



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD  
ON TUESDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE COUNCIL  
CHAMBER, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:-** Lord Mayor (Councillor Yvonne Mosquito) in the Chair.

**Councillors**

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RECORDING**

- 19098 The Lord Mayor advised that the meeting would be webcast for live and subsequent broadcasting via the Council's internet site and that members of the Press/Public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

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

---

**DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

- 19099 The Lord Mayor reminded members that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests arising from any business to be discussed at this meeting.
- 

**MINUTES**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

- 19100 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2018 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

---

**LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Death of Former Lord Mayor's Consort John Donnelly**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Lord Mayor's Consort John Donnelly who served alongside his wife Honorary Alderman Sue Anderson who was Lord Mayor of Birmingham 1998-1999 and Deputy Lady Mayoress from 1999-2000.

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

- 19101 **RESOLVED:-**

That this Council places on record its sorrow at the death of former Lord Mayor's Consort John Donnelly and its appreciation of his devoted service to the residents of Birmingham; it extends its deepest sympathy to members of his family in their sad bereavement.

---

**2. Poppy Appeal**

19102 The Lord Mayor reminded all in the Chamber that the annual Poppy Appeal was launched that day and if Members had not got a poppy there were plenty of our Armed Forces personnel selling them on Victoria Square and throughout the city centre.

The Lord Mayor noted that 2018 marked the centenary of the end of the First World War; and the City's commemorations were being overseen by Councillor Tristan Chatfield. A 'Tommy' silhouette was outside of the Council House; and on Sunday, ahead of the Remembrance Day Service and Parade, she would be unveiling a commemorative paving stone at the Hall of Memory.

---

**PETITIONS**

**Petition Relating to City Council Functions Presented prior to the Meeting**

The following petition was presented:-

(See document No. 1)

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

19103 **RESOLVED:-**

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

---

**Petitions Relating to External Organisations Presented at the Meeting**

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 2)

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

19104 **RESOLVED:-**

That the petitions be received and referred to the relevant external organisation.

---

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

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 3)

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

19105 **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. 4)

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19106 **RESOLVED:-**

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

---

**QUESTION TIME**

19107 The Council proceeded to consider Oral Questions in accordance with Standing Order 10.3.

During a reply from Councillor Majid Mahmood to a question from Councillor Zaker Choudhry, Councillor Jon Hunt rose on a point of order to indicate that he felt that Councillor Mahmood's comment, that Councillor Choudhry did not know how to ask a question, offensive. Councillor Mahmood clarified that he had indicated that Councillor Choudhry had asked several questions when he should only be asking one.

Details of the questions asked are available for public inspection via the Webcast.

---

**APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNCIL**

The following schedule was submitted:-

(See document No. 5)

Following further nominations it was:-

19108

**RESOLVED:-**

That appointments be made by the City Council for Members to serve on the Committees and other bodies set out below:-

**Standards Committee**

Following the City Council decision on 11 September 2018 to amend the composition of the Standards Committee (Minute No. 19090 refers) to the following:-

- 6 Councillors which will be made up of 2 Councillors from each of the 3 largest political parties represented on the City Council;
- 6 Independent lay members
- 1 Member of New Frankley in Birmingham Parish Council
- 1 Member of Sutton Coldfield Parish Council

the following Councillors be appointed in place of the current Councillors for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2019:-

Councillor Carl Rice (Lab)  
Councillor Julie Johnson (Lab)  
Councillor Deirdre Alden (Con)  
Councillor Adrian Delaney (Con)  
Councillor Paul Tilsley (Lib Dem)  
Councillor Neil Eustace (Lib Dem)

and it be noted that arrangements for identifying 6 Independent lay members are underway and the 2 Parish Councillors remain the same.

**Economy and Skills Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Lou Robson (Lab) to replace Councillor Karen McCarthy (Lab) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2019.

**Independent Remuneration Panel**

Appoint Honorary Alderman Fergus Robinson (Con) for the period 15 September 2018 -14 September 2022 as a co-opted member.

**WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Peter Fowler (Con) to replace Councillor Ken Wood (Con) as the main Member and Councillor Ken Wood (Con) to replace Councillor Maureen Cornish (Con) as the substitute Member for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2019.

**Co-ordinating Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Charlotte Hodiola (Con) to replace Councillor Maureen Cornish (Con) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2019.

**Children's Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Kerry Jenkins (Lab) to replace Councillor Safia Akhtar (Lab) for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2019.

---

**EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDERS**

It was moved by Councillor Martin Straker Welds, seconded and

19109 **RESOLVED:-**

That, pursuant to discussions by Council Business Management Committee, Standing Orders be waived as follows:

- Allocate 60 Minutes for item 9 (Birmingham and Solihull Draft Sustainability and Transformation Partnership Strategy)
- 

**BIRMINGHAM AND SOLIHULL DRAFT SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY**

The following report of the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care was submitted:-

(See document No. 6)

Councillor Paulette Hamilton moved the motion which was seconded.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Matt Bennett and Robert Alden gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 7)

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

A debate ensued.

Councillor Paulette Hamilton replied to the debate

The amendment 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 with names listed in seat number order was as follows:-

(See document No. 8)

The total results referred to in the interleave read:-

Yes – 32 (For the amendment)

No – 47 (Against the amendment)

Abstain – 0 (Abstentions)

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

It was therefore-

19110 **RESOLVED:-**

That the City Council:

- notes the draft Birmingham and Solihull Transformation Partnership Plan;
- welcomes the opportunity to shape the plan and the wider engagement within our communities; and
- notes that a final document reflecting feedback will be submitted for approval to the STP Board in April 2019.

---

### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

19111 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council be adjourned until 1705 hours on this day.

The Council then adjourned at 1635 hours.

At 1705 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 Standing Order 4(i).

**A. Councillor Simon Morrall and Alex Yip have given notice of the following motion.**

(See document No. 9)

Councillor Simon Morrall moved the Motion, which was seconded by Councillor Alex Yip.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Simon Morrall replied to the debate.

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

It was therefore-

19112

**RESOLVED:-**

This Council welcomes the Government announcement of a new campaign to tackle Mental Health – Every Mind Matters – which will be piloted first in the West Midlands, alongside new funding for the Samaritan's Helpline, the appointment of the first UK Minister for Suicide Prevention and plans for an annual 'State of the Nation' report on young people's mental wellbeing.

This Council notes that

- In England one person dies every two hours as a result of suicide
- Despite some significant reductions over the last 35 years, suicide still claimed 5,688 lives in 2016. In Birmingham around 70 people take their own life each year
- Suicide is currently the biggest killer of men under the age of 50 and men are three times more likely than women to be a victim of suicide with this gender gap growing over the last 35 years
- Men working in the lowest skilled occupations have a 44% higher risk of suicide than men as a whole
- Carers, both men and women, have a higher risk of suicide than average
- For a coroner to conclude that a suicide has taken place, a strict standard of proof – “beyond reasonable doubt” – must be met. This means that statistics on suicide are likely to be significantly underreported.

The Council also notes that the government's third progress report on its cross-departmental strategy 'Preventing Suicide in England' required every local area to put in place a multi-agency suicide prevention plan by the end of 2017. In Birmingham, an action plan led by the Birmingham and Solihull CCG is in place but the Council believes that given the importance of the matter, this should be reviewed and formally adopted by Full Council to give it greater visibility as well as parity with other partnership led strategies and plans.

This Council therefore calls on the Executive to:

- Update local plans to reflect new opportunities arising from recent Government policy announcements



- Bring the area action plan back to full Council for formal adoption and debate
  - Once adopted, ask Scrutiny to track progress against the Action Plan, reporting back to Full Council if the committee believes it necessary to update.
- 

**B. Councillor Jon Hunt and Mike Ward have given notice of the following motion.**

(See document No. 10)

Councillor Jon Hunt moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Mike Ward.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Ian Ward and John O'Shea gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 11)

Councillor Ian Ward moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor John O'Shea.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Paul Tilsley and Morriam Jan gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 12)

Councillor Paul Tilsley moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Morriam Jan.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Gary Sambrook and Adam Higgs gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 13)

Councillor Gary Sambrook moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Adam Higgs.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Jon Hunt replied to the debate during which he indicated that Councillor Paul Tilsley had indicated that the words ' - and therefore affirms that a decision on proceeding with Brexit should be approved or rejected in a public vote with the option to remain included' be deleted from his amendment. Councillor Paul Tilsley confirmed he was content for the wording to be removed.

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

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

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

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-

19113

**RESOLVED:-**

Council notes with concern the continuing and growing confusion surrounding the Brexit talks and their impact on business, training and research in the West Midlands.

Council reiterates its statement, agreed in Council, from July 2016 that it wishes to retain “as close ties as possible” with our friends, colleagues, cities and regions across Europe and continue to gain mutual benefit from sharing knowledge and expertise with each other.

It also believes it is timely to celebrate the continued peace, democratic strength and relative prosperity of our city alongside other cities of the European Union following the devastating wars of the last century.

It also continues to celebrate the huge contribution of citizens of other European countries to our city, including in the provision of social and health care.

Council recognises the concerns and hopes expressed by citizens who voted both ways in 2016 and notes that there is now a great deal more information about the options available and the risks to Birmingham of the UK leaving the EU than there was during the 2016 referendum.

It notes with particular alarm the evidence of dis-investment and delayed investment in major industries within our region as a result of uncertainty and the threat of restrictions on trade and movement of labour arising from some of the Brexit options.

Council recognises that the citizens of Birmingham voted narrowly to leave the EU in 2016 but notes they were not given any choice about or much information on the range of options involved in departing the EU and the impact of these options on the development of the city and its ability to provide services.

It, therefore, calls on the executive to press the government to ensure that the present electorate is satisfied with whatever arrangements are proposed for the UK’s future relationship with the EU and the impact on Birmingham.

