



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD  
ON TUESDAY, 13 JULY 2021 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE REP STUDIO  
THEATRE, CENTENARY SQUARE, BROAD STREET, BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:-** Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Mohammed Azim) in the Chair .

**Councillors**

Mohammed Aikhlaq	Penny Holbrook	Saddak Miah
Deirdre Alden	Jon Hunt	Gareth Moore
Robert Alden	Mahmood Hussain	Simon Morrall
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Shabrana Hussain	Yvonne Mosquito
Baber Baz	Timothy Huxtable	Brett O'Reilly
Matt Bennett	Mohammed Idrees	John O'Shea
Sir Albert Bore	Zafar Iqbal	Robert Pocock
Marje Bridle	Katherine Iroh	Hendrina Quinnen
Mick Brown	Ziaul Islam	Gary Sambrook
Tristan Chatfield	Morriam Jan	Darius Sandhu
Zaker Choudhry	Kerry Jenkins	Kath Scott
Debbie Clancy	Meirion Jenkins	Shafique Shah
Liz Clements	Julie Johnson	Ron Storer
Maureen Cornish	Brigid Jones	Martin Straker Welds
John Cotton	Nagina Kauser	Saima Suleman
Adrian Delaney	Chaman Lal	Sharon Thompson
Diane Donaldson	Mike Leddy	Paul Tilsley
Peter Fowler	Bruce Lines	Lisa Trickett
Jayne Francis	John Lines	Ian Ward
Eddie Freeman	Mary Locke	Mike Ward
Paulette Hamilton	Ewan Mackey	Ken Wood
Roger Harmer	Zhor Malik	Alex Yip
Adam Higgs	Karen McCarthy	

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RECORDING**

- 19508      The Deputy Lord Mayor advised that the meeting would be webcast for live and subsequent broadcasting via the Council's internet site and that members of the Press/Public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

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

---

**DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

19509 The Deputy 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.

No Interests were declared.

---

**MINUTES**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

19510 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

---

**LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Queen's Birthday Honours**

19511 The Deputy Lord Mayor indicated that he was delighted to congratulate those mentioned in the Queen's Birthday Honours list for services to Birmingham or who live in Birmingham as follows:-

**MBE:**

Sally Alexander  
Professor Thomas Clutton-Brock  
Dr Maurice Conlon  
Linda McGrath

**BEM**

Atif Ali  
Robert Capella  
Yousif Mohammed Eltom  
Orighoye Onuwaje

The Deputy Lord Mayor asked those in the meeting to join him in congratulating them all on those marvelous achievements.

---

**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 Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19512 **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 Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19513 **RESOLVED:-**

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

---

**QUESTION TIME**

19514 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**

Councillor Martin Straker Welds proposed nominations and it was-

19515 **RESOLVED:-**

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

**Economy and Skills Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Peter Griffiths (Lab) to replace Councillor Nicky Brennan (Lab) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022.

**Strategic Economic Delivery Board**

Councillor Lisa Trickett (Lab) to replace Councillor Ian Ward (Lab) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022.

**Licensing Sub-Committee A**

Councillor Martin Straker Welds (Lab) to replace Councillor Nagina Kauser (Lab) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022.

**West Midlands Police and Crime Panel**

Councillor Saima Suleman (Lab) to replace Councillor John Lines (Con) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2022 following discussions between the Met Leaders.

---

**UPDATE ON BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL'S CONTINUING RESPONSE TO COVID - 19 AND PROPOSED APPROACH TO RECOVERY**

The following report from the Cabinet was submitted:-

(See document No. 3)

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

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

(See document No. 4)

Councillor Meirion Jenkins moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Debbie Clancy.

A debate ensued.

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward, replied to the debate.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Meirion Jenkins and Debbie Clancy 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 (21)**

Deirdre Alden	Eddie Freeman	Gareth Moore
Robert Alden	Adam Higgs	Simon Morrall
Matt Bennett	Timothy Huxtable	Gary Sambrook
Debbie Clancy	Meirion Jenkins	Darius Sandhu
Maureen Cornish	Bruce Lines	Ron Storer
Adrian Delaney	John Lines	Ken Wood
Peter Fowler	Ewan Mackey	Alex Yip

**Against the amendment (45)**

Mohammed Aikhlq	Mahmood Hussain	Karen McCarthy
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Shabrana Hussain	Saddak Miah
Baber Baz	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Sir Albert Bore	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Marje Bridle	Katherine Iroh	Robert Pocock
Mick Brown	Ziaul Islam	Hendrina Quinnen
Tristan Chatfield	Morriam Jan	Kath Scott
Zaker Choudhry	Kerry Jenkins	Shafique Shah
Liz Clements	Julie Johnson	Martin Straker Welds
John Cotton	Brigid Jones	Saima Suleman
Diane Donaldson	Nagina Kauser	Sharon Thompson
Jayne Francis	Chaman Lal	Paul Tilsley
Paulette Hamilton	Mike Leddy	Lisa Trickett
Roger Harmer	Mary Locke	Ian Ward
Jon Hunt	Zhor Malik	Mike Ward

**Abstentions (0)**

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-

19516 **RESOLVED:-**

That the report be noted.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded and

19517 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council be adjourned until 1650 hours on this day.

The Council then adjourned at 1620 hours.

---

At 1653 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

**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. Councillor Ian Ward and Paulette Hamilton have given notice of the following motion 'Covid-19 public inquiry to begin in 2021'.**

(See document No. 5)

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

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

(See document No. 6)

Councillor Paul Tilsley moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Zaker Choudhry.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Matt Bennett and John Lines gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 7)

Councillor Matt Bennett moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor John Lines.

A debate ensued.

The Leader, Councillor Ian Ward replied to the debate.

The first amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Paul Tilsley and Zaker Choudhry having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The second amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Matt Bennett and John Lines 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 (19)**

Deirdre Alden	Eddie Freeman	Gareth Moore
Robert Alden	Adam Higgs	Simon Morrall
Matt Bennett	Timothy Huxtable	Darius Sandhu
Debbie Clancy	Bruce Lines	Ron Storer
Maureen Cornish	John Lines	Ken Wood
Adrian Delaney	Ewan Mackey	Alex Yip
Peter Fowler		

**Against the amendment (45)**

Mohammed Aikhlaq	Jon Hunt	Karen McCarthy
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Baber Baz	Shabrana Hussain	Yvonne Mosquito
Sir Albert Bore	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Marje Bridle	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Mick Brown	Ziaul Islam	Robert Pocock
Tristan Chatfield	Morriam Jan	Hendrina Quinnen
Zaker Choudhry	Kerry Jenkins	Kath Scott
Liz Clements	Julie Johnson	Martin Straker Welds
John Cotton	Brigid Jones	Saima Suleman
Diane Donaldson	Nagina Kauser	Sharon Thompson
Jayne Francis	Chaman Lal	Paul Tilsley
Paulette Hamilton	Mike Leddy	Lisa Trickett
Roger Harmer	Mary Locke	Ian Ward
Penny Holbrook	Zhor Malik	Mike Ward

**Abstentions (0)**

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.

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

**For the Motion (45)**

Mohammed Aikhlaq	Jon Hunt	Karen McCarthy
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Mahmood Hussain	Saddak Miah
Baber Baz	Shabrana Hussain	Yvonne Mosquito
Sir Albert Bore	Mohammed Idrees	Brett O'Reilly
Marje Bridle	Zafar Iqbal	John O'Shea
Mick Brown	Ziaul Islam	Robert Pocock
Tristan Chatfield	Morriam Jan	Hendrina Quinnen
Zaker Choudhry	Kerry Jenkins	Kath Scott
Liz Clements	Julie Johnson	Martin Straker Welds
John Cotton	Brigid Jones	Saima Suleman
Diane Donaldson	Nagina Kauser	Sharon Thompson
Jayne Francis	Chaman Lal	Paul Tilsley

Paulette Hamilton  
Roger Harmer  
Penny Holbrook

Mike Leddy  
Mary Locke  
Zhor Malik

Lisa Trickett  
Ian Ward  
Mike Ward

**Against the Motion (1)**

John Lines

**Abstentions (18)**

Deirdre Alden  
Robert Alden  
Matt Bennett  
Debbie Clancy  
Maureen Cornish  
Adrian Delaney

Peter Fowler  
Eddie Freeman  
Adam Higgs  
Timothy Huxtable  
Bruce Lines  
Ewan Mackey

Gareth Moore  
Simon Morrall  
Darius Sandhu  
Ron Storer  
Ken Wood  
Alex Yip

It was therefore-

19518

**RESOLVED:-**

This council notes that the United Kingdom has recorded:

- The seventh highest Covid death toll in the world (128,140 as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021), with around 42,000 deaths registered by care homes.
- One of the highest Covid mortality rates per 100,000 population.
- The second highest Covid death toll of the G7 nations
- The second highest Covid mortality rate per 100,000 population of the G7 nations.
- Almost 3,000 deaths have been recorded in Birmingham with COVID-19 on the death certificate.

In light of these sobering statistics, this council believes the Government decision to delay launching a public inquiry until spring 2022 represents a betrayal of the victims and their families – delaying the opportunity to learn vital lessons and prolonging grief and uncertainty.

A spring 2022 start means that calls from bereaved families for a swift inquiry into the handling of the pandemic have been ignored and it is likely that little progress will be made until autumn 2022, with conclusions delayed until 2023 at the earliest.

This delay simply cannot be justified.



Council therefore resolves to:

- Support the call from bereaved families for a fully-independent public inquiry into the Covid-19 pandemic to begin in 2021.
  - Write to the Prime Minister urging him to set out an expedited timetable for a wide-ranging and independent inquiry that will give bereaved families the answers they need.
    - The inquiry must involve bereaved families from the start, they must have a say in the selection of a chair and in determining the terms of reference.
    - And it must ensure that the UK is better prepared for future pandemics.
    - That the enquiry also focuses on the delay until 23rd April in adding India to the travel Red list to the UK and the cancellation of the Prime Minister's visit to India, fully two weeks after Pakistan and Bangladesh were placed on the Red list.
- 

**B. Councillor Robert Alden and Ewan Mackey have given notice of the following motion 'Calling on Birmingham City Council to establish a cross party taskforce to seek ways to protect and grow key industries, including car manufacturing and their supply chains in the wake of the impact of the COVID Pandemic'.**

(See document No. 8)

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

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

(See document No. 9)

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

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors John Cotton and Shabrana Hussain gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 10)

Councillor John Cotton moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Shabrana Hussain.

At the this point in the Meeting the Deputy Lord Mayor advised that the meeting had run out of time and he requested that the Councillors moving and seconding the third amendment do so formally.

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

(See document No. 11)

Councillor Gareth Moore formally moved the amendment which was formally seconded by Councillor Peter Fowler both without comment.

Councillor Robert Alden in summing up made a speech.

The first amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Jon Hunt and Roger Harmer having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be lost.

