material into Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF). No material is sent directly to landfill from the MRF.

The ERFs, as well as recovering energy, reduce the material processed to around 25 percent of its original mass. This residual output from the ERFs is in two forms: fly-ash which is sent to specialist landfill, and Incinerator Bottom Ash containing some metals (IBA) which are sent for sorting and recycling. This post incineration recycling and landfill has been considered when estimating the final destination figures, and these amounts were calculated for each individual year separately.

Residual

The kerbside collected residual material is either sent directly to the Tyseley ERF for energy recovery or to waste transfer stations where it is bulked-up for transfer to Tyseley ERF, alternate ERFs, or landfill. The landfill option is only used when there is insufficient ERF capacity available. This is mainly during the scheduled maintenance shutdown of the Tyseley ERF. The proportion of kerbside residual material that goes directly to the Tyseley ERF has been considered in the estimation of the final destination figures, as has the proportion of residual material transferred from waste transfer stations to either ERFs or landfill. These proportions were calculated for each individual year separately.

The ERFs, as well as recovering energy, reduce the material processed to around 25 percent of its original mass. This residual output from the ERFs is in two forms: fly-ash which is sent to specialist landfill, and Incinerator Bottom Ash containing some metals (IBA) which is sent for sorting and recycling. This post incineration recycling and landfill has been considered when estimating the final destination figures, and these amounts were calculated for each individual year separately.

Table 1: Kerbside collected materials by type (as collected)

Kerbside Collected (tonnes)	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22 (April to September)
Residual	240756	243853	241434	244642	271178	135852
Dry Mixed Recycling	28135	21466	24343	28190	34789	17291
Paper & Card	23612	16995	17997	17837	17178	8482
Green Garden	17435	16156	17681	17968	19454	14292
TOTAL KERBSIDE	309938	298470	301455	308637	342599	175917

Table 2: Final Destinations of Kerbside Collected Waste

Materials (Estimated)

Final Destinations	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22 (April to September)
Total Kerbside Collected (tonnes)	309938	298470	301455	308637	342599	175917
Recycling - Including Post Incineration IBA & IBA Metals (tonnes) #1	116041	100337	108262	112377	126087	66896
Recycling - Including Post Incineration IBA & IBA Metals (% of Kerbside Total) #1	37.44%	33.62%	35.91%	36.41%	36.80%	38.03%
Incineration with Energy Recovery - Excluding Recycled IBA and Landfilled Fly-Ash (tonnes) #2	160218	155307	160736	167346	193725	98948
Incineration with Energy Recovery - Excluding Recycled IBA and Landfilled Fly-Ash (% of Kerbside Total) #2	51.69%	52.03%	53.32%	54.22%	56.55%	56.25%
Landfill - Including Post Incineration Fly-Ash (tonnes) #3	33679	42827	32457	28913	22787	10073
Landfill - Including Post Incineration Fly-Ash (%) #3	10.87%	14.35%	10.77%	9.37%	6.65%	5.73%

#1 Recycling - Including Post Incineration IBA & IBA Metals, includes:

- The kerbside collected paper and card.
- The kerbside collected co-mingled DMR that is segregated at the MRF and forwarded for recycling.
- The post incineration recycling of bottom ash of the rejected materials from the MRF.
- The kerbside collected green garden waste material that is composted.

- The post incineration recycling of bottom ash and metals from both the residual waste that was processed at Tyseley ERF and the alternate ERFs.

#2 Incineration with Energy Recovery - excluding Recycled IBA and Landfilled Fly-Ash, is not the total amount of kerbside collected waste sent to ERFs for incineration with energy recovery. It is the amount of material that is consumed during the process (called process loss). This process loss figure excludes the residue from the incineration process: fly-ash, IBA, and IBA metals.

#3 Landfill - including Post Incineration Fly-Ash, is all the kerbside collected waste material with a final destination of landfill. This includes the post incineration residue (fly-ash) that is sent to landfill as well as the residual waste material that is sent directly from a waste transfer station to landfill.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

H12 Flytipping

Question:

Per month, for the last 5 years, please provide the total number of flytipping reports received.

Answer:

Please find the table below which shows the number of fly tipping reports per month. Note that this may include duplicate reports where separate reports have been received about the same incident.