Should parliament vote down the Government’s Brexit deal or the talks end in no deal, this Council believes this would constitute a loss of confidence in

the Government. In these circumstances, the best outcome for the country is an immediate General Election.

If there is no immediate General Election, Council supports all options remaining on the table, including campaigning for a public vote that includes the option to remain.

If the Government is confident in negotiating a deal that working people, our economy and communities in Birmingham will benefit from, they should not be afraid to put that deal to the public.

Council reaffirms its policy that those eligible and aged 16 or above should be entitled to vote.

Council further, therefore, re-affirms its desire to continue to be a member of Eurocities to maintain our city's links and influence with our European neighbours.

The Council resolves that the Leader of the Council will write within seven days to all the Members of Parliament in the City, the Members of the European Parliament for this region and to the Mayor of the West Midlands to make the Council's position clear.

Council further notes the specific benefits the city and the City Council have received from the EU, including a billion pounds over 25 years, together with £240 million worth of research grants to local universities.

Noting the economic benefits the city has enjoyed from EU membership and unfettered trade with EU countries, Council believes the success of any proposed deal should be measured against the benefits of remaining in the EU.

---

**C. Councillor Ian Ward and Sharon Thompson have given notice of the following motion.**

(See document No. 14)

The Lord Mayor advised that as the finishing time for the meeting had been reached the remaining motions and amendments should be moved and seconded formally (without comment) and following which they would be put to the vote without discussion.

Councillor Ian Ward formally moved the Motion which was formally seconded by Councillor Sharon Thompson.

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

(See document No. 15)

Councillor Debbie Clancy formally moved the amendment and in doing so indicated that she wish to add the words ‘as for example defined in the 27 November 2014 Guidance on promoting British Values in schools’ after the words ‘British values’.

The amended amendment was formally seconded by Councillor Meirion Jenkins.

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

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

It was therefore-

19114

**RESOLVED:-**

The Council notes the UK Government's commitment to the delivery of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The 17 SDGs have substantial cross-party support and the council commits to supporting the delivery of the SDGs in partnership with the UK Government, ensuring the Birmingham Commonwealth Games in 2022 is used as a further opportunity to promote the goals through the universality and global appeal of sport. This Council also recognises that the use of technology has a clear role to play in helping to deliver sustainable development, cleaning the air we breathe and eliminating poverty.

Further this Council believes that the surest way of achieving genuine sustainable development within and across nations is through a commitment to the values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect. As such it calls upon the Council to commit to these as ‘British values’ as for example defined in the 27 November 2014 Guidance on promoting British values in schools and to promoting them locally alongside the sustainable development goals.

**Overview of UN Sustainable Development Goals**

The SDGs recognise that ending poverty and other deprivations must go hand-in-hand with strategies that improve health and education, reduce inequality, and spur economic growth – all while tackling climate change and working to preserve our oceans and forests.

The goals are:

- End poverty in all its forms everywhere
- End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

## **City Council – 6 November 2018**

- Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
- Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
- Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
- Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
- Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
- Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
- Reduce inequality within and among countries
- Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
- Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
- Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
- Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
- Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
- Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
- Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

---

The meeting ended at 1845 hours.

**APPENDIX**

Questions and replies in accordance with Standing Order 10.2.

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

**A1      Severance Packages**

**Question:**

**I understand that Government guidance is that severance packages of more than £100,000 should be reported to full Council. Will the Leader be complying with this guidance?**

**Answer:**

Yes and the Council will be taking steps to comply with the guidance in the near future.

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

**A2     Sale of NEC**

**Question:**

**Given the re-sale of the NEC, with a mark-up of more than 100%, what steps are being taken to review the advice given to the Council when it sold the site in 2015?**

**Answer:**

The City Council sold the NEC Group in 2015 following a widely marketed bid process, on the basis of independent professional advice. We are working with advisers to review the transaction.

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

**A3      Benefits and Costs of Eurocities**

**Question:**

**Can the Leader set out the benefits - and costs - of the City's membership of Eurocities?**

**Answer:**

The Motion in your name on today's agenda paper calls on the Council to "reaffirm its desire to continue to be a member of Eurocities". So presumably you already are aware of the benefits of the city's continued membership.

However, if it helps I set out below my thoughts on the benefits of continued membership of Eurocities.

Eurocities currently has a 'full' membership of over 140 European cities. Full membership of the Eurocities network is €15,820 per annum.

As part of the Governance of Eurocities, 12 of its members form its Executive Committee. Executive Committee membership costs €21,540 per annum. The Executive Committee is the ultimate decision making arm of the network. Birmingham currently has a seat on the Executive Committee which operates in three year terms and a city's seat on the Executive Committee is voted by the membership of the network through its AGM.

In terms of the benefits of Eurocities membership, this can be summarised as:

- 1. Benefitting from networking in key thematic policy areas:**  
Eurocities is organised into policy forums including, social affairs, transport/mobility, environment, economic development, knowledge society, culture. Within these forums there are a range of working groups where cities work collaboratively in topics such as employment, affordable housing, air quality, waste, etc.
- 2. Learning from other cities**  
The structure of Eurocities as described above allows cities participating in those forums and working groups to learn the different approaches taken by other cities in tackling specific policy issues.
- 3. Shaping the Urban Policy agenda**  
Eurocities is the largest European network of cities and arguably the most well-known and influential in urban policy terms. It has significant lobbying, advocacy and most importantly influence with regards to adapting and shaping EU policy, funding, legislation and regulation



which impacts on cities. Interestingly membership of Eurocities post-Brexit will allow Birmingham influence over EU policy, legislation and regulation which may still affect us through post-Brexit trading of goods and services. UK government will not have such access as it would no longer have a seat on the European Council.

**4. Engaging in European projects**

Birmingham City Council currently has over £103m of EU grant funding some of which is via collaborative projects with Eurocities members. Eurocities also lead on EU funded projects which Birmingham is often invited to participate in.

**5. Building an international profile for your city**

Membership and active participation in Eurocities provides significantly enhanced visibility and profile for your city. As an active member and Executive Committee member we will often be invited to contribute to high level political and thematic dialogue with key European leaders and institutions where our city can also be used as an illustration of knowledge, innovation and good practice. Over the years, Birmingham has also chaired Social Affairs, Environment and Culture Forums which has brought many European city representatives into Birmingham.

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

**A4      Cabinet Advisors**

**Question:**

**What is the full list of Cabinet Advisors you appointed and why was this not reported to Council?**

**Answer:**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
Mike Sharpe	Armed Forces
Phil Davis	Heritage
Lucy Seymour-Smith	Strategic Partnerships
Josh Jones	Customer Services
Kath Scott	Transparency
Olly Armstrong	Culture
Alex Aitken and Kerry Jenkins	Young People and Skills
Diane Donaldson	Corporate Parenting
Zafar Iqbal	SEND
Fred Grindrod	Air Quality
Chaman Lal	Major Transport Projects
Shabrana Hussain	Street Cleansing
Keith Linnecor	Fly Tipping
Mary Locke	Carers
Mick Brown	Social Isolation
Karen McCarthy	Localisation
Saddak Miah	Private Rented Sector
Nicky Brennan	Domestic Abuse
Mohammed Idrees	Third Sector Partnerships

These are advisory roles and there is no requirement to report them to Council.

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

**A5     Paradise Late Report**

**Question:**

**On what date\time did you approve the late report on Paradise Circus for inclusion on the Cabinet Agenda on 9 October?**

**Answer:**

I signed the report on 5 October 2018.

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

**A6      Centenary Square Delays**

**Question:**

**What are the reasons for the 12 month delay to the works on  
Centenary Square?**

**Answer:**

The Centenary Square project commenced on site in April 2017 and was due to be completed in October 2018. The final phase is now due to be completed in July 2019, which represents a 9 month delay.

The delays are primarily due to unforeseen issues identified during the construction process including a requirement to redesign a plant room, remove underground obstructions and undertake utility diversions of a more complex nature than expected. Programme delays have also been compounded by the need to re-phase and coordinate public access routes across the site and to surrounding premises including the new HSBC headquarters.

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

**A7      Centenary Square Costs**

**Question:**

**What is the total cost implications to the Council of the delays to the works on Centenary Square including any loss of revenue (e.g. from Christmas Market and the Big Wheel)?**

**Answer:**

Based on a project completion date of July 2019, the additional cost to the Council resulting from contract delays on Centenary Square will be reported to Cabinet shortly.

There will be no loss of revenue associated with the Big Wheel and Ice Rink as they are being accommodated at Eastside City Park.

Loss of Revenue associated with the Craft Markets 2018 is estimated at £20,000.

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

**A8 Commonwealth Games Costs**

**Question:**

**How much has been spent by any council department so far on any aspect of the Commonwealth Games (broken down by department) between the announcement of the bid and now?**

**Answer:**

Costs attributable to the Commonwealth Games that are not a part of “business as usual” activities are separately captured, rather than being embedded within individual service budgets. The following table sets out total expenditure incurred between the award of the Games to Birmingham and the end of September 2018.

	Revenue Expenditure (£'000)	Capital Expenditure (£'000)	Total Expenditure (£'000)
<b>Games Village Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>9,554</b>	<b>9,642</b>
Accommodation	47	9,549	9,596
Wider Village	24	-	24
Perry Barr Regeneration	17	5	22
<b>Alexander Stadium Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Other Costs</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>239</b>
Team Costs - Staffing Costs	155	-	155
Activities - Gold Coast Observers Programme	84	-	84
<b>OC Funded Costs</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>158</b>
OC Funded Costs	158	-	158
<b>Total Revenue &amp; Capital Costs</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>9,591</b>	<b>10,076</b>

It should be noted that the OC funded costs (£0.158million) are anticipated to be reimbursed by the Organising Committee in due course, reducing the net Council expenditure at this stage to £9.918million, of which £9.642million relates to initial works on the Athletes Village at Perry Barr and £0.037m capital costs on Alexander Stadium.