The second amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors John Cotton and Shabrana Hussain having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The third amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Gareth Moore and Peter Fowler 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 (24)**

Deirdre Alden	Peter Fowler	John Lines
Robert Alden	Eddie Freeman	Ewan Mackey
Baber Baz	Roger Harmer	Gareth Moore
Matt Bennett	Adam Higgs	Simon Morrall
Zaker Choudhry	Jon Hunt	Darius Sandhu
Debbie Clancy	Timothy Huxtable	Ron Storer
Maureen Cornish	Morriam Jan	Ken Wood
Adrian Delaney	Bruce Lines	Alex Yip

**Against the amendment (37)**

Mohammed Aikhlq	Mohammed Idrees	Karen McCarthy
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Zafar Iqbal	Saddak Miah
Sir Albert Bore	Katherine Iroh	Brett O'Reilly
Marje Bridle	Ziaul Islam	John O'Shea
Mick Brown	Kerry Jenkins	Robert Pocock
Tristan Chatfield	Julie Johnson	Hendrina Quinnen
Liz Clements	Brigid Jones	Kath Scott
John Cotton	Nagina Kauser	Shafique Shah
Diane Donaldson	Chaman Lal	Martin Straker Welds

Jayne Francis  
Penny Holbrook  
Mahmood Hussain  
Shabrana Hussain

Mike Leddy  
Mary Locke  
Zhor Malik

Saima Suleman  
Sharon Thompson  
Ian Ward

**Abstentions (1)**

Mike Ward

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-

19519

**RESOLVED:-**

This Council is concerned about the long term impact of both COVID and the Brexit transition on vital local industries such as car manufacturing and the resultant loss of jobs that could result from any collapse in the supply chain, especially given the huge number of people in this city who work in this industry or connected to it.

In response to these significant challenges, a comprehensive Covid-19 Economic Recovery Strategy has been produced in collaboration with businesses and other stakeholders. In addition, the Council's ambitious R20 Action Plan identifies significant opportunities for green growth, particularly in the emerging green automotive sector.

This Council therefore resolves to build on the ongoing work with key external stakeholders to seek ways to protect and grow vital industries such as the car industry and secure a long term future for those industries that includes taking advantage of new opportunities within global Britain and for green growth to open up new markets in order to protect and grow jobs and wages going forward as well as meet challenges around climate change.

---

The meeting ended at 1833 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 ADAM HIGGS**

#### **A1     Bailiff Action**

##### **Question:**

**Please list all bailiff actions against the Council, Council staff, Council owned companies or Councillors including dates and details since May 2018, including whether bailiff action was challenged or settled and the outcome of this.**

##### **Answer:**

Legal team don't often receive instructions on bailiff matters, the bailiffs will show up at the Council House reception, the legal team will receive a call to be notified of this, the lawyer will attend the Council House to establish what the issue is.

It is usual for the matter to be referred to the relevant Directorate service area, to resolve the issue of leak / debt so there isn't any formal audit trail for the team to record against, they are simply trying to help in the moment.

There is not an essential record of bailiffs visits and Legal Services are not aware of every visit. Where a Bailiff visit is more involved and ongoing Legal assistance is required a file is opened within the Legal Team, in the Legal Data base since 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018, we have 344 matters in the time provided we are unable to review each individual matter and please note not all these matters are electronic , some are held in archive in closed buildings.

Legal are happy to meet with Councillor Higgs to answer any specific queries.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**A2     Victoria Square Public Realm – Transforming Cities Fund**

**Question:**

**Please provide a copy of details provided to the West Midlands Combined Authority for funding via the Transforming Cities Fund in order to pay for the Victoria Square public realm improvement works, including any data or information provided to demonstrate how it would meet the objectives of the fund and the assessment framework in order for the bid to be evaluated against other projects.**

**Answer:**

On the 1 June 2018 the Council submitted a Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) bid in accordance with the provided template to allow the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) and the Department for Transport to evaluate the submission. Further to an assessment process, the application for £5 million was approved by the Combined Authority Board on 9 November 2018 for a project called 'Public Realm Works at New Street and Victoria Square'

For reference, the main objectives of the fund in respect of this project and reported on an annual basis by WMCA are to:

- Encourage and support the expansion of a healthy, thriving and competitive retail centre to ensure its future integrity and attractiveness is maintained.
- Transform the city centre environment by creating safe, convenient and attractive spaces for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Support the reduction of traffic congestion in the city centre and to improve air quality by providing smart and connected public spaces that encourage the use of public transport.
- Improve public safety with the introduction of Hostile Permanent Vehicle Mitigation (HVM) barriers for the current obtrusive temporary National Barriers Assets deployed.
- Create a connected and walkable centre which will link Birmingham's sustainable transport network with the retail core.
- Expand and improve Victoria Square for better pedestrian access and usage as an event space.

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

**A3     Traffic Offences**

**Question:**

**Since 2012 how many fines have been issued to council owned, leased or rented vehicles for traffic offences, broken down by type of offence (eg speeding, parking infringement, entering bus lane) and by fleet type (waste collection vehicle, pool car etc)**

**Answer:**

We no longer hold records prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019.

From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 up to 6<sup>th</sup> July 2021, 191 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) have been issued to vehicles registered to Birmingham City Council:-

Environmental Services (Fleet & Waste/Transport Management) – Total 176 PCNs

- 93 PCNs for travelling through a bus lane
- 82 PCNs for entering the Clean Air Zone without paying the charge and
- 1 PCN for a parking contravention.

Place Directorate – Total 12 PCNs

- 4 PCNs for travelling through a bus lane
- 8 PCNs for entering the Clean Air Zone without paying the charge

Parks & Nurseries – 1 PCN for travelling through a bus lane

Transport Operations – 1 PCN for travelling through a bus lane

Thimble Mill Lane Depot – 1 PCN for travelling through a bus lane

The process is automated and PCNs are issued for any non-compliance. This includes operational and emergency vehicles.

For each PCN received within Street Scene a review is undertaken. There are a number of activities we need to undertake in bus lanes, collect refuse sacks, empty litter bins, sweep the bus lane. All of these operations could incur a PCN. If PCNs are received carrying out those operations we do contest the notice. So whilst these automated notices may have been issued since 2019, not all will need to have been paid. However, if we find the driver has been at fault, for example continuing to drive along the bus lane between bins, the fine is passed to the individual driver to pay.

For the clean air zone charges, there has been some start up issues for the Service. The system can only take payment from a PCard. There was an initial delay in organising additional PCards and them being issued to local managers. These PCNs will reduce now our internal system is up and running.

The Director of City Operations is now taking up this matter with the Assistant Director for Highways and Infrastructure.

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

**A4     International Triathlon Centre**

**Question:**

**It is good news the city is becoming an International Triathlon Centre. The Leader will be aware that triathlon is increasingly mass participation as people take forward their interest in running, cycling and swimming. Could the Leader set out what is being done in the city to encourage mass participation, in particular the open water swimming part of Triathlon?**

**Answer:**

The City Council's Sports and Events Teams are actively engaging with National Governing Bodies of Sport to work with them at grassroots level and indeed all levels of the sporting pathway to encourage an increase in participation in sport and physical activity. This work includes ongoing discussions with British Triathlon, British Cycling and Swim England to work on sporting programmes that include regular mass participation events. Hosting the CWG, and in particular the triathlon event within Sutton Park gives an opportunity to further develop the relationship with British Triathlon and as part of the games legacy we remain actively engaged with them around bringing future major events to the city. If successful, our proposal to host the World Triathlon series in 2024/25/26 includes supporting mass participation events.

Open water swimming is one of the fastest growing water sports in the country. Birmingham City Council, whilst understanding the growing interest in open water swimming, understands that around 85% of accidental drownings occur at open water sites. Many of these drownings occur due to a lack of knowledge and understanding of open water safety. That is why the Council published its Open Water Safety policy in 2018, whereby open water swimming in parks pools is only permitted as part of a booked group with adequate lifeguard provision. In this way, we can support the increase in interest in the sport whilst maintaining public safety at all times.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
PAUL TILSLEY**

**A5     Phone Masts**

**Question:**

**The Council previously had a policy of allowing two wards the proceeds of rental from phone masts on public highways. Could the Leader state whether that policy remains in place?**

**Answer:**

We are currently unable to identify such a policy. If Cllr Tilsley could provide more details, I will ask officers to investigate.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR  
ROGER HARMER**

**A6      Notice of Sale**

**Question:**

**Will the Leader be supporting the Co Operative who want to take over Montgomery Street Business Centre?**

**Answer:**

The Montgomery Street Co-Operative were given an opportunity in February 2020 to make a market value bid to purchase the Business Centre where many of them are currently tenants. This was an opportunity afforded to them in support of their aspirations, and on the basis the Council would not seek to externally market the property for sale at that time. As a result of the pandemic, they were given an extended period within which to appoint an agent and to formalise their bid, and this was received in March 2021. Having considered the offer on its merits, the Property Services team responded to the Co-Operative's agent several weeks ago to confirm the bid falls some way below the Council's expectations of market value.

The asset was listed as an Asset of Community Value at the start of the year. In line with this process Council officers have now formally notified the Co – Operative of the formal intention to sell under this process. If the Co – Operative confirm they wish to bid under the ACV process there is a 6 month moratorium under which the Council cannot take any action to sell. This will allow the Co – operative further time to develop their offer for the estate.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**B1     CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

**B2      Redirection of Resources**

**Question:**

**In the Delivery Plan, the Deputy Leader ruled some resources had been diverted for Pandemic activity. Could the Deputy Leader set out the impact of this on the Councils existing priorities?**

**Answer:**

The impact of Covid-19 on Birmingham's communities and the Council's response to the pandemic has been documented through a number of papers and verbal updates to Cabinet and City Council since March 2020.

Executive Business Reports (EBRs) setting out the details of the Council's response to Covid-19, alongside the impact on services and business planning, have been brought to City Council on a quarterly basis since June 2020. The most recent of these is coming to the July 2021 City Council and can be accessed online [here](#) (CMIS link).

**Financial impact of Covid-19**

The Financial Outturn 2020/21 report to June 2021 Cabinet set out that Covid had cost the Council £131.8m which included a £48.9m cost of staff redeployed onto Covid related activity. Government support through un-ringfenced grant and the income loss scheme met those costs and allowed us to carry forward into this year £17.4m of Covid funding.

**Performance monitoring**

In June 2021 Cabinet, we set out in detail our performance and progress against the outcomes and objectives in our Delivery Plan during Q4 2020-21 and the continuing impact of Covid-19.

The 2021/21 Q4 Performance Report can be accessed online [here](#) (CMIS link).

Headline examples of impact include:

- We refocused our business rates service so that in the last two quarters the Council paid out 44,391 Local Restrictions grants to businesses across Birmingham totalling just over £99.6m. This is in addition to the £217 million paid to businesses in the first period of lockdown grants.
- Our customer contact centre set up the Covid-19 response line in April 2020 and we have taken over 50,000 calls assisting citizens with urgent support needs, self isolation payments, grants and various other Covid-19 related enquiries. 94% of calls were answered compared to 88% last year.