<i>Year / Month</i>	<i>Total number of reports received</i>				
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
<i>Jan</i>	1798	2477	2310	2277	2640
<i>Feb</i>	1711	2047	1792	2091	2764
<i>Mar</i>	2333	1802	2114	1606	3984
<i>Apr</i>	1994	2447	2579	2173	3823
<i>May</i>	1948	2769	2200	2380	3092
<i>Jun</i>	2118	2825	2006	3369	3923
<i>Jul</i>	2425	2754	2947	3799	3842
<i>Aug</i>	2365	2480	2209	3574	3562
<i>Sep</i>	1686	2119	2273	3906	3466
<i>Oct</i>	1993	2203	2223	3189	2974
<i>Nov</i>	2170	2027	1962	2941	2648
<i>Dec</i>	1602	1748	1925	2548	2790

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

H13 Complaints

Question:

How many complaints has the council received in each year for the last 5 years, including year to date, of waste collection crews mixing recycling and general waste?

Answer:

It is not possible to provide this information as the system does not log complaints by this type.

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

H14 Mobile Household Recycling Unit

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide a breakdown of:

- (a) The roads that have been visited by the Mobile Household Recycling Units
between 23 December 2021 and 25 January 2022**
- (b) The total tonnage of waste collected during this period on each of these days?**

Answer:

Date	Location
Thu 23/12/2021	Tindal Street (B12 9RE)
Thu 23/12/2021	Finnemore Road B9 5XP (junction with Daniels Road)
Thu 23/12/2021	Wills Street B19 1PT
Thu 23/12/2021	Rutley Grove (back of Blandford Shops) B32 2LT
Mon 10/01/2022	Goosemore Lane B23 5PN
Mon 10/01/2022	Old Bridge Street B19 3UB
Mon 10/01/2022	Booths Farm Road, B42 2NX
Mon 10/01/2022	Stonehouse Road, B73 6LJ
Tue 11/01/2022	Leigham Drive B17 8AT
Tue 11/01/2022	Brunswick Road B12 8PJ
Tue 11/01/2022	Bilton Grange Road , opp 123 (B26 2JY)
Tue 11/01/2022	Beech Hill Road, B72 1BY
Wed 12/01/2022	Banners Walk B44 0TD
Wed 12/01/2022	Ventnor Avenue, near 11 (B36 8ED)
Wed 12/01/2022	Brockwell Road B44 9PF
Wed 12/01/2022	Highfield Hall Community Centre (B28 0HS)
Thu 13/01/2022	Hawkesley Square (Shopping Car Park) B38 9TU
Thu 13/01/2022	Horrell Road, 72 (B26 2PA)
Thu 13/01/2022	Castle Road (B29 5HQ)
Thu 13/01/2022	Heath Road South B31 2BE
Fri 14/01/2022	Coopers Road B20 2JU
Fri 14/01/2022	Anderton Park Road, B13 9DT
Fri 14/01/2022	Ley Hill Farm Road B31 1UA
Fri 14/01/2022	Manor Park Grove (opp Hollymoor Centre) B31 5ER
Mon 17/01/2022	Rowlands Road B26 1AS (near 32)
Mon 17/01/2022	BP Garage, Pershore Road B29 7NY
Mon 17/01/2022	Honeycomb Way (next to Walmesley Way Park) B31 1RA
Mon 17/01/2022	Metchley Park Road B15 2PG

City Council – 1 February 2022

Tue 18/01/2022	Turves Green Road (Car Bay opposite Co-Op) B31 3TG
Tue 18/01/2022	Highfield Road, B14 4DU
Tue 18/01/2022	Oddingley Road (next to Car Park West Heath Park) B31 3BS
Tue 18/01/2022	Carhampton Road / Woodington Road, B75 7PQ
Wed 19/01/2022	Rodney Close B16 8DP off Ledsam St
Wed 19/01/2022	St Johns Road (B11 3SQ)
Wed 19/01/2022	Hall Road B20 2BB
Wed 19/01/2022	Manningford Road B14 5NA
Thu 20/01/2022	Cherrywood Road B9 4UR
Thu 20/01/2022	Blake Place B9 5QX (near junction with Blake Lane)
Thu 20/01/2022	Eatesbrook Road B33 9TA
Thu 20/01/2022	Bodington Road, B75 5ET
Fri 21/01/2022	Rupert Street B7 4PR
Fri 21/01/2022	Dawberry Fields Road (Next to Playing Fields) B14 6NZ
Fri 21/01/2022	Spring Road, B11 3DT
Fri 21/01/2022	Blackberry Lane, B74 4JQ
Mon 24/01/2022	Foxton Road, o/s 99 (B8 3HN)
Mon 24/01/2022	Dolphin Lane B27 7DE
Mon 24/01/2022	Carlyle Road B19 1RR
Mon 24/01/2022	Springthorpe Road / Spirral Green, B24 0SP
Tue 25/01/2022	Tudor Hill B73 6BH
Tue 25/01/2022	Eastfield Road (B9 5XA)
Tue 25/01/2022	Holder Road, opposite 135, Oaklands Car Park (B25 8AR)
Tue 25/01/2022	Kestrel Avenue, near 60 (B25 8QU)

Data is only available for January up to the 21st and may be incomplete while records are collated. Total tonnage 84.52 consisting of 2.78 recycling and 81.74 residual for December 23rd to January 21st, noting this includes the Christmas service break.