The remaining revenue costs of £0.239m will be met from the Commonwealth Games earmarked reserve set aside for this purpose.

All expenditure identified above (both revenue and capital) falls within existing approved budgets for the delivery of the Commonwealth Games.

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

**A9      Athletes Village**

**Question:**

**What proportion of housing in the council's bid to government for funding for the athletes village was made up of social housing and what was the proportion finally agreed?**

**Answer:**

The Planning Application for the Athletes' Village, and the bid to Government, propose 24% affordable housing.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

**A10     Commonwealth Games Governance**

**Question:**

**What is the overall governance structure for Commonwealth Games committees, including who from the Council sits on each committee and what each is responsible for?**

**Answer:**

The governance structure for the Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth Games is set out in the Host City Contract signed by the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF), Commonwealth Games England (CGE), Birmingham City Council (BCC) and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) when we won the bid in December 2017. The governance structure was designed by the CGF based on best practice from previous games.

The key meetings are as follows:

Commonwealth Games Strategic Board

Member: BCC Leader

Standing Attendee: BCC Chief Executive

The purpose of the Strategic Board is to provide strategic direction, guidance and oversight of Games-wide planning and delivery of contractual obligations, Games vision and legacy.

Commonwealth Games Chief Executive Group

Member: BCC Chief Executive (Co-Chair of the Group)

Standing Attendee: BCC Project Director

The purpose of the Chief Executives (CEO) Group is to facilitate coordinated cross-partner decision making, communication and issue resolution.

Cross Partner Working Groups

As prescribed in the Host City Contract, there are a number of key working groups where BCC have appropriate officer representation. The key groups are:

Capital Programmes

Security

Transport

Strategic Communications

Budget

Organising Committee Board



Member: BCC Leader

The primary delivery vehicle for the games is the Birmingham 2022 Organising Committee (OC). The OC is a non-departmental government body and a separate entity to BCC. The purpose of the Organising Committee Board is to provide strategic direction and decision making, to enable the Organising Committee execute the delivery of the B2022 Sport programme and supporting operations.

#### **BCC Internal Games Governance**

In addition BCC has internal governance arrangements to ensure that internally we deliver our commitments as set out in the Host City Contract. A key meeting is the Members Advisory Group made up of 8 cross party Councillors who offer advice, and input and influence the development of BCC's responsibilities for the games.

BCC internal and officer governance arrangements are owned and managed by the BCC Project Director and their Project Team.

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

**A11     NEC Sale**

**Question:**

**Following the £307m sale of the NEC, what was the actual net gain to the council of the sale after deducting legal and transaction costs plus any other liabilities such as pensions?**

**Answer:**

The net value of the transaction is currently estimated to be around £260m, depending on the future performance of the NEC pension schemes, which is broadly in line with the figure reported to Cabinet at the time.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR SUZANNE WEBB**

**A12     NEC Sale Revenue Impact**

**Question:**

**What revenue had to be removed from the council budget in the medium and long term financial plans due to the sale of the NEC?**

**Answer:**

The net impact on the City Council's revenue budgets was as follows:

£25million in 2015/16  
£31million in 2016/17  
£40million in 2017/18  
£41million in 2018/19 and thereafter

This is broadly in line with the figure reported to Cabinet at the time.

Following the sale of the NEC Group, the City Council no longer receives the Group's trading income and the City Council continues to meet the cost of all the outstanding debt raised to fund the NEC Group capital assets. However, following the sale, the City Council has retained the freehold of all NEC Group sites and short leases at The ICC Birmingham and Arena Birmingham.

The legacy costs have remained since the sale proceeds were not used to pay off historic NEC debts.

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

**A13     Community Infrastructure Levy 1**

**Question:**

**How much money has been raised in Community Infrastructure Levy since it was introduced?**

**Answer:**

CIL was adopted on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and an annual report is published online (in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended)).

Funds received are allocated in accordance with Regulations, with 15% allocated to the Ward in which development takes place, and 5% allocated to the monitoring and administration of CIL. The remaining 80% is allocated to the strategic, city wide CIL.

Financial Year	5% M&A (£)	15% Local CIL (£)	80% Strategic CIL (£)	TOTAL (£)
2015/16	0	0	0	
2016/17	7,582.63	22,747.89	121,322.07	151,652.59
2017/18	110,396.48	331,189.44	1,766,343.68	2,207,929.60
2018/19 to date	79,962.88	239,888.65	1,279,406.11	1,599,257.64
TOTAL TO DATE	197,941.99	593,825.98	3,167,071.86	3,958,839.83

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

**A14     Community Infrastructure Levy 2**

**Question:**

**How much money has been spent of Community Infrastructure Levy funds since it was introduced?**

**Answer:**

The Community Infrastructure Levy was adopted on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016.

Funds received are allocated in accordance with Regulations, with 15% allocated to the Ward in which development takes place, and 5% allocated to the monitoring and administration of CIL. The remaining 80% is allocated to the strategic, city wide CIL.

Financial Year	5% M&A (£)	15% Local CIL (£)	80% Strategic CIL (£)	TOTAL (£)
2015/16	0	0	0	
2016/17	7,582.63	22,747.89	121,322.07	151,652.59
2017/18	110,396.48	331,189.44	1,766,343.68	2,207,929.60
2018/19 to date	79,962.88	239,888.65	1,279,406.11	1,599,257.64
TOTAL TO DATE	197,941.99	593,825.98	3,167,071.86	3,958,839.83

To date, no Community Infrastructure Levy funds have been spent on specific projects. However, a payment has been made to Sutton Coldfield Town Council, in line with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

The CIL regulations require the City Council to pass the local CIL receipt to parish or town councils. For the wards covered by Sutton Coldfield Town Council, a payment of £16,969.61 was made to the Town Council in September 2018 (this figure is included in the Local CIL contribution outlined in the table above). No payment has been made to Sutton Coldfield Town Council for 2018/19 but is due to be made in November.

The local percentage can be spent on a wider range of things than the rest of the levy, provided that it meets the requirement to 'support the development of the area'. The wider definition means that the neighbourhood portion can be spent on things other than infrastructure. For example, the pot could be used to fund affordable housing where it would support the development of the area by addressing the demands that development places on the area.

Once the levy is in place, parish, town and community councils should work closely with their neighbouring councils and the charging authority to agree on infrastructure spending priorities. If the parish, town or community council shares the priorities of the charging authority, they may agree that the charging authority should retain the neighbourhood funding to spend on that infrastructure. It may be that this infrastructure (eg a school) is not in the parish, town or community council's administrative area, but will support the development of the area.

If a parish, town or community council does not spend its levy share within 5 years of receipt, or does not spend it on initiatives that support the development of the area, the charging authority may require it to repay some or all of those funds to the charging authority.

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

**A15    Community Infrastructure Levy 3**

**Question:**

**How much of the Community Infrastructure Levy raised in Birmingham has been spent outside Birmingham?**

**Answer:**

The Community Infrastructure Levy was adopted on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016.

No CIL funds raised within Birmingham have been spent outside the administrative boundary.

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

**A16     Community Infrastructure Levy 4**

**Question:**

**How much of the Community Infrastructure Levy raised in Birmingham has been spent on, or earmarked for, the Commonwealth Games?**

**Answer:**

To date, no Community Infrastructure Levy receipts have been spent on the Commonwealth Games.



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

**A17    JNC Paperwork**

**Question:**

**JNC paperwork for the 4 October meeting was again distributed less than 24 hrs in advance of the meeting. Do you think this is acceptable?**

**Answer:**

**No**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM  
COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

**A18    Cabinet Advisors**

**Question:**

**What actual powers do the Cabinet Advisors have?**

**Answer:**

Cabinet Advisors have no additional powers.

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

**B1      FOI Disclosure Log**

**Question:**

**Does every response to an FOI request appear on the disclosure log on the council website, if not what is the criteria for not publishing one, including who makes the decision?**

**Answer:**

No, not all FOI's are published on the disclosure log.

Circumstances in which responses are not published would include where the information is not held by the Council, repeat requests, such as details of Council Tax Credits / Empty properties, where hard copy information is required by the requestor or where the information is already published by the Council elsewhere.

The decisions are made on a case by case basis by the officers assigned to the request.

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

**B2      CT\NNDR Write-offs**

**Question:**

**On what date did you amend the cap on the write off limit for council tax and business rate arrears, including what the new limit is?**

**Answer:**

The limit for Officers writing off debts under delegated authority has not been changed. Debts are pursued for as long as it is economically feasible to do so, and are only written off when all options have been exhausted. The volume of such write-offs may fluctuate from time to time, dependent upon the caseload under review.

The amount written-off will vary and will need to take into account the following:

- The overall level of debt.
- The number of accounts which meets the write off criteria.
- The growth in the tax bases.

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

**B3      CT\NDR Write-offs 2?**

**Question:**

**What was justification for raising limit for Council Tax and Business Rate debts that officers could write-off each month?**

**Answer:**

The limit for Officers writing off debts under delegated authority has not been changed. Debts are pursued for as long as it is economically feasible to do so, and are only written off when all options have been exhausted. The volume of such write-offs may fluctuate from time to time, dependent upon the caseload under review.

The amount written-off will vary and will need to take into account the following:

- The overall level of debt.
- The number of accounts which meets the write off criteria.
- The growth in the tax bases.

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

**C1      Travel Assist**

**Question:**

**For each year since 2012, what has been the average spend per head on pupils using the Travel Assist\Home to School transport service?**

**Answer:**

There is no data available prior to August 2016. Birmingham does not currently have an IT solution that can break down the individual cost per pupil, therefore we base this on the number of pupils and annual spend. This results in an average cost of £4,500 per pupil.