- The pandemic has led to an increase in the numbers of enquiries and referrals received from Birmingham schools and other local authorities regarding children missing education (CME). To address this our Education and Skills Directorate have been working closely with colleagues in school attendance as well as Birmingham Children's Trust and partner agencies. Staff were repurposed from other teams to support the CME work and this focus will continue.
- We have redirected our adult social worker capacity to support our response to the Covid-19 outbreak, which reduced the number of staff available to complete reviews. Our performance on proportion of clients reviewed, assessed or reassessed within 12 months has not met the end of year target, however, we improved upon last year's end-of-year result of 72.3% by achieving 74.8%.
- Alternative delivery models, compliant with Covid-19 requirements, have been strong across all front-line services during the year. However, whilst services have in the main continued, the pandemic did stop all non-essential works, and this impacted on our Grounds Maintenance. Work between end of March and May 2021 was restricted to safety works and checks. The use of parks for people's daily exercise changed the maintenance work to essential and Birmingham was the first authority to use grass cutting to promote the 2m distance rule.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDRENS  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**C1      CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

**It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDRENS  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

**C2     EHCP Outstanding question**

**Question:**

In your answer to Question C5 from June Council, some of the information was apparently still being collated and you promised members a full response by 25 June, which does not appear to have been provided. In any case written questions need a public response so please provide the answer here. For clarity, the outstanding information was

**Please provide, broken down by area of need, year group, number of children & young people with EHCPs who currently have annual reviews recommending change of placement that have not yet been actioned**

**Answer:**

- There are currently 10,698 EHCPs maintained by Birmingham
- The data breakdown for those EHCPs where annual reviews have recommended a change of placement is contained in the table below:

<b>Yr Grp</b>	<b>ASD</b>	<b>HI</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SEMH</b>	<b>C &amp; L</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>-1</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>0</b>	6	0	1	0	5	<b>12</b>
<b>1</b>	15	0	0	0	1	<b>16</b>
<b>2</b>	15	0	0	3	4	<b>22</b>
<b>3</b>	20	0	1	1	8	<b>30</b>
<b>4</b>	3	0	0	0	4	<b>7</b>
<b>5</b>	4	0	0	0	7	<b>11</b>
<b>6</b>	1	0	0	0	2	<b>3</b>
<b>7</b>	0	1	0	2	3	<b>6</b>
<b>8</b>	2	0	0	0	6	<b>8</b>
<b>9</b>	2	0	0	0	2	<b>4</b>
<b>10</b>	3	0	0	2	6	<b>11</b>
<b>11</b>	0	0	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
<b>12</b>	1	0	0	0	2	<b>3</b>
<b>13</b>	0	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>137</b>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDRENS  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

**C3     Send Interims and Consultants**

**Question:**

**Provide a detailed breakdown of the current interim and consultants covering the Inclusion & SEND Dept, detailing their specific roles and responsibilities, the vacancies they are covering and the cost incurred in each case.**

**Answer:**

The information requested is included in the table provided below with this response.



Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	03/03/2020	27/08/2021	£62,675	BAU - SENAR
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	SENAR Recovery - Annual Review	03/03/2020	27/08/2021	£66,520	BAU - SENAR
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	04/10/2020	27/08/2021	£92,670	BAU - SENAR
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	03/03/2020	27/08/2021	£49,685	BAU - SENAR
Interim Annual Review Officer / Plan Writers	Senar Recovery - Annual Review	12/03/2020	27/08/2021	£49,505	BAU - SENAR
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	28/02/2021	27/08/2021	£4,370	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	07/09/2020	27/08/2021	£19,255	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	24/07/2020	27/08/2021	£20,240	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	28/02/2021	27/08/2021	£7,360	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	02/12/2020	27/08/2021	£7,988	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	05/03/2021	27/08/2021	£6,498	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim Link Officers	Link Service	09/03/2020	27/08/2021	£29,495	Transformation - Parent Link & School Link service Developed as a early help model to support the linked professionals way of working
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	25/01/2021	27/08/2021	£17,690	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	28/02/2021	27/08/2021	£25,200	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£21,300	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	01/03/2021	27/08/2021	£48,800	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£31,400	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£24,900	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£24,900	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	25/01/2021	27/08/2021	£12,690	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£31,500	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	02/01/2021	27/08/2021	£48,300	BAU - SENAR

### City Council – 13 July 2021

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/02/2021	27/08/2021	£28,500	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£29,250	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	01/03/2021	27/08/2021	£22,650	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£30,150	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case worker	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£37,800	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	30/09/2020	27/08/2021	£50,480	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	04/10/2020	27/08/2021	£65,850	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	02/10/2020	27/08/2021	£63,970	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	04/10/2020	27/08/2021	£62,200	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	17/08/2020	27/08/2021	£26,025	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	30/10/2020	27/08/2021	£58,920	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	01/04/2020	27/08/2021	£79,825	BAU - SENAR

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	20/04/2021	27/08/2021	£15,600	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	02/10/2020	27/08/2021	£59,325	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	29/04/2020	27/08/2021	£13,873	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	02/01/2021	27/08/2021	£34,200	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	01/03/2021	27/08/2021	£86,148	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	04/10/2020	27/08/2021	£65,850	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	06/04/2021	27/08/2021	£12,000	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	06/04/2021	27/08/2021	£14,400	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	06/04/2021	27/08/2021	£12,000	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	19/04/2021	27/08/2021	£7,050	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	19/04/2021	27/08/2021	£8,100	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	19/04/2021	27/08/2021	£17,420	BAU - SENAR

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	19/04/2021	27/08/2021	£9,000	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	10/05/2021	27/08/2021	£8,700	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	10/05/2021	27/08/2021	£8,700	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	19/05/2021	27/08/2021	£8,100	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	10/05/2021	27/08/2021	£6,900	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	10/05/2021	27/08/2021	£8,700	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	19/04/2021	27/08/2021	£7,050	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	26/04/2021	27/08/2021	£9,600	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	10/05/2021	27/08/2021	£8,700	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	26/04/2021	27/08/2021	£11,400	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	26/04/2021	27/08/2021	£6,900	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	01/06/2021	27/08/2021	£15,600	BAU - SENAR

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	01/06/2021	27/08/2021	£1,500	BAU - SENAR
Interim PO / SEND Case workers	Senar - Case Work	01/06/2021	27/08/2021	£1,500	BAU - SENAR
Interim Project Manager	Transformation & Project Support	13/07/2020	30/06/2021	£71,090	Developing Early Help team
Interim Project Support Officer	Transformation & Project Support	01/04/2020	30/09/2021	£15,224	Developing Early Help team
Interim SEMH Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	08/03/2021	08/09/2021	£33,925	Transformation - SEMH/Commissioning
Interim SEMH Transformation Lead	SEND Strategic Transformation	01/03/2021	01/09/2021	£41,145	Transformation - SEMH/Commissioning
Interim Tribunal Officer	Senar - Case Work	20/10/2020	27/08/2021	£66,300	BAU - SENAR
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	10/02/2021	27/08/2021	£35,975	BAU - SENAR
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	06/05/2021	TBC	£17,360	BAU - SENAR
Operational Lead	Senar - Case Work	11/01/2021	27/08/2021	£43,860	BAU - SENAR
Provision Manager	Senar - Case Work	01/03/2021	27/08/2021	£46,080	BAU - SENAR

### City Council – 13 July 2021

Role	Area	Start Date	Contract end date (if assignment active)	Cumulative costs from Sept 2018 to Mar 2022	Role/Responsibilities
Provision Manager	Senar - Case Work	01/03/2021	27/08/2021	£52,760	BAU - SENAR
Provision Manager	Senar - Case Work	01/03/2021	27/08/2021	£44,890	BAU - SENAR
Strategic lead for ASC	SEND Strategic Transformation	29/10/2020	28/10/2021	£86,730	Recruited as the strategic lead to support the transformation of the CAT service Currently supporting in the SENAR HOS role Also lead advisor on the SEND COP and the SENAR restructure

#### Home to School Transport

Interim Compliance Performance Officer	Home To School Transport	23/09/2020	31/10/2021	£77,925	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim Ops Manager (Transport)	Home To School Transport	24/08/2020	31/10/2021	£90,764	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim SEND Transport Officer	Home To School Transport	09/11/2020	31/10/2021	£64,815	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	26/10/2020	31/10/2021	£62,162	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim Senior Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	17/09/2020	31/10/2021	£59,206	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim Compliance	Home To School	01/12/2020	31/10/2021	£40,386	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the




### City Council – 13 July 2021

Officer	Transport				service is complete
Interim Compliance Officer	Home To School Transport	06/10/2020	31/10/2021	£50,405	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim Project Manager - 365	Home To School Transport	06/04/2021	31/10/2021	£45,864	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete
Interim Contracts & Compliance Manager	Home To School Transport	19/04/2021	31/10/2021	£19,623	HTST BAU activity - until redesign of the service is complete

### **Directorate Wide SEND Transformation**

SEND Improvement programme Manager	Transformation & Project Support	27/04/2021	31/10/2021	£13,000	Programme Manager with responsibility to prepare the local area for the SEND revisit and implement the recommendations from the outcome report
SEND Project Manager	Transformation & Project Support	21/06/2021	21/06/2022	£7,500	Project manager in the SEND improvement programme - looking after getting the basics right - including the nexus upgrade
Transformation Director E&S	Transformation & Project Support	01/03/2021	01/08/2021	£49,000	Transformation Director, leading on improvement programmes across Education and Skills Directorate.
SEND Programme Manager	Transformation & Project Support	04/05/2021	04/11/2021	£13,000	Programme Manager looking at resolving safeguarding issues in Home to School Transport.

## C3 - Appendix 2

						
Project name:	Birmingham City Centre Retail Core Public Realm Transformation - Phase One Temple Street/Lower Temple Street					
Promoter Authority/Authorities:	BCC					
Project Sponsor:	Phil Edwards					
Transforming Cities Fund - strategic alignment - describe how the project would contribute to:						
Improving productivity through changes in connectivity	A transformed City Centre environment in New Street / Temple Street / High Street will support the inclusive growth of the city by creating safe, convenient and attractive spaces for pedestrians and cyclists, and will provide a high quality of living. It will make it easier to access the City Centre, with improved legibility and wayfinding helping to make the connections between public transport modes. These links will play a vital role during events such as the Commonwealth Games.					
Reducing traffic congestion	A series of attractive, safe and connected public spaces will encourage the use of active travel modes and public transport, reducing the use of private cars. The reduction of access and loading periods across the area will enhance pedestrian access and permeability. This will have a positive impact on levels of traffic congestion in the City Centre.					
Improving air quality	A liveable and connected city centre will respond to the challenge of climate change through sustainable growth, pioneering the low carbon future by encouraging walking, cycling and public transport use. This project will support the potential implementation of a Clean Air Zone in the City Centre to meet air quality targets as mandated by Central Government.					
Reducing journey times	The visual uplift of the New Street / Temple Street / High Street areas and a revised TRO will create connected and efficient spaces that enhance wayfinding and legibility, maximising pedestrian access and permeability. This will ensure 'last mile journeys' to work, retail, leisure and events, including Commonwealth Games, will be quick and convenient.					
Mode shift to sustainable transport	This project will seek to create a connected and walkable centre which will link Birmingham's sustainable transport network with the retail core. It will form the next stage in linking the 3 City Centre stations (New Street, Snowhill and Moor Street), Centenary and Paradise Developments, HS2 and the Metro extension, encouraging mode shift to sustainable transport.					
Harnessing the potential of new technology	New technologies will complement the City Centre living, cultural activity and enhanced environments for residents, visitors, commuters and businesses. The efficiency and experience of journeys will be significantly improved through enhanced wayfinding, pedestrian permeability and legibility of these public spaces.					
Local factors - describe the status of the project in relation to:						
Key WMCA priorities - emerging spatial investment and delivery plan	The project supports the emerging WMCA spatial investment and delivery plan priorities of increased delivery of housing and new employment opportunities across the region. This project both improves connectivity through and to the City centre and also improves the public realm and feeling of place which will encourage people to live and work in the city centre. The new Street / Temple Street / High Street area will act as a gateway to Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth Games and improved wayfinding experience is essential to facilitate connections between transport modes for the high number of visitors to the city. It is also vital that the city's core is modern, inviting and enjoyable, and that it leaves a lasting legacy for Birmingham.					
Key WMCA priorities - Commonwealth Games / Coventry City of Culture	This project supports the same objectives as 'making the connections' and 'one station' projects, funded by GBSLEP, which have been put on hold to be reassessed prior to this comprehensive scheme being brought forward. GBSLEP has indicated to go back to them with the comprehensive scheme. The project is supported by Retail BID, TfWM, Birmingham City Council, City Centre Enterprise Zone, and will also benefit public transport operators.					
Stakeholder support (e.g. LEPs, employers, transport providers)	This project is included in Section 12.1 of the 2026 Delivery Plan: 'Improved conditions for walking will be created through the delivery of district and city centre public realm improvements...'. The project is supported by Retail BID, TfWM, Birmingham City Council, City Centre Enterprise Zone, and will also benefit public transport operators.					
Inclusion in 2026 delivery plan	This project is included in Section 12.1 of the 2026 Delivery Plan: 'Improved conditions for walking will be created through the delivery of district and city centre public realm improvements...'. The project is supported by Retail BID, TfWM, Birmingham City Council, City Centre Enterprise Zone, and will also benefit public transport operators.					
Proposed breakdown of cost - summary						
Funding stream	Details/key cost items	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
TCF	Design	£500,000	£1,000,000			
TCF	Construction		£1,000,000	£2,500,000		
Total Transforming Cities Fund:		£500,000	£2,000,000	£2,500,000	£0	£5,000,000
Total match funding		£0	£0	£0	£0	
Total cost of project		£500,000	£2,000,000	£2,500,000	£0	£5,000,000