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

I1 Changes

Question:

What changes to street lighting levels and time in operation are set to be reduced to save a projected £150,000 in the coming year?

Answer:

The proposed changes to the lighting levels on the City's appropriate street lighting assets would be:

- Extending the current dimming (where lighting intensity is adjusted to suit the use of the area) levels between 33% and 40% of existing lighting levels between 00:00hrs and 05:00hrs.
- Application of revised trimming (the lighting activation level of the street light at dusk and the deactivation level at dawn to suit local lighting levels) to revised levels appropriate to current good practice and established industry guidance.

All areas that may be subject to changes will be assessed and reviewed in accordance with current good practice guidance and established industry guidance prior to any changes being implemented.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER

I2 Electric vehicles

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member report on the programme for installing public electric vehicle charging points outside the city centre, setting out how many have been installed and how many are planned in the next four years?

Answer:

The EV Charge Point Strategy (2021-2032) sets out the plan for the roll out of charge points across the City via the Council's procured EV Charge Point Network Delivery Partner, ESB Ltd, for public sites (Highways, public car parks and public land) alongside Private Sector development of privately owned sites to meet market growth of EV vehicle take up.

To date 301 public charging points are installed to date in Birmingham, of which 97 are within the City Centre, and 204 are outside of the city centre.

Jan 2022 – Current number of charging points installed per power and operator

Power (kW)	Birmingham (total)			Within City Centre		
	BCC/ESB	Private Operators	TOTAL	BCC/ESB	Private Operators	TOTAL
< 22 kW	6	129	135	2	33	35
22 kW	46	54	100	26	28	54
50 kW	18	22	40	6	2	8
150 kW	0	10	10	0	0	0
250 kW	0	16	16	0	0	0
TOTAL	70	231	301	34	63	97

Estimated total number of public charging points per year (source: Birmingham EVCP Strategy)

Year	Birmingham (total)	City Centre
2022	625	183
2023	787	28
2024	1,088	38
2025	1,359	48

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND
THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

I3 Budget Pressure

Question:

Of the £400k 'pressure' on this years budget as a result of the waste service's non-compliance with the Council's own charging clean air zone, how much relates to standard daily £8 charges and how much relates to fixed penalty notices for non payment of the charge?

Answer:

Based upon transactions in the ledger to date, roughly 32% relates to fixed penalty notices

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

I4 Fixed Penalty Notices

Question:

How many fixed penalty notices have been issued to council owned fleet for non-payment of CAZ charges since the introduction of the charge, broken down by month?

Answer:

We do not hold this information and would need to conduct a search based on the individual addresses of the Departments in the format that has been registered with the DVLA.

In order to do this, we would need to obtain the permission from the DVLA to conduct any search of the data they provide us with regarding the registered keeper details. This is because we are only authorised to use this data for the specific sole purpose of recovery of Penalty Charge Notices in accordance with the statutory process.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR VULNERABLE
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

J Referral to Exempt Accommodation

Question:

How many people have been referred to exempt housing providers by the Council since 2012, broken down by year?

Answer:

Unfortunately, we do not have easily accessible records going back to 2012 on placements into non-commissioned exempt as systems for recording this level of detail was not in place however we started using a new recording method, as the Homeless Reduction Act 2017 came into place and BCC implemented it in 2018.

We have had 24,200 households approach the homeless service in a 3 year period. Exempt accommodation is not a specific category so to extract that information would require checking each individual case.

For specific figures from 2020 and during the Covid Pandemic we had a walk in service that was run as an emergency service for Rough Sleepers and single homeless only. From 31st March 2020 through to 31st March 2021 just for the single homeless walk in's we saw 1983 people. Of those we placed 514 people into exempt supported accommodation. It roughly equates to 26% of the people that have presented.

Those exempt providers referred to have been arrived at through extensive operational experience in working with them and many of them are applicants to the Charter of Rights, and/or Standards.

To further provide assurance, we have the Transitions Workers that sit with SIFA and St Basils. They support individuals within 24 hours with immediate needs who has been referred into non-commissioned services. In the event of these visits should they find that the non-commissioned service is not up to standard, they will report it as part of the Supported Housing pilot work and this will be addressed by the service area who will try and support individuals.

Work is now progressing with those providers who have applied to the Charter of Rights, and/or Standards, to understand their referral processes, lettings requirements and capacity so that referrals are aligned to their provision and prioritised.