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

**C2      Travel Assist Budget**

**Question:**

**For each year since 2012 what has been the allocated budget vs the actual outturn position for the Travel Assist\Home to School transport service?**

**Answer:**

**Travel Assist  
Budget V Actual**

			Budget	Actual	Variance
Financial year			£	£	£
17/18	Travel Assist	Net Expenditure	17,446,650	20,537,880	3,091,230
16/17	Travel Assist	Net Expenditure	13,543,745	18,249,493	4,705,748
15/16	Travel Assist	Net Expenditure	15,710,900	16,792,354	1,081,454
14/15	Travel Assist	Net Expenditure	16,570,440	15,503,558	(1,066,882)
13/14	Travel Assist	Net Expenditure	16,579,356	17,307,061	727,705
12/13	Travel Assist	Net Expenditure	17,392,445	16,884,196	(508,249)

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

**C3      Day Nurseries**

**Question:**

**It has been alleged in the local press that plans to close the city's last remaining day nurseries will in fact cost the city in excess of £2.5million in redundancy payments and potential claw-back on buildings when the council claimed this would save the city money. In the council's original plans to close the sites in September, reversed and paused in October, can you confirm how much the Council estimated the original closing of the community day nurseries would cost/save the city in each year of the MTFS?**

**Answer:**

The proposal being considered by the Council is to withdraw from direct service provision and to invite proposals for the delivery of childcare services by other organisations including Social Enterprise/Voluntary and Private Providers. By transferring the provision, the Council can reduce the impact of redundancy costs and enter into negotiations with the Department for Education regarding the clawback costs on the basis that the buildings will still be used to deliver services for children under 5 and their families.

The estimated total cost of redundancy for the Council-employed staff is £624,581 which includes an amount for the Pension strain.

The total clawback liability on the eleven buildings is £3.21m. Five of these buildings are also being used as Children's Centre Hubs by Birmingham Forward Steps which means that they are still being used and reduces the clawback liability from £3.21m to £2.29m.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S  
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

**C4     EHCPs**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years how many new EHCPs were requested, broken down by numbers granted, completed, refused, successfully appeal and unsuccessfully appealed?**

**Answer:**

	Requested	Started	Completed	Refused
1/4/15-31/3/16	1491	1007	971	349
1/4/16-31/3/17	1255	916	927	398
1/4/17-31/3/18	1302	821	776	399

Please note that the columns will not balance as the 20 week timescale can bridge more than one financial year.

In relation to appeals, the performance data currently collected and reported on does not break down appeal numbers for different categories of decision or for appeal outcomes. However, the data above does include all those EHCP assessments initiated as a result of appeals.

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

**C5     EHCPs**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years how many completed EHCPs were completed within the recommended 20 week period, how many were completed within a 30 week period, and how many took over 30 weeks?**

**Answer:**

	Within 20 weeks	Within 30 weeks	30 weeks plus
1/4/15-31/3/16	630 (91 exemptions)	274 (60 exemptions)	67 (18 exemptions)
1/4/16-31/3/17	846 (61 exemptions)	79 (64 exemptions)	2 (2 exemptions)
1/4/17-31/3/18	654 (72 exemptions)	120 (86 exemptions)	2 (2 exemptions)

Please note that the exemptions figures in brackets refer to exceptional circumstances in which it is not reasonable to expect the LA to comply with the statutory 20 week time limit - e.g. where assessment information is delayed due to school summer holidays.

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

**C6      Travel Assist Taxis**

**Question:**

**Please can you provide a breakdown of taxi use for the travel assist service, including how many routes under Travel Assist are currently provided through a taxi service, the average monthly cost of this taxi-provided service, average miles per journey and the range in cost (lowest and highest)?**

**Answer:**

With the current IT solution we are not able to update information until the start of the new academic year which is the busiest time for Travel Assist. During September and October the new routes are embedding in and can change on a daily basis. The allocation of bus passes is also a priority therefore there is a delay in updating the current IT solution. During October the IT solution is updated and should be complete by mid-November at the latest. Therefore the information requested above is not in a reportable format at the moment. We are happy to share this information with you when it is available.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ**

**D1      Interventions by Grade 3 staff working on waste collection  
crews**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member report how many interventions have been undertaken by Grade 3 staff working on the waste collection crews since they adopted new job descriptions in September?**

**Answer:**

The Waste Recycling and Collection Officers (WRCOs) are integral to the overall waste collection service. You will be aware of the move to a 5 day working week and the review of all collection rounds for Birmingham's 360,000 properties required significant changes to the service.

The WRCO role has been integral to identifying where there have been any difficulties in completing rounds and assisting management in reconfiguring workloads. Any data collected by WRCOs is being used to improve the service and importantly (and specifically) increase recycling activity.

The overall impact of this initial work will improve recycling rates. Specific individual interactions are being captured and the information will be provided in due course.

It is true that the link between the WRCO interaction and an increase in recycling is too early to quantify. We are monitoring daily activity and working with WRCO's to ensure they understand their new role and modifying the forms they are using to meet their need.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL  
EUSTACE**

**D2      Missed Collections - Percentages**

**Question:**

**The Cabinet Member cites percentages for missed collections. Could he state whether those percentages refer to the number of households missed by crews or the number of reports of missed collections made by members of the public, and, if the latter, explain what is being done to assess the full impact of the difficulties in implementing the new arrangements for waste collection?**

**Answer:**

The 'percentage of missed collections' refers to the number of reports of missed collections made by members of the public.

This is one of many metrics regularly being used by the Service to assess the impact of implementing the new arrangements. Other information used includes the daily feedback from the crews on roads not completed, together with reasons why this has occurred. Vehicle tracking software is being studied to assess the routes taken by the crews and the time taken to complete the new round structures together with tipping data which details the amount of waste being disposed of and capacity of vehicles. All of this information together with other data sets are being used to refine rounds on a daily basis to improve performance and reduce missed collections.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**D3      Missed collections**

**Question:**

**Please set out, by ward and month, the number of properties suffering missed collections since the beginning of May.**

**Answer:**

Find below numbers of individual property missed residual, recycling and garden missed collections as reported by residents. Duplicate reports of the same property and type of missed collection reported in the same week have been removed, where possible, so as to answer the question more accurately.

To put the below values into context Waste Management collect from 8331 Acocks Green ward properties per week, of which 434 are garden collection subscribers. So over a 4 week month period (4 x Residual, 2 x Recycling and 2 x Garden, as appropriate) Acocks Green ward receives 50 854 collections and in October 143 individual properties reported a missed collection.

Please note: Wards with a high garden collection customer base may not provide a true comparator to those wards where garden collection subscriptions are low.

Ward	Properties	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Ward	Properties	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct
Acocks Green	8331	57	52	57	51	83	143	Longbridge & West Heath	8359	140	117	155	110	276
Allens Cross	4284	70	79	128	53	68	130	Lozells	3112	16	9	10	19	41
Alum Rock	6686	21	26	29	26	40	48	Moseley	5746	43	42	27	52	188
Aston	6259	18	25	28	38	34	53	Nechells	2535	2	10	7	27	37
Balsall Heath West	3051	26	22	37	26	37	80	Newtown	1932	6	17	12	21	17
Bartley Green	9216	238	121	145	174	105	284	North Edgbaston	5975	114	98	71	76	99
Billesley	7235	105	108	106	85	107	155	Northfield	4105	65	57	46	51	133
Birchfield	3380	19	18	25	14	17	25	Oscott	8500	45	48	50	62	99
Bordesley & Highgate	2260	12	17	16	15	40	47	Perry Barr	7496	50	37	34	35	69
Bordesley Green	3580	20	37	18	17	20	23	Perry Common	4574	31	21	20	27	38
Bournbrook & Selly Park	5576	76	54	60	46	41	64	Pype Hayes	4481	43	33	34	60	45
Bournville & Cotteridge	6816	255	134	128	177	108	209	Quinton	8380	139	126	107	113	185
Brandwood & Kings Heath	6865	55	65	79	46	72	106	Rubery & Rednal	3805	91	68	44	64	56
Bromford & Hodge Hill	6441	117	34	136	50	48	106	Shard End	5063	32	53	19	46	118
Castle Vale	3492	58	32	25	34	26	49	Sheldon	7745	55	44	60	67	102
Druids Heath & Monyhull	3565	76	75	79	82	80	81	Small Heath	5391	19	19	21	22	33
Edgbaston	3175	108	147	97	85	136	242	Soho & Jewellery Quarter	6082	30	36	25	54	68
Erdington	7134	61	54	45	53	39	72	South Yardley	3785	27	20	9	29	54
Frankley Great Park	4979	138	97	68	52	65	133	Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East	7128	33	31	26	26	49
Garretts Green	3711	16	28	40	22	25	65	Sparkhill	5386	16	15	23	25	58
Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	8547	53	40	50	37	66	130	Stirchley	4197	58	25	44	33	69
Gravelly Hill	3208	27	29	30	22	23	42	Stockland Green	7873	75	85	52	66	84
Hall Green North	7122	34	39	43	29	42	120	Sutton Four Oaks	3278	34	29	44	46	65
Hall Green South	3922	35	20	15	11	18	38	Sutton Mere Green	3782	24	23	23	30	50
Handsworth	3455	24	46	24	12	12	29	Sutton Reddick	3727	23	33	29	36	99
Handsworth Wood	5765	40	61	39	37	44	50	Sutton Roughley	4404	29	37	27	31	104
Harborne	7037	163	200	216	119	151	419	Sutton Trinity	3546	29	24	22	15	64
Heartlands	3543	25	13	13	14	14	35	Sutton Vesey	7456	59	69	51	54	137
Highters Heath	4228	74	47	35	26	45	102	Sutton Walmley & Minworth	6374	53	45	45	35	114
Holyhead	3805	21	24	20	18	17	10	Sutton Wyde Green	3259	43	31	27	29	54
Kings Norton North	4238	176	74	37	135	79	178	Tyseley & Hay Mills	4175	23	19	14	22	56
Kings Norton South	4524	68	88	36	54	33	55	Ward End	3694	15	23	27	26	39
Kingstanding	8133	80	91	63	37	54	95	Weoley & Selly Oak	8375	90	138	72	86	303
Ladywood	2133	48	39	49	34	36	123	Yardley East	4072	36	13	13	38	94
								Yardley West & Stechford	3824	21	12	24	26	54

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER  
CHOUDHRY**

**D4      Waste Collections - New Rounds Drawn Up**

**Question:**

**Given that prior to September waste was collected five days a week, could the Cabinet Member explain why a system that implemented a five day working week for staff required new rounds to be drawn up?**

**Answer:**

Prior to the changes made to the service which was a 5 day operation, the employees worked a 9.125 hour day four days per week. Employees now work 5 days x 7.18 hours per day.