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDRENS  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**C4     WSOA**

**Question:**

**Please provide a table dealing the following in relation to the Ofsted Written statement of Action:**

- **Area from WSOA**
- **The area it relates to from the Inspection in 2018,**
- **Has the SEND Improvement Board consistently been satisfied with the actions/progress (yes or no)**
- **Detail of any concerns the SEND Improvement Board expressed concern in relation to actions and progress (including dates)**
- **Action taken as a result of these concerns**

**Answer:**

<b>Area of weakness identified in 2018 inspection report and WSOA.</b>	<b>Has the SEND Improvement Board consistently been satisfied with the actions /progress (yes or no)</b>	<b>Detail of any concerns the SEND Improvement Board expressed concern in relation to actions and progress (including dates)</b>	<b>Detail of any concerns the SEND Improvement Board expressed concern in relation to actions and progress (including dates)</b>
The lack of an overarching approach or joined-up strategy for improving provision and outcomes for children and young people who have SEN and/or disabilities across Birmingham The effectiveness of inter-agency working The coordination of assessments of children and young people's needs between agencies Integrated commissioning Co-production Parental engagement and satisfaction of parents The accessibility and currency of the local offer The quality of EHC plans Waiting times and access to therapies and	No	As the board has been meeting since autumn 2018 on a regular basis (monthly and then fortnightly), it will take considerable officer time to go through all the minutes and itemise with dates every concern raised throughout the process and what action has been taken to address those concerns.  The Board has been monitoring the delivery of the WSOA and has posed regular questions to the workstream leads related to both progress and performance.  At the most recent two Boards in April 2021 it was raised that there has been a lack of impact tracking over the course of	

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

<b>Area of weakness identified in 2018 inspection report and WSOA.</b>	<b>Has the SEND Improvement Board consistently been satisfied with the actions /progress (yes or no)</b>	<b>Detail of any concerns the SEND Improvement Board expressed concern in relation to actions and progress (including dates)</b>	<b>Detail of any concerns the SEND Improvement Board expressed concern in relation to actions and progress (including dates)</b>
professionals in Child Development Centres (CDCs)		the WSOA for the activity that has taken place. As a result, officers were asked to develop a Self-Evaluation Framework (SEF) that is based on progress in delivering the actions identified in the WSOA and the impact this has had on children and families. The Self-Evaluation concluded that not enough progress had been made, particularly in respect of the impact on better outcomes and experience of children with SEND and their families.	
Academic progress when compared to all pupils nationally			
Absence and exclusions			
Employment opportunities			

The WSOA and the areas it relates to from the Inspection Letter can be found in the WSOA published document: [SEND Written Statement of Action, December 2018 | Birmingham City Council](#)

The WSOA covers the same areas as the Inspection letter with the exception that Parental Engagement and Parental Satisfaction are treated in the WSOA as one area whereas in the letter they are treated as two distinct areas.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDRENS  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

**C5     Send Improvement**

**Question:**

**Has the Cabinet Member retained confidence in the direction of travel since the production of the Written Statement Of Action or, if not, what actions has she required to be taken to remedy areas that were not making sufficient progress?.**

**Answer:**

I have not been satisfied with the pace of change since the production of the Written Statement Of Action. We have unfortunately had a period of significant churn within the leadership of the service, during the past few years. Over the past 15 months we have also been dealing with the COVID19 pandemic which has led us all to working with unprecedented challenges.

There have been significant improvements introduced in the service area and a great deal of emphasis has been place on improving our home to school transport service. I am confident that some of the changes we have in place, particularly in respect of inclusion and mainstream schools, is in line with the direction of national policy and I am optimistic that in time will lead to a better service for many children their families and carers.

The improvement of SEND service is a priority for us all and our partners. Taking all our stakeholders specifically our parents and schools with us will be key and I am wholly and totally committed to ensuring co-production is the key feature of our improvement journey.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDRENS  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC STANFORD**

**C6     Send Improvement**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of the members of the SEND Improvement Board**

**Answer:**

The SEND Improvement Board will be reviewed in line with the outcome of the Local Area SEND Revisit.

The current standing membership of the board, as it stands in the Terms of Reference, is as follows:

- Assistant Chief Executive, Birmingham and Solihull Clinical Commissioning Group
- Director, Education & Skills, Birmingham City Council
- Chair, Parent Carer Forum
- Assistant Director SEND and Inclusion, Birmingham City Council
- Associate Director of Nursing and Quality, Birmingham and Solihull Clinical Commissioning Group
- Director of Joint Commissioning, Birmingham and Solihull Clinical Commissioning Group
- Assistant Director, Adult Social Care, Birmingham City Council
- Interim Director, Commissioning and Corporate Parenting, Birmingham Children's Trust
- Interim Deputy Divisional Director, Children and Families Division
- Director of Nursing and Quality, Birmingham and Solihull Clinical Commissioning Group
- Chief Nurse, Birmingham and Solihull Clinical Commissioning Group
- Transformation Director, Birmingham Children's Partnership
- Children and Young People Improvement Lead, Birmingham Children's Partnership
- Project Manager, Birmingham City Council

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS  
AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC STANFORD**

**D1     World's End School meals**

**Question:**

**For each week between November 2020 and May 2021, how many hot school meals were provided at Worlds End Primary and Infants Schools?**

**Answer:**

During the period of national lockdown from January – March 2021, all children eligible for free school meals were provided with supermarket vouchers through the government's scheme with Edenred.

In addition, supermarket vouchers were provided to families eligible for free school meals by BCC using government funding to cover the February half-term, Easter holidays and May half-term periods.

**Worlds End Junior:**

Food hampers were supplied from November 2020 and hot meals from March 2021, when the school was opened to all pupils.

**Hot meal numbers:**

- 30/03/21 - 240
- 04/04/21 - 360
- Easter Break for two weeks
- 25/04/21 - 360
- 02/05/21 - 625
- 09/05/21 - 375 two days closure
- 16/05/21 - 600
- 23/05/21 - 644
- 30/05/21 - 720

**Worlds End Infant:**

Universal Infant Free School Meal (UIFSM) Children- all take a meal

**Hot meal numbers:**

**City Council – 13 July 2021**

- 02/11/20 - 1033
- 09/11/20 - 1033
- 16/11/20 - 1033
- 23/11/20 - 1033
- 30/11/20 - 1033
- 07/12/20 - 1033
- 14/12/20 - 1033
- Two weeks Christmas holidays
- January 4th to March 5th (partial opening for Key worker and vulnerable) packed lunches for all children.
- March 8th to May 28th (full opening) packed lunches for all children.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS  
AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**D2     World's End School Meals 2**

**Question:**

**During the January and February lockdown of schools and until they fully reopened, how many key worker children attended Worlds End Primary and Infant schools?**

**Answer:**

On average between 11<sup>th</sup> January – 5<sup>th</sup> March, 72 children of critical workers were in attendance at World's End Junior School and World's End Infant and Nursery School.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, SKILLS  
AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**D3      CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.

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

**D4     Children missing from school**

**Question:**

**Children in the most deprived areas of the country are almost twice as likely as those in wealthier areas to be forced to self-isolate and although there have been reports the Government will look to end the current bubble system in schools amid concern that too many pupils are missing out on school. Could the Cabinet Member comment on how many children are currently off school in the City? Could this information be split by ward?**

**Answer:**

Information about the number of children absent from school for COVID reasons (positive tests or self-isolation) is collated by the Department for Education and is not available by ward.

The number of pupils absent due to COVID in Birmingham has been increasing, particularly since pupils returned from half-term last month as we have seen cases of the Delta variant grow in the city.

As at Monday 5<sup>th</sup> July, there were 19,423 pupils absent from schools (including independent schools) and Post 16 settings in Birmingham. This represents around 10% of the total cohort.

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

**D5     Duke of Edinburgh Award**

**Question:**

The Department of Education has announced a £3.4 million investment to support pupils in England to take part in volunteering and extra-curricular learning through the Duke of Edinburgh's Award scheme. The scheme will be expanded to enable up to 291 more schools not currently delivering the awards to do so in areas where deprivation is highest.

Could the Cabinet Member indicate what measures are being taken to ensure City Schools are encouraged to take advantage of this initiative?

**Answer:**

Last month the government announced a funding boost of £3.4m for the Duke of Edinburgh's Award over the next three academic years. The Department for Education has said it will be working to expand opportunities to up to 291 more schools across the country not currently delivering the Award.

As yet, the DfE has not indicated which areas/schools it will be working with, but we would be keen for Birmingham schools to access some of this funding so young people in the city can take advantage of the Award.

I have written to the DfE to ask when more information will be available and officials have committed to providing a response. I will ensure councillors are updated when this is received.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND  
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**E1      CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

**It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND  
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

**E2      PWC**

**Question:**

**Please list all contracts including value and descriptions awarded to PWC since May 2018**

**Answer:**

Contract Description	Start Date	End Date	Value £
Financial Advisor Commercial Advice	08.05.2018	30.04.2019	£132,818
Operational Strategic Tax Advice	07.06.2018	31.05.2022	£740,940
Voluntary Liquidation of IB Birmingham	01.03.2019	29.02.2020	£30,000
Tourism Visitor Levy Assessment	02.05.2019	01.06.2019	£25,000
Procurement Maturity & Saving Opportunity Assessment	01.08.2019	31.12.2019	£105,000
Assurance Review Paradise Circus	18.12.2019	17.12.2022	£144,765
Infrastructure Review Scoping Exercise	25.02.2020	31.03.2020	£25,000
Total Impact Review Audit	03.03.2020	12.05.2020	£47,300
Validation of the cost envelope CWG 2022	05.03.2020	08.08.2020	£113,850
Financial Model Perry Barr Regeneration Scheme	18.01.2021	01.03.2021	£90,000

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND  
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**E3      PWC Levelling Up**

**Question:**

**Please provide details of the procurement of PWC to carry out levelling up work, including procurement route used, number of bidders, total cost, hours procured.**

**Answer:**

We are in the pre-procurement discussions phase and therefore cannot comment further at this point.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR DARIUS SANDHU**

**E4     JNC Interims**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of all JNC posts currently filled by interims, together with the equivalent annual salary paid to these interims (if necessary in salary bands of £5k in compliance with the Government's Local Government Transparency Code)**

**Answer:**

For clarity, the term interim in this context has been taken to mean those paid to undertake a role within the JNC structure (Directors) who aren't employees on the Council payroll.

Annual salaries (for those classed as interims) have been based on a 220 day working year (allowing for statutory bank holidays, 6 weeks leave and 2 days other absence. It is also to be noted that these day rates include margins taken from providers which in some case can be up to 20%.

The equivalent Council salary is based at top of grade and includes on-costs (pension contribution at 35.4% and National Insurance contribution at 13.8%).

Directorate	Job Title	Day rate / salary equivalent	Salary equivalent	Council equivalent
Commonwealth Games	CWG Programme Director (B03)	£1,200	£264,000	£254,173
City Operations	AD Regulations and Enforcement (B02)	£909	£199,980	£190,037
Education & Skills	Director of Education & Skills (B03)	£1,120	£246,400	£254,173
Education & Skills	AD of Commissioning (B01)	£863	£189,860	£142,082
Education & Skills	Transformation Director: Children's Services (B02)	£977	£214,940	£190,037
Council Management	Director of Council Management (B03)	£1,267	£278,740	£254,173
Council	AD of Legal (B01)	£795	£174,900	£142,082



**City Council – 13 July 2021**

Directorate	Job Title	Day rate / salary equivalent	Salary equivalent	Council equivalent
Management				
Partnerships, Equalities & Participations	Assistant DPH Population (B01)	£750	£165,000	£142,082
Partnerships, Equalities & Participations	Consultant in Public Health (Governance and Surveillance) (B01)	£750	£165,500	£142,082
Partnerships, Equalities & Participations	Consultant in Public Health (Communication & Engagement) (B01)	£767	£168,740	£142,082
Partnerships, Equalities & Participations	Consultant in Public Health (Health Protection Response) (B01)	£750	£165,000	£142,082

The 3 posts of consultant in Public Health are externally funded from the **Contain Outbreak Management Fund**. An additional post which has recently become vacant for Assistant Director Public Health (Test and Trace) is also funded from the same fund, this will be backfilled in due course.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND  
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

**E5      Online payment system – outstanding query**

**Question:**

**The answer provided for question for E5, asking for copies of the signed and dated contracts with Stripe and GoCardless for the online CAZ payment system, was not answered. Whilst a partial response was emailed to elected members this was not the complete contract and furthermore councillors were told they could not share it. This does not comply with the requirement of written questions, where an answer should be placed in the public domain. Please provide a full answer to that question here with all information that can be made public and an explanation for that which cannot.**

**Answer:**

For Clarity – the original question was E12 at Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2021.

Whilst copies of contracts have been provided with some initial redactions these have not yet been reviewed by the relevant suppliers. Not least the information contained in the contracts, if released in the public domain, without redaction could be prejudicial to their commercial interests.

One of these contracts is 39 pages in length and, therefore, is taking some time to review to the satisfaction of both parties.

Given the limited amount of time to respond to the initial written question and the potential risk of legal action against the Council if consent had not been reached with each party above it was felt that in the interests of transparency it was appropriate to share a partially redacted form of the contracts on the basis that they would not be disclosed in the public domain.

The Council's Legal Services team are working to provide these contracts as soon as possible.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND  
SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**F1      CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

**It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

**F2      Adult Social Care**

**Question:**

**Adult social care services are facing a “deluge” of requests for support from vulnerable and older people as society starts to open up after the pandemic, according to a survey by the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services. Councils are also facing a spike in demand for social care support for people with mental illness, victims of domestic violence and abuse, and rough sleepers, according to another finding of the survey.**

**Could the Cabinet Member give full details of any upsurge in requests providing a breakdown of (a) the numbers of residents helped, (b) those whose request has been refused and (c) the resources available to respond to these requests?**

**Answer:**

Figures for domestic violence and abuse and rough sleepers are not currently available and will need to be collated by officers across a number of departments and agencies.

Between March 2020 and June 2021 there has been an increase of 38% in the number of referrals for citizens experiencing mental health difficulties.

Requests are not refused and there is an appropriate level of resources and services across Adult Social Care and partners to meet the needs of citizens. Advice and support has been provided throughout the Covid19 pandemic to vulnerable citizens by the Social Work Teams, Neighbourhood Network service and our partners have enhanced and adapted the services to assist and support citizens. The 3 conversations model builds on the individual's own network of support, the community assets and the wider support across the City. The increase in contacts has been supported as part of the wider system resilience work that has been instrumental to the Health and Social Care response throughout the pandemic.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**F3      COVID Vaccinations**

**Question:**

**Given the underspend of Covid Related Grant money, how is the Cabinet Member going to target resources to reverse the abysmally low vaccination rates in some neighbourhoods and communities, particularly in light of the surge in Delta variant cases?**

**Answer:**

The Vaccination programme is led by and funded by the NHS. The challenges in vaccination uptake are complex and layered and include two main themes: barriers to access, both physical and language, and understanding and confidence issues, including challenging fake news.

The NHS has been working hard with the Council to identify new sites for the mobile van vaccination units which has included releasing Council car parks and other facilities. This has focused on areas with lowest uptake.

The Council has been providing additional support to this programme through many elements of the COMF funded activity, especially in relation to community engagement and communication. This has included the mobilisation of the Covid Champions, commissioned engagement partners, facilitating engagement with faith leaders, utilising commissioned community media and advertising space.

Where the Council is supporting this work this is being funded through the COMF funding in line with the Government criteria around this grant and the spend is reported through the Local Outbreak Engagement Board on a monthly basis.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

**F4      Drug and Alcohol Addictions**

**Question:**

It has been reported that fewer people with alcohol and drug problems are being treated since responsibility for their care changed from the [NHS](#) to local councils. In an article in the Health Service Journal it is claimed patients' care has become poorer, specialist detoxification beds are now harder to access, and the cost of treatment has increased. There have been calls for these services to return to the NHS.

**Could the Cabinet Member provide a comprehensive overview of the support available to local residents that have drug and alcohol addictions in the City to include (a) number of beds available, (b) overall cost of the service and (c) number of patients currently being treated?**

**Answer:**

The provision of drug and alcohol treatment services is defined as one of the grant conditions of the Public Health Grant. The current drug and alcohol treatment and recovery provision in Birmingham is delivered by the third sector organisation 'Change Grow Live' (CGL). They were awarded a five year contract for the period 1st March 2015 – 28th February 2020 and BCC exercised the option to extend the contract for a further two years from March 2020 to February 2022. The contract was extended via BCC Cabinet in February 2021 by a further 13 months to 31st March 2023 to mitigate against delays in the re-commissioning and procurement process as a direct result of COVID-19.

A 'recovery' approach has been taken regarding the treatment for Birmingham citizens experiencing the harms associated with drug and alcohol misuse. This currently involves the treatment and care of approximately 5,500 service users.

There are four locality hubs across the city (North – Great Barr, South - Bournville, East – Stechford, and Central & West - Newtown). These are designed to provide accessible and welcoming spaces for service users to tackle substance misuse and prevention agenda within local communities. Each hub has a multi-disciplinary team with a wide range of expertise that includes Doctors, Nurses, Recovery Co-ordinators and Outreach Workers. These locality hubs are open 9am – 5pm, Monday to Friday.

To support the recovery focused delivery model, service users are provided with the necessary advice and support which is delivered via a 5-tier delivery model which responds to differing levels of case complexity, the tiers are:

*Tier 1:* Advice & Information; including signposting to other services which include advocacy and mutual aid.

*Tier 2:* Non-dependent drug and alcohol use – Group / 1:1 work for up to 12 weeks

*Tier 3:* Dependent alcohol use, opiate use, heavy crack cocaine/synthetic cannabinoids etc. – Group/1:1 work, longer term, structured support

*Tier 4:* In-patient specialist unit (Park House in Hockley) which delivers detoxification and stabilisation

*Tier 5:* Aftercare provision – Group/1:1 work/recovery Programmes

From the 23rd March 2020 to present the CGL Birmingham Adult Substance Use service has been open and accessible to all Birmingham citizens and the service continued to operate throughout all stages COVID-19 pandemic. The CGL website <https://www.changegrowlive.org/drug-and-alcohol-service-birmingham> is continually updated and details how and where services can be accessed as well as offering Coronavirus information for service users.

Cumulatively from 23rd March 2020 to 18th June 2021 there have been 3,663 new treatment starts; 2,080 opiate and 1,583 alcohol.

**(a) Number of beds available – Inpatient Residential Detoxification**

The recovery-focused delivery model, where appropriate, offers inpatient residential detoxification for alcohol and substance dependencies as part of Tier 4.

An 18 bed inpatient detox unit operates from Park House, 5 Park Rd South, Hockley, Birmingham B18 5QL. CGL as the service provider holds multi-disciplinary panel meetings to discuss the suitability of detox for potential clients, and agree the preparation work required prior to detox. The length of an inpatient stay within Park House is two weeks.

Park House closed due to COVID in mid-March 2020 and re-opened on 17.08.2020 with an initial intake of six service users (usually 18); the reduced capacity was to enable patients to adhere to social distancing guidance. Capacity is currently improved to 14 beds and will be increased to the full capacity of 18 beds at the earliest opportunity based on government guidance.

When Park House re-opened on 17.08.2020 there was a wait of approximately five months due to the vastly reduced capacity. As of May 2021, waiting times have reduced to about six weeks and are expected to reduce further when operating at the full 18 bed capacity.

Residential rehabilitation is not part of the service offer.

**(b) Overall cost of the service**

The current yearly contract value of drug and alcohol treatment and recovery provision is £14,190,609.00. For comparative purposes the annual spend from 2013/14 to 2022/23 is detailed below.

Year	Spend £
2013/14	27,303,000

<b>Year</b>	<b>Spend £</b>
2014/15	25,234,000
2015/16	19,022,930
2016/17	18,055,513
2017/18	15,450,810
2018/19	15,164,704
2019/20	14,937,483
2020/21	14,190,608
2021/22	14,190,608
2022/23	14,190,608

Expenditure on drug and alcohol treatment services in the City has reduced from £27M in 2013/14 to approx. £14M in 2021.

This trend is consistent with national data which shows a gradual decline in the number of people accessing substance use services since 2013/14 to the present (Public Health England National Drug Treatment Monitoring System (NDTMS)).

A comparison between contract value for adult substance use services in Birmingham and people receiving treatment in 2013/14 and in 2019/20 (the most recent available full years' data from NDTMS) is shown below.

Contract year	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2019/20</b>
Contract value	£27,303,000	£14,937,483
No. service users	9,575	6,882
Average cost per service user	£2,851	£2,170
Average service users/£10,000 costs	3.5	4.6

(c)  
of

**number  
patients  
currently**

**being treated?**

Verified data as of Q4 (31<sup>st</sup> March 2021) there were 5,628 service users accessing the CGL adult substance use service in Birmingham. Data from Q1 (30<sup>th</sup> June) 2021/22 is expected in August 2021.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL EUSTACE**

**F5      Mental Health**

**Question:**

**Further to recent data that has suggested one in five adults have experienced depressive symptoms during the pandemic, could the Cabinet Member provide an update on the strategy that has been put forward to tackle this issue in the City?**

**Answer:**

The NHS is the lead organisation for the provision of clinical support for mental health illnesses and the Council works closely in partnership with them to respond to the impacts of Covid on both physical and mental health.

This work has included during the pandemic supporting the NHS led expansion of Kooth, an online digital support platform for children and young people and expansion of bereavement support in the City in the first wave of the Pandemic.

Working with partners we built on this in multiple ways to support mental wellbeing including: developing video interventions based on the five ways to wellbeing through the Healthy Brum YouTube channel, including signposting resources to the Waiting Room resource into food parcels and in the food banks of the city, launching the Be Healthy Toolkit in Summer 2020, which was translated into multiple languages, to support self-care wellbeing interventions and running training webinars to support community organisations to use Be Healthy and access further support around mental wellbeing.