As a result the previous rounds which were based on the longer working day could not be completed in the new shorter 7.18 hr working day. It was therefore necessary to redesign all of the rounds servicing the City, whilst trying to keep the majority of residents on the same day of collection so as to cause minimum disruption.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

**D5 Weekly Missed Collections**

**Question:**

**For each week since the beginning of the financial year what has been the missed collection rate per 100,000 for the waste collection service? (please included the combined figure and broken down by type of refuse collection i.e. residual, recycling, green and trade)?**

**Answer:**

Below are the missed individual property collections as reported by residents for residual and recycling collections. Duplicate reports have been removed where the same property and type of missed collection have been reported in the same week multiple times, as far as is possible. Week 14 starts on Sunday 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 and the last complete week provided is Week 43, which ended on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2018.

Unlike the data for residual and recycling collections which is regularly provide as a 'per 100 000' missed collection return for corporate monitoring, the garden collection service is monitored within the service using actual numbers. Data in this format can be provided immediately, however due to the daily changing garden customer service base it will take a considerable amount of time to provide missed garden as a 'per 100 000' value.

Due to the nature of the Trade Service which includes in many instances multiple collections per property per week, the service do not hold the data in a format which would enable conversion into a 'per 100 000' value.

Week Received	RESIDUAL per 100 000	RECYCLING per 100 000	COMBINED per 100 000
14	86	95	85
15	78	89	81
16	90	141	96
17	67	107	77
18	61	129	77
19	73	107	79
20	68	109	76
21	66	111	75
22	64	96	70
23	65	93	70
24	78	102	77
25	73	82	73
26	79	121	86
27	86	105	83
28	71	117	80
29	79	86	75
30	90	119	90
31	69	101	72
32	70	109	75
33	60	101	71
34	75	90	76
35	68	82	67
36	71	88	77
37	76	88	80
38*	82	113	92
39	171	157	167
40	180	192	184
41	153	174	160
42	137	198	157
43	130	164	142



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID  
BARRIE**

**D6      Monthly Missed Collections**

**Question:**

**For each month since April 2016 what has been the missed collection rate per 100,000 for the waste collection service (please include the combined figure and broken down by type of refuse collection i.e. residual, recycling, green and trade)?**

**Answer:**

**Residual & Recycling Collections**

Due to collections being carried out weekly for residual and fortnightly for recycling it is only possible to answer this request on a weekly basis, rather than monthly as requested. Below are the missed individual property collections as reported by residents for residual and recycling collections.

**Please Note:** Duplicate reports have been removed where the same property and type of missed collection have been reported in the same week multiple times, as far as is possible. The weeks are calendar based rather than financial, with Week 1 being the 1<sup>st</sup> week in January and Week 52 being the last in December. As the amount of daily collections fluctuate on a daily basis as properties throughout the city are demolished and built, the below calculations are based on there being 351 911 residual collections, with half of those properties receiving a recycling collection per week.

**Garden Collections**

Unlike the data for residual and recycling collections which is regularly provide as a 'per 100 000' missed collection return for corporate monitoring, the garden collection service is monitored within the service using actual numbers. Data in this format can be provided immediately, however due to the daily changing garden customer service base it will take a considerable amount of time to provide missed garden as a 'per 100 000' value.

**Trade Collections**

Due to the nature of the Trade Service which includes in many instances multiple collections per property per week, the service do not hold the data in a format which would enable conversion into a 'per 100 000' value.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR BOB  
BEAUCHAMP**

**D7      WRCO Engagements**

**Question:**

**Since 17 September, for each different type of refuse collection (residual, recycling, green and trade) how many individual engagements have the new WRCOs issued to improve recycling rates, broken down by type of engagement (door knocked, leaflet left, warning issued, collection refused etc)?**

**Answer:**

The Waste Recycling and Collection Officers (WRCOs) are integral to the overall waste collection service. You will be aware of the move to a 5 day working week and the review of all collection rounds for Birmingham's 360,000 properties required significant changes to the service.

The WRCO role has been integral to identifying where there have been any difficulties in completing rounds and assisting management in reconfiguring workloads. Any data collected by WRCOs is being used to improve the service and importantly (and specifically) increase recycling activity.

The overall impact of this initial work will improve recycling rates. Specific individual interactions are being captured and the information will be provided in due course.

It is true that the link between the WRCO interaction and an increase in recycling is too early to quantify. We are monitoring daily activity and working with WRCO's to ensure they understand their new role and modifying the forms they are using to meet their need.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

**D8      Agency Staff**

**Question:**

**For each week since the beginning of the financial year, how much has been spent on agency staff within the waste collection service?**

**Answer:**

It has not been possible to identify accurately on a weekly basis spend incurred on agency staff, therefore the information has been provided on a monthly basis.

The financial information in the table below include the following service areas,  
Refuse Collection, Trade Waste, Green Waste and Co-Mingled Waste.  
The information for the months April-August is consistent with the financial information shared with Resources and Overview Scrutiny Committee on 18 October 2018, 'Financial Monitoring 2018/19 Month 5'. 'Financial Monitoring 2018/19 Month 6' information will be shared at Cabinet on the 13<sup>th</sup> November 2018.

<b>Month</b>	<b>£'000</b>
April *	285
May *	285
June	584
July	528
August	370
September	473
October	427
Total	2,952

\*The costs shown for April and May have been averaged for the two months, as financial year end accounting processes can impact on the value of invoices processed for payment.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE  
CLANCY**

**D9      Overtime**

**Question:**

**For each week since the beginning of the financial year, how much has been spent on overtime within the waste collection service?**

**Answer:**

Overtime is paid on a monthly basis in arrears.

The financial information in the table below include the following service areas, Refuse Collection, Trade Waste, Green Waste and Co-Mingled Waste. It is consistent with the financial information shared with Resources and Overview Committee on 18 October 2018, 'Financial Monitoring 2018/19 Month 5'

<b>Month</b>	<b>£'000</b>
April	136
May	129
June	89
July	89
August	94
<b>Total</b>	<b>537</b>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR MAUREEN  
CORNISH**

**D10     Missed Collection Catch-up**

**Question:**

**Since 17 September, for each different type of refuse collection (residual, recycling, green and trade) what percentage of reported missed collections have been collected within 24 hours, within 48 hours, within 5 days or more than 5 days?**

**Answer:**

Since the 17 September and to facilitate the bedding in of the new round structure the Service have been operating support crews which start later in the day and aim to collect missed collections within 24 to 48 hours.

Due to the way missed collection worksheets are closed, most do not reflect the exact time they were actually resolved it is therefore not possible to accurately provide the information as has been requested.

However we do know that we have been unable to meet our service commitment of collecting missed collections within 48 hours. Extra resources will be deployed this week to collect all outstanding roads as soon as possible.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN  
DELANEY**

**D11     Recommendations for Improvement**

**Question:**

**Please can you publish all 4 of the following reports relating to the waste management service for public inspection, or at least list all the recommendations contained within them, and circulate full copies of the reports to elected members?**

- **Service Improvements (cases for changes)**
- **Lessons Learnt (industrial action)**
- **MoU Requirements**
- **Waste Management Report (service failure report)**

**Answer:**

**I will ask the Acting Director of Place to arrange for appropriate reports to be made available**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM  
HIGGS**

**D12     Slabs in Cabs**

**Question:**

**What has been the total cost of the ‘slabs in cabs’ previously purchased, including purchase and running costs (up until the point they were replaced this year)?**

**Answer:**

The cost of the implementation of the “slabs in cabs” was £1.26m which covered hardware, software and services to deliver the slab solution. The overall costs include implementation and ongoing use.

The proposed ‘slab in cab’ replacement is currently under review and has not yet taken place. The planned project only includes the replacement of the actual ‘slab in cab’ hardware unit. All of the previously purchased associated software and services, which formed the majority of the initial cost, are compatible with the proposed new hardware and will remain in place.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR  
CHARLOTTE HODIVALA**

**D13     Slabs in Cabs Replacement testing**

**Question:**

**What testing was done with the staff (who will be using them) with the new tablets bought to replace the 'slabs in cabs' that those same workers didn't like?**

**Answer:**

A review of the technology for the waste collection service has been ongoing. The Waste Recycling and Collection Officer (WRCOs) roles have all been issued with equipment used to capture information about refuse collection and recycling.

Tracking systems are operational on each vehicle allowing management analysis of routes, break times and tipping times etc. The final piece of technology which will replace so-called 'slabs in cabs' is under review.