Recently Birmingham was successful in an application to PHE Prevention and Promotion Fund for Better Mental Health 2021-22 for £ 792,973.00. The bid was developed through collaboration with the Creating a Mentally Healthy City Forum and the Council was commended on its rapid partnership work.

Birmingham has selected a range of interventions for this funding to address mental health and wellbeing needs across the lifecourse. The range includes universal programmes that are available across the city as well as interventions that are targeted to specific ethnicity, faith groups and populations by identity or behaviour so that we can address key areas of inequality as evidenced by local and national research, community engagement and stakeholder consultation.

We have prioritised interventions that will have a lasting legacy beyond the fixed-term funding, that are evidence based, that build upon established work programmes, that focus on skills development and resource development and where there is a clear evidence of need. Eleven projects were approved including:

**Bereavement Support**

Local evidence has found that take up existing universal bereavement support has been lowest within our most deprived areas and in our Central and Eastern European Community, Black Community and LGBT Community. This intervention will increase the reach and equity of access of this service by introducing outreach work in schools in the most deprived areas of Birmingham, training 20 bereavement volunteers, and providing targeted and culturally specific support, outreach and resources.

**The Mindful Muslims Programme**

The intervention offers peer-to-peer bereavement support for the Muslim community facilitated by a qualified and registered counsellor, ensuring emotional safeguarding as well as hosting a series of seminars to increase awareness and confidence on issues surrounding mental health.

**Being Well Programme**

Mental health and wellbeing training targeted at people aged 18 plus who have mild to moderate mental health issues and or at risk of developing mental health issues. This intervention will deliver 15 courses aiming to improve resilience, mental health and wellbeing, enhanced participation in community life and getting back to the post-Covid “new normal”.

**Youth Mental Health Peer Support Programme**

Using Personal Experiences to Support Youth Mental Health Youth mental health peer support workers who will enable and increase access to mental health services in the 0-25-year age group, reduce stigma around mental health and associated barriers to existing care. This intervention has been developed with service users and has wider partnership support. The Peer Support workers are all former users of mental health services.

The Creating a Mentally Healthy City Forum will oversee the delivery of the programme reporting into the Health and Wellbeing Board.

There were a small number of proposals that were put forward that did not meet the criteria of the fund or were considered longer term projects and these are being taken forward using the core Public Health grant funding.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

**G1     Empty Council Homes**

**Question:**

**What is the total number of council homes that have been empty for more than 6 months and for more than 12 months. Broken down by property type and number of bedrooms.**

**Answer:**

**Voids more than 6 months**

Property Type	Bed Queue 0	Bed Queue 1	Bed Queue 2	Bed Queue 3	Bed Queue 4	Total
Bungalow		1				1
High-Rise Flat	4		1			5
Sheltered high rise Flat	2	4	5			11
Low-Rise flat		2				2
House			2	1	2	5
Maisonette				1		1
Total	6	7	8	3	2	25

**Voids more than 12 months**

Property Type	Bed Queue 0	Bed Queue 1	Bed Queue 2	Bed Queue 3	Bed Queue 4	Total
Bungalow						0
High-Rise Flat	6	2	6			14
Sheltered High-Rise Flat		2	7			9
Low-Rise Flat						0
House			2		2	4
Maisonette						0
Total	6	4	15		2	27

The above figures exclude properties scheduled for demolition and represent less than 0.1% of the City's housing stock.

High-Rise Sheltered Flats can be harder to let in less popular schemes and have specific criteria compared to general needs dwellings.

Sixteen of the High-Rise Flats have been purposefully kept void during extensive and disruptive capital investment works in two of our blocks.

Houses will have serious structural issues including the need for underpinning and requiring full option appraisals and complex solutions to be developed before determining if they are to

be retained. Of the nine above, 7 are with contractors progressing the works required and two are having solutions completed.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR BOB BEAUCHAMP**

**G2     CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

**It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.**

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

**G3     Yardley Cemetery**

**Question:**

**Please can you provide an update of the plans to deal with the badger setts in Yardley Cemetery, which are causing considerable distress to relatives of those buried nearby?**

**Answer:**

Bereavement Services are actively trying to find a solution to the damage being caused by the badger setts. Badgers are a protected species and therefore Bereavement Services are liaising with an ecologist and Natural England to obtain a Licence to interfere with the setts. Legally no-one can touch or disrupt any of the badger sett without a licence that approves specific works as detailed on the licence by Natural England.

The Service has been trying to address this disturbance for some years with Natural England and a previous application in 2019 for a licence was declined. We are now working together with an ecologist to achieve a licence. The ecologist has advised on all steps that can be taken to make the area “less attractive” to the badgers. This includes reduction of food sources and natural cover, however as a burrowing species it is difficult to change the environment to dissuade them from the area.

In the meantime, we are monitoring their movements and the graves that they have disturbed. The service has used cameras to track where they go and to try and establish how many are living in the cemetery. Efforts to encourage them to feed further away from the grave section has unfortunately not been successful.

We understand how distressing this situation is and can assure you that we are looking into every option possible to move the badgers from the grave sections. Unfortunately, this is not a quick process. Every effort is being made to convince Natural England that all other routes have been exhausted so that a licence can be obtained. Bereavement Services will rectify the damage for all the families affected.

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

**G4     Women Rough Sleepers**

**Question:**

**As there has been a significant rise in female rough sleepers, could the Cabinet Member confirm how many female rough sleepers there are in the City and if these are all currently in accommodation?**

**Answer:**

An official snapshot count of people sleeping rough in England takes place each autumn and is reported in the following January/February. This records the number of people bedded down across the city on a single night. The table below shows figures for the last 4 years relating to gender of people found sleeping rough.

Year	Female	Male	Not Know	Total
2017	13	36	8	57
2018	6	81	4	91
2019	8	41	3	52
2020	3	12	2	17

Based on that data women have represented between 7% and 23% of identified rough sleepers. It is noted and recognised that the experience and understanding of women rough sleeping is less well understood and often more hidden than that of men. This is highlighted in the recently published report: - <https://springhousing.org.uk/news/violence-under-quiet-conditions-initial-enquiry-into-women-and-rough-sleeping-within-birmingham/>

Partner agencies supported by Birmingham City Council undertake a monthly snapshot of rough sleeping in the city. This is not under the same conditions as the official annual count but is a regular measure of rough sleeping.

The June 2021 snapshot identified 37 individuals rough sleeping, of those 10 were women, 27 men. Of particular note, was the number of individuals with available accommodation but on that night sleeping rough. Of the women 5 had tenancies, and 2 supported housing, each of the 3 other women had received multiple offers of accommodation. No woman sleeping rough on the streets at this time is without an offer of accommodation. It can be a complex mix of poor mental health, substance misuse, relationships and vulnerability that make taking up and sustaining support and accommodation difficult. The services making up the partnership around preventing and relieving rough sleeping remain very engaged in this work.

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

**G5     Housing and Environmental Health**

**Question:**

**Please detail what changes have been made, and on what date, in response to the complaint that led to the Local Government Ombudsman Decision 20 010 642 regarding the poor co-ordination between Housing Officers and Environmental Health.**

**Answer:**

This recommendation relates to the fact that some noise issues are dealt with as Statutory Nuisances and others under Antisocial Behaviour legislation (ASB). This is due to the ASB act requiring primary legislation to be used where it can be and that not all noise falls under the statutory nuisance provisions. An example is behavioural noise (shouting) cannot be dealt with under statutory nuisance but is clearly ASB if it causes harassment, alarm or distress to others.

In response to a previous recommendation from a Community Trigger case, a joint working group was set up but unfortunately stalled in March 2020, due to COVID-19. Following the recent Local Government Ombudsman Decision this has since resumed with City Housing chairing a Noise Nuisance Focus Group on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2021. This group has managers from Housing, Environmental Health and ASB Partnership Team which is reviewing ASB Policy and adding Statutory nuisance considerations into the updated policy. Birmingham Community Safety Partnership has taken on the responsibility for this group.

At an Officer level additional noise monitoring equipment has been purchased by City Housing to reduce demand on the Environmental Health team's equipment and to ensure several recorders are available to Housing Officers in a timely manner. Training is ongoing for both officers to ensure the resources are used effectively and that whatever is recorded by the complainant is assessed and referred in a timely way to the relevant officer/team.



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

**H      CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

**It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.**

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

**I1      Mobile Recycling Wagons 1**

**Question:**

**What is the make, model, fuel type and emissions standards of the new mobile household waste recycling wagons?**

**Answer:**

The Mobile Recycling Wagons are Romaquip Kerb Sort vehicles. 12 tonne capacity with Euro 6 Diesel engine

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

**I2      Mobile Recycling Wagons 2**

**Question:**

**Do the new mobile household waste and recycling wagons require any form of power source to run when parked up (e.g. to compact waste) if so what is this and what is the carbon footprint?**

**Answer:**

The recycling vehicle has a number of compartments that require no power to operate. There is a compactor that is only operated when the hopper is full. During this operation the engine will need to be switched on.

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

**I3      Mobile Recycling Wagons 3**

**Question:**

**Will the engines for the new mobile household waste and recycling wagons be prohibited from 'idling' when parked up to collect waste?**

**Answer:**

All of the vehicles will be switched off during the loading operation. The engines will only be turned on to activate the compactor.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR DARIUS SANDHU**

**I4      Additional Clean Street Investment**

**Question:**

**Please provide a breakdown of how much of the £7.2m investment in cleaner streets will be spent in each ward?**

**Answer:**

It is not possible to provide a breakdown of expenditure to each Ward as these new initiatives are mobile and will be directed to areas of need based on local knowledge and LAMS data. Resources have been allocated across all the depots and will be spread across the City.

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

**I5      CAZ delay informal Cabinet Meeting**

**Question:**

**According to a recent FOI response you were told about the ‘soft launch’ approach to the CAZ with no charging or enforcement until 14 June at an informal cabinet meeting on 26 May. This was after the call-in on the payment system procurement had been received and after it was pointed out that the meeting could not be rushed through without the requisite notice period. At that meeting was the call in or the delay in procurement cited as a reason for not charging from 1 June?**

**Answer:**

**It was not cited as a reason for delaying the launch of payments.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR DOMINIC STANFORD**

**I6      Agency Parks Staff**

**Question:**

**How many Parks Staff (as total number and proportion of total staff) are agency workers?**

**Answer:**

There are 110 agency employees within Parks; 58 of these are seasonal roles. This is approximately 33% of the total staff. Where agency staff are currently covering for permanent posts, these full-time posts will be recruited to.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND  
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**I7      Agency spend in Parks**

**Question:**

**In each of the last 5 years, how much has the council spent on agency staff within the parks department?**

**Answer:**

2020/21 = £2,118,505

2019/20 = £2,310,601 – first financial year of all contracts being in-house

2018/19 = £1,000,719

2017/18 = £930,451

2016/17 = £1,135,334

2019/20 was the year when GM was brought back in house. This meant that BCC took on the responsibility for seasonal work and cover for staff that were previously outsourced



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

**18      Household and Recycling Waste Collections**

**Question:**

**In light of proposals to standardise rubbish collections, could the Cabinet Member provide an update on the authorities proposals for the future of the city's waste services?**

**Answer:**

We are fully committed to provide the best collection service in the UK. We have been working with Independent advisors and Trade Unions to improve our current services.

The Government has announced in this year's Queen's Speech that the Environment Bill will be passed. DEFRA are currently consulting on a number of areas raised in the Waste to Resources paper. One of these areas is consistency of collections. We have fed into this consultation and eagerly await their findings which will, of course, feed into the way we will collect in the future. It would be premature of me to think of changes before the outcome of this consultation and subsequent legislation.

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

**I9      Closure of Perry Barr Recycling Centre**

**Question:**

**Given the closure of the Household Recycling centre in Perry Barr, will the Cabinet Member ensure that the proposed mobile recycling units spend extra time in the wards served by this HRC to continue to provide local access to legal waste disposal services?**

**Answer:**

Perry Barr Depot is undergoing a major development. The current depot is no longer fit for use and a modern facility will provide better accommodation for our staff, be designed to support the future vehicle fleet and provide the necessary space for the equipment required for safe handling of household waste.

This will require extensive building work and to complete that safely, the HWRC will close to the public at the end of normal opening hours on the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2021.

The work is expected to be completed and the site reopened by Spring 2023.

In the interim, users of the site will be redirected to use the Castle Bromwich HWRC on Tameside Drive, B35 7AG. There should be sufficient capacity there to cope with the loss of the slots at Perry Barr. Of course, residents are free to use any of the sites in the city. HWRC staff at Perry Barr will be redeployed to Castle Bromwich to support the expected increase in visitors.

We will display notices and issue leaflets to visitors to Perry Barr to make sure that they are aware of this change. We will liaise with the local media and also put the information out through our social media channels to reinforce this message.

We have also just significantly increased the number of slots available at all our sites by 35%, which means that there is usually availability within two hours.

We will monitor usage at Castle Bromwich and deploy the mobile HRC as needed. There is one unit based at Perry Barr to cover the northern part of the City.

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

**I10      Closure of Perry Barr Recycling Centre**

**Question:**

**Given the closure of the Household Recycling Centre in Perry Barr, will the Cabinet Member restore special street collections for the wards serviced by this centre, especially in the light of the many traffic restrictions currently in this part of the city?**

**Answer:**

Special street collections have been reviewed, but they are not an affordable option in the current budget.

We are proposing the following measures to mitigate the closure of Perry Barr to enable a total rebuild.

Users of the site will be redirected to use the Castle Bromwich HWRC on Tameside Drive, B35 7AG. There should be sufficient capacity there to cope with the loss of the slots at Perry Barr. Of course, residents are free to use any of the sites in the city. HWRC staff at Perry Barr will be redeployed to Castle Bromwich to support the expected increase in visitors.

We will display notices and issue leaflets to visitors to Perry Barr to make sure that they are aware of this change. We will liaise with the local media and also put the information out through our social media channels to reinforce this message.

We have also just significantly increased the number of slots available at all our sites by 35%, which means that there is usually availability within two hours.

We will monitor usage at Castle Bromwich and deploy the mobile HRC as needed. There is one unit based at Perry Barr to cover the northern part of the City.

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

**I11      Missed Collections**

**Question:**

**In the Quarter 4 Performance Report which was presented to Cabinet on 29 June, it clearly says in relation to reported missed collections ‘.. There has been significant improvement in the reliability of the service and generally missed collections are made within 48 hours’ however we are receiving complaints from residents who have advised their household waste and recycling collections are being missed time and time again with some residents having to wait up to 6 weeks for their bins to be emptied. Could the Cabinet Member provide details of the improvements they believe have been made to this service?**

**Answer:**

There have been improvements made to the service over the last 18 months and collections have improved. I am not complacent about what has been achieved and I recognise there is still a long way to go and I will not stop until we have no missed collections in the City.

However, here are some of the improvements made over the last 2 years:

1. Budgets - the budgets have been challenged and corrected. This has been reviewed by both CIPFA and the District Auditor. We now have a strong base to build upon.
2. Investment - £12m has been spent on new vehicles with more planned for 2022/23 and 2023/24. Lifford has had a new office and staff facilities built, Perry Barr is just about to start a total rebuild and a new site is starting to be developed to replace both Montague Street and Redfern Road.
3. We are currently replacing and installing in cab technology.
4. We have recruited to vacant posts.
5. We have improved communications with staff and hold regular Trade Union meetings.
6. We have just completed a recruitment drive for our Waste Enforcement Team taking them to 24.
7. We have reviewed and changed rounds following the Wood assessment. Performance is reviewed daily and a weekly report is produced and analysed.
8. The enquiries and complaints section have been improved and data is reviewed looking for common trends.

Performance has improved.

In the week ending 5 July 2019, there were 1096 outstanding roads waiting for collection. In the week ending 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2021, this was down to 18 roads.

In a service collecting from 450,000 properties every week – some 27 million collections a year, there will be always be specific problems – access to particular roads, COVID isolation, vehicle breakdown and staff sickness will always cause problems.

The Service has worked right the way through the pandemic, with staff showing resilience and flexibility to maintain collections – we should be very proud of the response from our people to keep the service functioning.

I am aware there is still more we can do to improve performance and we will keep driving to improve the service that we deliver to the residents of this city.

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

**I12     Wildflower Meadows**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member explain what consultation has local communities about the programme of delivering wildflower meadows taking over playing fields?**

**Answer:**

I am not aware of any programme of delivering wildflower meadows on playing fields. If you have any specific location I will ask officers to have a look and report back.

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

**J1      Clean Air Day New Street Display 1**

**Question:**

**What was the total cost of the vehicles and display put on outside New Street Station for Clean Air Day?**

**Answer:**

The vehicles and associated production costs were £20,000. In addition, there were costs of £25,970 which included creative development, production and event staffing (this includes security). All costs of the event were covered by the Clean Air Zone implementation budget.

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

**J2      Clean Air Day New Street Display 2**

**Question:**

**What vehicles and machinery (including engine specifications and power sources) was used to construct the Clean Air Day Display outside New Street Station?**

**Answer:**

The three vehicles used in the display were a 2010 Vauxhall Combo Van, a Golf and a Citroen C3. The engines of all of the vehicles were removed from the cars prior to installation, and no additional power sources were used for these vehicles.

The vehicles were moved on site by a HIAB lorry (i.e. a flat-bed lorry with a crane attached), which was Euro 6 compliant.



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

**J3      Clean Air Day New Street Display 3**

**Question:**

**What will the vehicles that formed part of the Clean Air Day Display outside New Street Station be used for once the display has finished?**

**Answer:**

The vehicles used in the display have been returned to a production house, which specialises in custom builds for events of this type. Any materials used in the display will be broken down and re-purposed or recycled for future campaigns.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**J4      Pot Holes**

**Question:**

**How many potholes have been filled in each of the last 5 years?**

**Answer:**

The term “pothole” is not defined in terms of size / extent or material. For example, there are a range of defects and deterioration in surfaces between cracking and the formation of holes.

For this reason, the council (in common with other highway authorities and in line with highway maintenance practice) uses a process of identifying defects in carriageway and footway surfacing (not just ‘holes’) and assessing the risk that the defect presents.

In respect of carriageway (‘roads’), the number of repairs that have been carried out is as follows:

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Carriageway surfacing repairs</b>
<b>2016-2017</b>	3,724
<b>2017-2018</b>	2,893
<b>2018-2019</b>	5,522
<b>2019-2020</b>	3,872
<b>2020-2021</b>	4,775
<b>2021- July 2021</b>	2,820

It should be noted that:

- A repair may be for more than one defect.
- This does not include repairs that have been carried out as part of resurfacing schemes, which will also repair multiple defects within the section surfaced.
- This does not include footway (‘pavement’) repairs. These may include defects that might be considered a pothole, but would also include defects such as cracking or missing slabs or blocks.

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

**J5      Pot Hole Cost**

**Question:**

**What is the average cost to the council of fixing a pothole?**

**Answer:**

The term “pothole” is not defined in terms of size/extent or material. For example, there are a range of defects and deterioration in surfaces between cracking and the formation of holes.

For this reason, the council (in common with other highway authorities and in line with highway maintenance practice) uses a process of identifying defects (not just ‘holes’) and assessing the risk that the defect presents.

To calculate an average cost as requested requires:

- A “pothole” to be defined and differentiated from other surfacing defects. As explained above, this is not done.
- The specific cost of all resources allocated exclusively to the repair of those surfacing defects.
- The number of defects that are rectified by each repair to be identified.

This information is not therefore held.

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

**J6      Pot Hole Spend**

**Question:**

**In each year since 2012 how much has been spent on highways repairs?**

**Answer:**

The council's costs for Highway Maintenance and Management services covers the full range of services within the scope of its contract. "Highways repairs" is not a specific term and the costs for "repairs" cannot be separated from other costs such as inspections, surveys, overheads and support.

The below table shows details of expenditure on Highway Maintenance and Management services from 2011-12 to 2020-21, which encompasses the period since January 2012.

	<b>Highways Expenditure</b>
<b>Financial Year:</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>2011/12</b>	55,989,948.50
<b>2012/13</b>	62,327,907.19
<b>2013/14</b>	70,943,112.79
<b>2014/15</b>	77,085,266.50
<b>2015/16</b>	68,030,297.07
<b>2016/17</b>	82,180,519.20
<b>2017/18</b>	70,715,186.63
<b>2018/19</b>	41,626,169.06
<b>2019/20</b>	55,890,982.12
<b>2020/21</b>	77,745,152.16
<b>Total</b>	<b>662,534,541.22</b>

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

**J7      PFI Legal costs**

**Question:**

**In the last ten years how much has the Council spent on legal advice relating to Highways PFI or Highways contractor issues.**

**Answer:**

From December 2014 to May 2021 the council spent £7,886,657.09 on external legal advice (including relevant expert technical and commercial advice) relating to the Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract.

It should be noted that:

1. These costs were incurred in connection with the costs of pursuing a complex combination of disputes and settlements relating to the contract. The expenditure should therefore be considered in the context of:
  - a. Retaining the PFI grant that the council receives from government - £50.3m per annum for 25 years.
  - b. The overall value of the disputes, in terms of the cost of the services of which the council was disputing provision. This resulted ultimately in a settlement exceeding £300m in value.
  - c. Money retained by the council under settlements, which remains ring fenced for Highways services.
  - d. The value of the council now being able to proceed with changes to restructure the contract and replace the contractor.
2. For clarity, this figure does not include:
  - a. VAT.
  - b. Internal legal, financial / commercial and technical costs (which are included within council staffing costs and are not separable).
  - c. Costs recovered where the council has been successful in disputes.
  - d. The actual costs of the council's contractor (Birmingham Highways Ltd) or their advisory costs, which are deducted from council payments.

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

**J8      PFI Credits**

**Question:**

**In total, broken down by year, how much has the Council received in PFI credits from Government for the Highways Contract?**

**Answer:**

The council's PFI grant is a fixed grant of £50,311,300 per annum, which is paid on a quarterly basis. It has been paid by government since 7 June 2010. The totals are shown in the table below.

	<b>PFI Grant Income</b>	
	£	
<b>2010/11</b>	39,846,549	
<b>2011/12</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2012/13</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2013/14</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2014/15</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2015/16</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2016/17</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2017/18</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2018/19</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2019/20</b>	50,311,300	
<b>2020/21</b>	50,311,300	
<b>Total</b>	542,959,549	

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

**J9      CAZ Soft Launch**

**Question:**

**On what date did the Council inform the Government\JAQU that it would definitely not be implementing charging for the CAZ until 14 June?**

**Answer:**

There were a number of informal discussions with the Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU) about how the scheme would launch on 1 June 2021 and these covered a range of potential scenarios. Through such discussions JAQU's focus was on ensuring that the scheme launched in line with the objective of achieving compliance with the legal limit for nitrogen dioxide in the shortest possible time.