As part of the modernisation of this service, data collection is essential and therefore we will be working with Trades Unions and the workforce on ongoing technological advances.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR TIM  
HUXTABLE**

**D14     Slabs in Cabs Replacement costs**

**Question:**

**What was the total cost of replacing the 'slabs in cabs' with new equipment?**

**Answer:**

The proposed 'slab in cab' replacement is currently under review and has not yet taken place. The planned project only includes the replacement of the actual 'slab in cab' hardware unit. All of the previously purchased associated software and services, which formed the majority of the initial cost, are compatible with the proposed new hardware and will remain in place.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE  
FREEMAN**

**D15     HRC Permit Costs**

**Question:**

**What is the projected cost to the council of the proposed permit system for Household Recycling Centres?**

**Answer:**

The proposed permit system for Household Recycling Centres has not been scoped as yet. A business case is currently being developed which proposes a permit system for HRC. This has yet to be fully developed with the associated financial appraisal.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR PETER  
FOWLER**

**D16     Reporting Missed Collections**

**Question:**

**A number of residents who have complained about their missed collections have made clear their frustration at the difficulties they have had in reporting, with long hold times when they call and a voice message telling them to use the website. Some do not feel that the link to report a missed collection is prominent enough on the main website. It is not one of the large icons at the top of the page, but 6 down on the list of 'more on waste and recycling' and easy to miss, especially for someone who has already spent a long time trying to get through on the phone. Clearly the real answer to preventing the frustration with reporting missed collections is to not miss collections and where unavoidable service failures do occur, ensuring that people can report through the channel of their choice. However, whilst missed collections and contact centre issues persist would you at least commit to making the online 'report a missed collection' option a more prominent feature of the waste homepage, alongside the large icons you have for the revenue raising options of ordering charged for services?**

**Answer:**

Following your suggestion we have reviewed the related webpages and as a result are in the process of making changes so that it is easier to find the link to raise a missed collection.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN  
MACKEY**

**D17     5 Day Week**

**Question:**

**Was the move to a 5 day week permanent or is it subject to any further agreement or negotiations with the Unions?**

**Answer:**

The five day working week is a permanent change for the workforce and this has been agreed.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**D18     Waste Overspend**

**Question:**

**The Month 4 budget monitoring report forecast a £7.9m overspend in the Waste Management service but this was based on the assumption that the new MOU would be implemented on 1 September (which it wasn't) and that the new model would be 'cost neutral.' Given the delay in implementation and the 'teething problems' that have been apparent since its roll out began, what is the current position with the waste management budget, including additional costs (above budget) incurred since the end of August, details of mitigations found for this and the current forecast overspend?**

**Answer:**

The Month 4 financial information shared with Resources and Overview Committee on 20 September does not include the forecast overspend identified in the question

However the financial information shared with Resources and Overview Committee on 18 October 2018, '[Financial Monitoring 2018/19 Month 5](#)' states the following

'In the case of Place Directorate, the overspend of £7.9m relates to Waste Management services of £5.5m and Markets £1.1m, offset by other directorate net savings of £1.9m. In addition there are savings delivery challenges totalling £3.2m.'

The overspend for the Place Directorate as a whole is £7.9m of which £5.5m relates to Waste Management Service base budget pressures. The service is reporting a further £0.5m worth of savings forecast not to be delivered resulting in a total forecast overspend of £6.0m

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GARY  
SAMBROOK**

**D19     Waste Data Quality and Transparency**

**Question:**

**There is, perhaps understandably given their experience of the bin service over the last few years, some scepticism and a lack of trust amongst the public whenever you report an improvement in service performance. In order to combat this and to improve both data quality and transparency, will you commit to asking Internal Audit to carry out a review of data collection and reporting within the waste management service and sharing the results of that audit with elected members and the public?**

**Answer:**

The MoU agreement specifies specific review times; these are 6 and 12 months from the date of implementation.

A full and detailed audit will be undertaken to ensure we are complying with all elements of the MoU.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON  
MORRALL**

**D20     Missed Collections Contingency**

**Question:**

**What spare capacity (for staff and vehicles) is built into the operating model for waste collections to meet demand of missed collections?**

**Answer:**

There is 20% cover for drivers and vehicles on refuse collection, this is an industry standard.

As part of the agreed new model four 'mop-up' crews have been employed for up to four months to assist with the 'bedding-in' of the new working arrangements.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID  
PEARS**

**D21     Waste Collection Working Day**

**Question:**

**What is the breakdown of the typical working day now that waste collection crews are on a 5 day week (i.e. start time, time leave depot, breaks, return to depot, finish time)?**

**Answer:**

The working week consists of 5 days Monday to Friday of 7.18 hours per day with a 30 minute unpaid lunch break. Additionally because of the nature of the duties and working environment a 15 minute concessionary paid break is provided for.

A typical working day would be:

Start time 06:00

Leave depot 06:20 following mandatory vehicle checks

Breaks are taken at an appropriate point in the day and may be taken separately or amalgamated into one 45 minute break

Return to Depot, the crews return to the depot following completion of scheduled work, or where work is not completed in sufficient time to tip the vehicle and return keys and paperwork.

Finish 13:48

Vehicles are tracked in terms of routes taken, break times and tipping times.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN  
STREETS, WASTE AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH  
MOORE**

**D22    Waste Collection Peer Review**

**Question:**

**Given the long running problems with the waste management service, will you commit to an LGA led peer review in 12 months to review the implementation of the new operating model?**

**Answer:**

Your suggestion is noted and will be taken under consideration.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION,  
SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**E1      Culture Commissioning**

**Question:**

**What was the culture commissioning annual budget spent on in each financial year between 2015/16 and 2018/19?**

**Answer:**

**Birmingham City Council Culture Commissioning:**

Year	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Arts Revenue Commissioning	£5,952,000	£4,335,000	£2,772,000	£2,772,000
Arts Project Commissions and Associated Programmes	£473,457	£515,000*	£405,000	£405,000

\*The Arts Project Commissions and Associated Programmes figure in 2016-17, includes Arts Revenue Commissioning originally allocated to The Drum before its closure.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION,  
SKILLS AND CULTURE FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

**E2      CME IT ISSUES**

**Question:**

**The Schools Noticeboard on 21 September highlighted an IT issue with the Children Missing Education System, have all referrals made since 14 September that were affected by this now been allocated and dealt with?**

**Answer:**

For clarity purposes, there was a major outage incident that affected several services across the Council - not just the Children Missing Education Service. It was unfortunate that the network connectivity issue spanned at least three working days and prevented Officers from accessing, processing and responding to telephone and email queries.

I can advise that all referrals sent into the electronic mail boxes on or around that date (14<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> September) have been processed.

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

**E3      Library Agency Impact**

**Question:**

**Since the non-essential spend freeze, what changes have been made to library opening hours or the services offered within libraries to account for the reduction in use of agency staff?**

**Answer:**

No changes have been made to library opening hours since the non-essential spending freeze. The type and levels of service offered in each library are specific to the building size, facilities and the number of staff available and so this will vary site by site.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**F1      Counter Fraud Activity**

**Question:**

**How much does the Council spend on counter fraud activity and how much did it recoup through prevented fraud in each of the last 3 years? Broken down by type of fraud (e.g. council tax, business rates, social housing etc.)**

**Answer:**

A dedicated team within Birmingham Audit is budgeted to cost approximately £640,000 in 2018/19 including employee costs, legal fees, travel and subscriptions but excluding recharges.

It is not possible to place a monetary value on our anti-fraud activity as it relates to prevention and deterrence.

However, Social Housing frauds prevented are assigned a notional value by the Cabinet Office of £93,000 per property recovered, £36,000 per housing application cancelled and £65,000 per property for a cancelled Right to Buy application. Using these indicative figures, the following levels of fraud were prevented.

Category	2015/16 £m	2016/17 £m	2017/18 £m
Social Housing Properties Recovered	8.83	4.18	8.09
Social Housing Applications cancelled	10.80	6.98	5.47
Right to Buy Applications cancelled	0.46	0.26	0.26

For completeness, while the following values were detected or reported rather than prevented.

Category	2015/16 £m	2016/17 £m	2017/18 £m
Corporate Fraud	0.50	0.75	0.70
Council Tax	0.19	0.31	1.08
Housing Benefit overpayments	0.56	0.59	0.83

It can be assumed that there may also have been elements of prevention within these detected amounts (e.g. Single Person Discount may have continued to be claimed had the fraud not been investigated).

An annual report on counter fraud activities is reported to Audit Committee each year, most recently in September 2018.

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

**F2      Alcohol**

**Question:**

**How much has the Council spent on wine, and other alcoholic  
beverages since 2014/15?**

**Answer:**

Information is not held in the Council's accounts at a sufficient level of detail to enable this question to be answered. However, the Council's procurement agent has advised that, from their records, there was City Council expenditure on alcoholic beverages totalling £19,660 over the period from November 2015 to September 2018.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

**F3      Agency Workers**

**Question:**

**Broken down by service area, what is the total headcount and total cost of agency workers employed in each service area during each month since April 2018?**

**Answer:**

Headcount and Costs by Directorate for each month since April 2018 are:

<b>BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL AGENCY HEADCOUNT YEAR 18/19 TO DATE</b>						
<b>(Data Source: HAYS &amp; Extra Personnel Portals)</b>						
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Apr-18</b>	<b>May-18</b>	<b>Jun-18</b>	<b>Jul-18</b>	<b>Aug-18</b>	<b>Sep-18</b>
Adults Social Care and Health	276	250	314	346	349	368
Children and Young People	10	8	12	12	13	13
Economyal	60	65	70	71	73	68
Finance & Governance	57	69	51	45	47	50
Place	650	638	702	677	603	592
Strategic Services	90	104	106	80	74	68
<b>Total</b>	<b>1143</b>	<b>1134</b>	<b>1255</b>	<b>1231</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>1159</b>
<i>* Cityserve has not yet developed processes to enable the 'Managed Service Provider (MSP), i.e. HAYS, to source agency workers on their behalf and therefore, workers this service are NOT included in this report. Wrk is on-going within the Cityserve to develop this.</i>						