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

**J10     Parking**

**Question:**

**What is the total number of on and off street car parking spaces removed by the council since 2012 in the city centre and each district centre (listed separately).**

**Answer:**

The council does not hold data on the number of parking spaces that have been removed by the council.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DARIUS SANDHU**

**J11     Number 11**

**Question:**

**Please provide a copy of the assurances given by National Express that the Number 11 Bus Service will return to a fully circular route following the completion of the current roadworks in Perry Barr?**

**Answer:**

The 11 bus service provides key public transport accessibility for residents across the city and those in our adjoining districts. Further to my letter to the Managing Director seeking assurances that the 11 bus service will be returned to its full circular route as soon as possible, the attached was provided in response to my strong concerns.

The Council, Transport for West Midlands and National Express will continue to work closely to ensure a range of improvement works to enhance bus reliability are completed in an expedient manner to allow the normal routing to resume as soon as possible.



Our ref: DB/lab

30<sup>th</sup> June 2021

Sent by: Email : waseem.zaffar@birmingham.gov.uk

Cllr Waseem Zaffar MBE  
Birmingham City Council House  
Victoria Square  
Birmingham  
B1 1BB

Dear Councillor Zaffar

**No 11 bus route**

Thank you for your letter of 28 June 2021.

I can confirm that National Express West Midlands will be operating the 11 bus route in a different way from Sunday 4 July 2021. This is because of the disruption to the punctuality and reliability of service due to the roadworks at Perry Barr.

We have worked really hard behind the scenes with your officials and TfWM to try and NOT change how we run the 11. But between us, we just can't figure out a way for the works to be done without it affecting too many bus customers to an unacceptable degree - especially now that there are more cars on the roads as lockdown eases.

By organising the buses differently, 96% of our customers will get a much more punctual and reliable bus service while the roadworks continue.

As a transport operator, National Express would much prefer to run the 11 as a proper circular route. I am very pleased to hear you say that the key works should be significantly completed in October 2021. Our network team will keep working closely with your officials to understand the details of that, with the aim of getting back to running the buses round in the full circle as soon as possible.

In addition, the 11 route is a big focus of the work we're doing with TfWM on the West Midlands' Bus Service Improvement Plan (part of the National Bus Strategy). We are putting in plans - and will hopefully get funding - to address some of the other historical pinchpoints on the 11 route. We are determined to reverse the delays that have accumulated over the years as traffic has worsened, and try and make the service as fast as it used to be in previous decades.

I hope you find this information useful. As ever, please feel free to contact me at any time if I can help with anything.

Yours faithfully

David Bradford  
Managing Director  
National Express West Midlands  
[david.bradford@nationalexpress.com](mailto:david.bradford@nationalexpress.com)

[david.bradford@nationalexpress.com](mailto:david.bradford@nationalexpress.com) Birmingham B5 6DD

 [nxbus.co.uk](http://nxbus.co.uk)

West Midlands Travel Ltd. Digbeth, B5 6DD. Registered in England, No 02652253. Part of National Express Group



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**J12     CAZ Launch Delay**

**Question:**

**The decision to suspend payments and enforcement of the clean air zone from 1 June to 14 June meant foregoing £1.68m in revenue (based on 2/52 of projected first year income in the FBC) as well as being a decision that impacted on more than more ward. As such it was clearly a key decision. Whilst Labour's excessive delegation policy allows officer financial decision at this level it is far from clear that given previous cabinet decisions that this could have been taken under delegated authority. In any event there should still be a clear and dated record of the key decision, including sign offs. Whilst we clearly welcome any form of delay to charging the least well off in our city, for transparency, please provide a copy of this decision record.**

**Answer:**

The report to Cabinet on 19 January 2021 provided an update on the projected income for the Clean Air Zone. This update noted the impact on forecast income of two delays from the original launch date (January 2020). Similarly, the report noted potential additional pressures to the forecast income in the form of an increase in costs levied by the Government for the provision of its 'central services' and a maximum lifetime of six years (against the original business plan of 10 years) for the Clean Air Zone (on the basis that the Government had committed to providing its central services through to the end of financial year 2026/2027). On that basis any potential income during that period would have been significantly lower than the figure quoted in the question.

The update in January 2021 also made clear that the core objective for the Clean Air Zone was to accelerate compliance with the legal limit for nitrogen dioxide in the shortest possible time and while income could be generated the scheme was not designed with revenue generation in mind. The report also noted that while an update to forecast income had been provided the forecasts were still subject to a high degree of uncertainty and that an updated income and expenditure forecast would be provided once 'live' data from the scheme was available.

As this was an operational decision taken in consultation between the Head of Service, Senior Responsible Officer and Cabinet Member, no formal decision record was required.

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

**J13     Highways Repairs**

**Question:**

**Please provide a breakdown of how much has been spent per ward on highways repairs since 2018**

**Answer:**

The council's costs for Highway Maintenance and Management services covers the full range of services within the scope of its contract. "Highways repairs" is not a specific term and the costs for "repairs" cannot be separated from other costs such as inspections, surveys, overheads and support.

The council does not record details of spending on a ward basis. This is for two reasons:

- i. The costs are paid for under a single highway maintenance and management contract for the city; and
- ii. Costs are not attributed individually to wards, as the boundaries of wards are not necessarily the same as the areas used for highway maintenance.

However, total spend is set out per year as follows:

	<b>Highways Expenditure</b>
<b>Financial Year:</b>	£
<b>2018/19</b>	41,626,169.06
<b>2019/20</b>	55,890,982.12
<b>2020/21</b>	77,745,152.16
<b>Total</b>	<b>175,262,303.34</b>

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

**J14     Highways Repairs 2021/22**

**Question:**

**Please provide a breakdown of how much will be spent in total on highways repairs in 2021/22 including the funding sources for this (i.e. new pfi credits, money from highways contract previously held back, new general fund commitments etc)**

**Answer:**

The council's costs for Highway Maintenance and Management services covers the full range of services within the scope of its contract. "Highways repairs" is not a specific term and the costs for "repairs" cannot be separated from other costs such as inspections, surveys, overheads and support.

The council does not record details of spending on a ward basis. This is for two reasons:

- i. The costs are paid for under a single highway maintenance and management contract for the city; and
- ii. Costs are not attributed individually to wards, as the boundaries of wards are not necessarily the same as the areas used for highway maintenance.

However, total spend is set out per year as follows:

	<b>Highways Expenditure</b>
<b>Financial Year:</b>	£
<b>2018/19</b>	41,626,169.06
<b>2019/20</b>	55,890,982.12
<b>2020/21</b>	77,745,152.16
<b>Total</b>	<b>175,262,303.34</b>

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

**J15     Highways PFI Contract**

**Question:**

**The highways PFI required one for one replacement of felled trees on the highway. Can the cabinet member confirm this arrangement is being maintained, both in the contract with Kier and with proposed contractual arrangements in the future?**

**Answer:**

The Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract required that the service provider ensure that there is no overall decrease in the number of highway trees (without consent from the council) and that they comply with the council's Tree Policy.

The interim contract with Kier includes requirements to comply with the Tree Policy, which preserves this requirement.

There are no proposals at present to change this requirement for future contracts.

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

**J16     Perry Barr Railway Station**

**Question:**

**At cabinet he blamed the combined authority for complexities and delays in the works at Perry Barr caused by the building of a new rail station. As this project was always part of Perry Barr regeneration, could he explain in what way it has caused unexpected delays or complications?**

**Answer:**

The evolving design of the rail station has required a change in the construction methodology being used by the contractor. This has resulted in the lane closure on the A34 being required for longer than anticipated further complicating the overall traffic management arrangements being coordinated across the various projects in Perry Barr.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**K      Environmental Health Enforcement**

**Question:**

**In each of the last 5 years, how many complaints have been received by Environmental Health that related to properties where the Council is landlord and how many of these complaints resulted in enforcement action being taken?**

**Answer:**

We cannot provide the information requested. Environmental Health receives jobs whether they be statutory nuisances, pest control, drainage etc. and will require the owner, occupier or other relevant person to take action to remedy problems as necessary. As a result, we record the name of the relevant person, but we do not record the ownership of a property i.e. whether it is owner occupied, private or a public landlord. Below is a table of the number of Requests for Assistance (Service requests) Environmental Health receive over a 5-year period.

Area of work	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Animal Welfare (dogs only)	3,405	3,317	3,187	2,422	2,070
Pest Control	14,868	14,876	17,798	16,445	16,919
Request for Assistance	21,919	20,469	31,524	27,675	35,885
Coronavirus related				24	6,369
Grand Total	40,192	38,662	52,509	46,566	61,243



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM  
COUNCILLOR DARIUS SANDHU**

**L      Booths Lane/Sandy Lane**

**Question:**

**As part of Planning Application 2013/09475/PA, and any other linked applications for the development at Booths Lane/Sandy Lane, please provide a breakdown of s106 agreements, including the total amount agreed, the total amount spent, the amount spent on individual projects, which ward these projects were in, and which ward councillors approved each one and on what date.**

**Answer:**

Planning obligations, also known as Section 106 agreements are agreements made between local authorities and developers and can be attached to a planning permission to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. Planning Obligations are used for three purposes:

- **Prescribe** the nature of development (for example, requiring a given portion of housing is affordable)
- **Compensate** for loss or damage created by a development (for example, loss of open space)
- **Mitigate** a development's impact (for example, through increased public transport provision).

Planning obligations must be directly relevant to the proposed development.

2013/09475/PA was for 'Clearance of driving range and associated buildings and redevelopment of site (including part of associated golf range) to provide 249 new build dwellings together with realignment of Booths Lane. Other works to include provision of children's play area and associated works'. It was considered at the planning cttee meeting held on the 29<sup>th</sup> May 2014. It was resolved minded to approve subject to the completion of a section 106 legal agreement to secure the following:

- i. The provision of 46 houses to be provided for rent and/or intermediate rent.
- ii. The provision of a financial contribution of £380,000 to be paid upon implementation (index linked from the 17th April 2014) for the provision of public open space provision/improvement and or sports/ recreational purposes in the area or to be spent on any other purpose that shall be agreed in writing between the City Council

and the party responsible for paying the sum provided that any alternative spend purpose has been approved by the Council Planning Committee.

The contribution of £380,000 towards off site public open space improvements was as compensation for the loss of the driving range and part of the golf course. The applicant had provided a financial viability appraisal of the scheme that demonstrates that the development would be unviable with a contribution higher than £380,000. In order to provide flexibility in determining the final spend of this money, it was agreed that this sum be allowed to be used for public open space provision/improvement and or sports/ leisure/recreational purposes in the area. The S106 was subsequently completed and the planning permission issued on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

£392.844 was received (with interest) and as the site was on the border of Oscott and Parry Barr wards, meetings were held with both sets of ward councillors who put forward a schedule of sites for improvement. Meetings and approvals were also sought from District and District Parks Managers, Friends of Queslett Nature Reserve and Friends of Turnberry Park. The money was spent as follows:

- £79,450 (including maintenance) was spent for the extension to the existing skate park in Perry Park (including maintenance) – Perry Barr Ward
- £139,480 (including maintenance) was spent on path improvement and street furniture at Queslett Nature Reserve, for laying out 300m grass running track at Glenmead unattached School Playing Field, fencing and storage container at Turnberry Park – Perry Barr and Oscott Wards
- £5,000 to develop masterplan for Turnberry Park – Perry Barr Ward
- £170,475 for new MUGA and path improvement works at Turnberry Park and upgrading existing lighting between the subway and Forgers Lane – Perry Barr Ward (NB – Since this approval, additional match funding has been approved by Veolia, reducing the S106 commitment).

There is approximately £20,000 remaining in the account and the Neighbourhoods Team will discuss options for these remaining monies (expiring January 2022).