<b>HAYS Expenditure Year 18/19 Year to Date</b>							
<b>Data Source: HAYS Dashboard &amp; Extra Personnel Timesheets</b>							
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Apr-18</b>	<b>May-18</b>	<b>Jun-18</b>	<b>Jul-18</b>	<b>Aug-18</b>	<b>Sep-18</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Adults Social Care & Health	512,448	761,439	678,113	702,644	873,690	715,512	4,243,846
Children and Young People	24,000	20,763	30,345	15,321	24,820	16,900	132,148
Economy	158,615	147,966	157,777	191,611	167,432	143,138	966,539
Finance & Governance	188,303	174,884	143,597	135,287	151,371	117,873	911,316
Place	1,036,630	1,020,386	956,769	1,048,967	893,235	823,854	5,779,842
Strategic Services	112,651	146,751	103,849	83,323	82,495	59,900	588,969
<b>BCC Total</b>	<b>2,032,647</b>	<b>2,272,189</b>	<b>2,070,451</b>	<b>2,177,153</b>	<b>2,193,043</b>	<b>1,877,177</b>	<b>12,622,660</b>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND  
SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

**G      Home Visits**

**Question:**

**Broken down by ward, and for each of the last 4 years, how many home visits to senior citizens have taken place?**

**Answer:**

Table depicting data set out below:

Ward Name	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Acocks Green	122,123	121,330	128,342	132,267
Aston	131,993	138,421	155,902	150,958
Bartley Green	101,656	108,214	118,842	108,549
Billesley	128,853	127,686	145,721	142,431
Bordesley Green	94,168	98,385	109,159	108,375
Bournville	102,136	115,767	137,639	122,932
Brandwood	139,251	157,263	174,176	162,179
Edgbaston	46,183	58,540	70,867	59,025
Erdington	81,334	79,133	88,840	89,985
Hall Green	133,848	137,174	169,064	157,708
Handsworth Wood	88,249	93,217	109,016	111,924
Harborne	102,052	129,628	123,147	112,542
Hodge Hill	113,028	106,032	110,827	124,225
Kings Norton	84,485	88,252	107,646	101,982
Kingstanding	113,800	125,367	125,260	124,258
Ladywood	39,935	34,882	40,810	43,840
Longbridge	89,223	102,811	110,751	112,554
Lozells and East Handsworth	90,653	96,987	107,695	116,077
Moseley and Kings Heath	80,127	82,985	100,318	98,798
Nechells	93,743	110,134	106,643	131,250
Northfield	126,683	132,570	160,433	151,188
Oscott	98,121	113,971	124,346	121,105
Perry Barr	98,120	102,905	116,802	107,966
Quinton	120,757	110,142	133,016	147,724
Selly Oak	40,950	49,512	44,128	41,155
Shard End	164,688	178,479	172,490	163,748
Sheldon	123,471	129,411	129,595	134,451
Soho	77,471	84,160	104,363	106,261
South Yardley	104,561	107,913	106,236	104,129



**City Council – 6 November 2018**

Sparkbrook	137,217	159,825	169,717	154,365
Springfield	85,092	108,955	130,142	130,782
Stechford and Yardley North	120,316	127,711	129,391	113,675
Stockland Green	87,968	102,765	115,492	108,647
Sutton Four Oaks	85,216	87,258	99,335	104,585
Sutton New Hall	75,543	66,095	75,585	90,779
Sutton Trinity	89,570	93,506	95,812	98,596
Sutton Vesey	64,814	72,772	78,962	81,233
Tyburn	118,338	131,389	136,705	130,202
Washwood Heath	76,854	81,264	88,422	93,803
Weoley	98,688	113,995	143,544	141,822
Grand Total	3,971,277	4,266,802	4,695,180	4,638,078

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

**H1      3,000 homes in Perry Barr - Where?**

**Question:**

**Repeated statements from various sources at council, regional and national level - most recently the Chancellor of the Exchequer - have indicated that 5,000 homes are to be built in Perry Barr as part of the investment in the Commonwealth Games. So far as I am aware the sites being developed allow for few more than 2,000 homes. Could the Cabinet Member indicate where the remaining 3,000 will be, perhaps providing a map?**

**Answer:**

**5,000 homes are to be built in Perry Barr and the surrounding area. I will ask my Officers to brief Cllr Hunt on the location of these sites.**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE ALDEN**

**H2     Sprinklers**

**Question:**

**Where tower blocks due to have sprinklers installed are also due to have other work done as part of the Housing Investment Programme, particular internal work such as central heating are work packages being aligned to reduce cost to the council and inconvenience to the tax payer?**

**Answer:**

To improve efficiency and reduce costs, sprinkler installations will be programmed on a block by block basis. Where these installations coincide with planned internal improvement works - which are programmed on an expired life-cycle process - then contractors will as a rule combine appointments if possible to reduce inconvenience and improve efficiency. If large structural works are being carried out we will align the programs as far as practicable.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**H3     Sprinklers & Leaseholders**

**Question:**

**What cost, if any, is the council passing on to leaseholders for the installation of sprinklers in council owned tower blocks?**

**Answer:**

The council are installing sprinklers at no cost to leaseholders

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR PETER FOWLER**

**H4     HRA Trespassers**

**Question:**

**The 17/18 Statement of Accounts show 86 HRA properties not currently available as social housing due to trespassers occupying the properties, what is the average length of time these properties have been occupied by trespassers for?**

**Answer:**

In this instance the term trespassers refers to 'unlawful occupiers' which was previously lodgers left in occupation. It is where tenancies are ended, often joint tenancies, by one party leaving others in occupation with no housing solution. The time to resolve these cases and get possession back can range dramatically between immediate possession to very lengthy and complex re-housing where there are vulnerable people left in occupation often with dependants. We also need to follow due legal processes which can also be lengthy. In certain cases alternate smaller accommodation is required which due to individuals needs and requirements can cause additional delays. It is anticipated there will be a reduction due to a focused specialised team

The average length of time that these 86 properties have been by occupied by trespassers is 1 year 111 days.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOOD FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON MORRALL**

**H5     HRA Trespasser Removal**

**Question:**

**The 17/18 Statement of Accounts show 86 HRA properties not currently available as social housing due to trespassers occupying the properties, how many of these have the trespassers now been removed from?**

**Answer:**

Of the 86 HRA properties identified in the 2017/18 Statement of Accounts as occupied by trespassers, 32 properties are no longer occupied by trespassers.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

**H6      Void Properties Temporary Accommodation Consultation**

**Question**

**What consultation is carried out with local residents before a Void property is used as temporary accommodation?**

**Answer:**

The council has a statutory duty to provide temporary accommodation (TA) to any household who are eligible for assistance and have a priority need as defined by the Housing Act 1996 and amended by the Homelessness Act 2002 and Homelessness Reduction Act 2017.

Households can become homeless from any type of tenure and family background. Providing TA in individual properties is very similar to providing accommodation to a household provided with an introductory or secure tenancy and therefore does not require consultation. The only difference the homeless household is only entitled to stay in the TA until a decision is made on their homeless application. If the council accepts a full homeless duty to the household they will be able to stay in the accommodation until the duty is discharged.

Where the council is changing the use of a building to be used as TA, consultation is carried out with local residents. Most recently, agreement was given to change the use of Barry Jackson Tower and Magnolia House. Consultation was carried out with the local residents about the change of their use to homeless centres. The consultation carried out, involved officers from the Housing Options Service who informed the local residents about the reason for the change and reassured residents that they shouldn't be an increase in anti-social behaviour as a result. In accordance with planning application rules, officers from the Planning Department were also involved, as were West Midlands Police and Fire Service.

The council has 4 established homeless centres in various locations across the city, three of which have been in operation in excess of 20 years. The staff based at these centres ensures that they have an excellent working relationship with local residents and they are quick to respond and resolve any queries from them. Consultation has always been undertaken with local residents about any changes to the buildings. The most recent consultation about any changes to these centres was about security lights and change of use from an older person's home to a homeless centre.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND  
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR SUZANNE WEBB**

**H7      Void Properties Temporary Accommodation**

**QQuestion:**

**In the last 2 years, broken down by month, how many Void Properties have been converted for use as temporary accommodation?**

**Answer:**

The number of void BCC properties which are currently being let as temporary dispersed accommodation, from 1 April 2016 is detailed below:

<b>2017</b>	<b>Total 449</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>Total 444</b>
January	50	January	38
February	37	February	53
March	50	March	39
April	28	April	34
May	28	May	46
June	36	June	37
July	39	July	49
August	32	August	50
September	42	September	43
October	57	October	55
November	26		
December	24		

During the same period 657 dispersed temporary accommodation properties have been converted back to general void properties.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL  
INCLUSION, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND EQUALITY FROM  
COUNCILLOR JOHN LINES**

**I        Illegal Encampments**

**Question:**

**For the last 5 years please list all the illegal traveller encampments in Birmingham by ward along with the associated costs for each one (including all aspects of removal, legal fees, cleaning, repairs etc.)**

**Answer:**

The land owning departments are responsible for maintenance, protection and costs for the sites that they own and Environmental Health are responsible for the costs of serving notices to require the sites to be recovered. It has not therefore been possible to provide the data in the format requested.

Attached are the combined response of Environmental Health, Education and Leisure Service. An additional spread sheet for costs incurred by Leisure Services is also attached.

Housing have advised that they only have a record of clean-up costs on housing sites going back 18 months, during which period the clean-up costs following traveller occupations was £4,000.

See appendix 1 – pages 3510-3514

**APPENDIX 1 – (I) – ILLEGAL ENCAMPMENTS**

Costs to EH			Costs to Land Owning Department					
Site Descriptor / Location for non-Parks Land	Ward	L/O Dept ("PL", "TR", "HO", "ECD", "EDU")	Bailiff Costs (visit costs) £	Bailiff Costs (eviction costs) £	Other Legal Costs £	Clean-up Costs £	Other site based costs e.g. protection, repair, etc £	Comment
Leaford Way	Shard End	TR						
Burcote Road	Erdington	HO		£2,622.50				
Vere Street	Ladywood	TR						
Selly Oak Rec	Selly Oak	PL						
Rotten Park Road	Ladywood	TR						
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Billesley Common	Billesley	PL		£4,227.50				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Selly Oak Rec	Selly Oak	PL						
Manningford Road	Druids Heath	PL		£740.00				
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Baverstock Road	Druids Heath	EDU		£2,140.00				
Stechford Hall park	Hodge Hill	PL		£2,320.00				
Sarehole Mill	Springfield	PL		£5,120.00				
Hodge Hill Common	Hodge Hill	PL						
Pype Hayes Park	Erdington	PL		£400.00				
Sheldon Country Park	Sheldon	PL		£1,670.00				
Tower Street	Newtown	PL						
Vere Street	Ladywood	TR						
The Radleys	Garretts Green	PL						
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Rotten Park Road	Ladywood	TR						
Allens Cross Park	Northfield	PL	£400.00					
Rookery Park	Erdington	PL		£3,500.00				
Winson Street Park	Winson Green	PL						
Witton Lakes	Stockland Green	PL						
Bromford Lane	Bromford	PL		£1,340.00				
Sutton Park		PL						
Gospel Lane	Acocks green	PL		£540.00				
Glebe Farm Rec	Shard End	PL	£400.00	£3,125.00				
Tennal Lane		PL						
Newey Park	Hall Green	PL		£540.00				
Kents Moat	Yardley	PL		£1,340.00				
Chinn Brook Park	Billesley	PL						
Sheldon Country Park	Sheldon	PL		£1,020.00				
Bleak Hill Park (Short Heath)	Erdington	EDU					£1,592.81	Ongoing repairs and maintenance cost up to P7
St Peters Park	Tile Cross	PL						
Kineton Croft	Quinton	PL						
Dudley Road	Winson Green	Prop Services						
Clapgate Lane	Quinton							
Winson Street Park	Winson Green	PL						
Perry Park		PL						
Sandwell Park	Handsworth	PL		£7,760.00				
King George V Fields Sutton Oak Road	Sutton Vesey	PL		£5,270.00				
The Dell Manningford Road	Druids Heath	PL	£260.00					
Leasow Drive	Edgbaston	HO	£520.00					
Calthorpe Park	Ladywood	PL		£4,810.00				
Foyle Road	Kings Norton	HO						
Selly Park Rec	Selly Oak	PL						
Hospital Street	Aston	PL						
New Fosse Way	Edgbaston	EDD						
Sarehole Mill	Moseley	PL		£5,700.00				
Freeth Street	Ladywood	PL						
a47 railway sidings		EDD						
Baverstock School	Druids Heath	EDU	£183.75	£630.00			£71,051.00	The cost includes installation of bollards to prevent trespassers getting on the site with their vehicles and 24 hour security charges
New John St POS	Aston	PL						
Bracebridge Road	Aston	EDD						
Chinn Brook Park	Billesley	PL	£400.00	£8,910.00				
Woodgate Valley	Quinton	PL		£2,232.50				
Baverstock Road	Druids Heath	??						
All Saints Street	Winson Green	??						
Priory Road	Aston	TR						
Manningford Park	Druids Heath	PL		£1,110.00				
Calthorpe Park	Ladywood	PL						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Dudley Road	Winson Green	PL						
Talbot Way	Small Heath	Prop Services						
Bracebridge Road	Aston	TR						
Tennal Lane	Quinton	PL						
Calthorpe Park	Edgbaston	PL						
Senneleys Park	Bartley Green	PL		£1,800.00				
Leasow Drive	Edgbaston	PL						
Ickneild Square	Winson Green	??						
Cole Bank Road	Billesley	PL						
Tennal Lane	Quinton	PL						
Cromwell Lane	Quinton	PL						
Manningford Park	Druids Heath	PL						
Leasow Drive	Edgbaston							
Ley Hill Rec	Bartley Green	PL	£300.00	£4,390.00				
Dudley Road	Winson Green	PL						
Calthorpe Park	Edgbaston	PL		£472.50				
Senneleys Park	Bartley Green	PL						
Ickneild Square	Winson Green							
Selly Park Rec	Selly Oak	PL						
Tile Cross Rec	Tile Cross	PL		£735.00				
Poolway	Stechford	HO						
Penrith Croft	Bartley Green	HO						
Batcholars farm	Bordesley Green	PL		£2,460.00				
New John St POS	Aston	PL						
Ickneild Square	Winson Green	??						
Sandwell Park	Handsworth	PL						
Dudley Road	Winson Green	PL						
Ickneild Square	Winson Green							
Selly Oak Rec	Selly Oak	PL		£415.00				
Calthorpe Park	Edgbaston	PL		£2,460.00				
New John St POS	Aston	PL						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Bracebridge Raod	Aston	TR						
Mvddleton Street	Ladywood	PL						

# City Council – 6 November 2018

Site Descriptor / Location (if Parks land attend to name the land as per the true name from the Parks GIS layer / database)	Ward	LO Dept ("PL", "TR", "HO", "EDD", "CYPF")	Costs to EH		Costs to Land Owning Department		Other alla based costs e.g. protection, repair, etc £	Comment
			Bailiff Costs (visit costs) £	Bailiff Costs (eviction costs) £	Other Legal Costs £	Clean-up Costs £		
Highfield Farm Rec Highfield Road	Quinton	PL						
Norman Chamberlain Playing Fields	Shard End	PL						
Swale Grove	Kings Norton	HO		£1,000.00				
Manor Park Manor Road	Stechford	PL						
Wansbeck, Tern Branch Roads	Kings Norton	HO		£4,040.00				
Swale Grove	Kings Norton	HO	£600.00	£1,600.00				
Tower Street Rec	Aston	PL						
Perry Park Church Road	Perry Barr	PL		£3,200.00				
Billesley Common	Moseley	PL		£1,000.00				
Chin Brook Rec	Moseley	PL						
Manningford Rec	Druids Heath	PL		£2,500.00				
Shannon Road	Kings Norton	HO		£1,500.00				
Hawksley Community Centre	Kings Norton	HO						
New John Street rec	Aston	PL						
Walkers Heath Park	Kings Norton	PL						
Longdale Road	Kings Norton	HO						
Weston Lane Park	Acocks Green	PL		£2,400.00				
Sheldon Park	Sheldon	PL		£2,400.00				
Hawksley Community Centre	Kings Norton	PL		£1,200.00				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Hodge Hill Common	Hodge Hill	PL						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
New Spring Street North Park	Ladywood	PL						
Gressell Lane Park	Shard End	PL						
Kings Heath Park	Kings Heath	PL		£5,530.00				
Queensbridge Lane	Moseley	CYPF		£900.00				
Selly Park RG	Selly Oak	PL		£1,800.00				
Calthorpe Park	Ladywood	PL						
Swale Grove	Kings Norton	HO						
Winson Street Park	Soho	PL						
New John Street Public Open Space	Aston	PL						
Ackers Trust	South Yardley	PL		£11,500.00				
Hamstead Rec	Handsworth	PL		£3,500.00				
Norman Street	Soho	PL						
Park Lane	Soho	PL						
Gospel Lane	Acocks Green	CYPF						
New Fosse Way	Selly Oak	EDD						
Foundry Road	Soho	PL						
Shady Lane	Perry Barr	PL	£200.00					
Webster Way	Sutton Coldfield	PL						
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Edgwood Road	Kings Norton	PL	£400.00	£1,000.00				
Ley Hill Rec	Bartley Green	PL	£400.00	£3,510.00				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Tennal Lane	Quinton	PL	£400.00	£1,800.00				
Walkers Heath Park	Kings Norton	PL		£1,000.00				
Manningford Rec	Druids Heath	PL	£400.00	£2,500.00				
Monmouth Road	Bartley Green	PL						
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL		£1,300.00				
Billesley Common	Billesley	PL	£400.00					
West Heath Park	Northfield	PL	£400.00	£3,500.00				
Hope Street	Ladywood	TR	£400.00	£3,700.00				
Kings Norton Playing Fields	Kings Norton	PL		£3,900.00				
Swale/Tern Grove	Kings Norton	HO		£1,800.00				
Perry Barr Park	Perry Barr	PL		£1,800.00				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Selly Park RG	Selly Oak	PL						
Kings Norton Playing Fields	Kings Norton	PL						
Highbury Park	Moseley	PL	£400.00					
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL						
Selly Oak rec	Selly Oak	PL	£800.00	£4,060.00				
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Leasow Drive	Edgbaston	PL	£400.00	£4,510.00				
Highbury Park	Moseley	PL						
Foyle Road	Kings Norton	PL	£400.00					
Perry Park Church Road	Perry Barr	PL		£3,500.00				
Walkers Heath Park	Kings Norton	PL	£400.00	£3,645.00				
Sutton Oak Road (Twickenham)	Kingstanding	CYPF						
Sell Park Rec	Selly Oak	PL	£400.00	£2,500.00				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL		£1,400.00				
Penny Acre	Kings Norton	PL		£4,070.00				
Foundry Road	Soho	PL						
Highbury Park	Moseley	PL						
Holders Park	Moseley	PL	£400.00	£3,875.00				
Swale grove	Kings Norton	HO		£1,500.00				
Vincent Drive	Edgbaston	EDD						
Belchers Lane	Hodge Hill	HO						
Stechford Hall Park	Hodge Hill	PL	£400.00	£2,400.00				
Leasow Drive	Edgbaston	PL	£400.00	£800.00				
Walkers Heath Park	Kings Norton	PL	£400.00	£4,255.00				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL	£400.00	£3,240.00				
Chin Brook Rec	Moseley	PL	£400.00	£2,540.00				
Foyle Road	Kings Norton	HO	£400.00					
Sarehole Mill	Moseley	PL	£400.00	£2,240.00				
Daisy Farm Park	Billesley	PL						
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL		£3,000.00				
Tern Grove	Kings Norton	HO						
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL	£400.00					
Sarehole Mill	Moseley	PL	£400.00	£3,400.00				
Manningford Rec	Druids Heath	PL	£400.00	£1,000.00				
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL		£1,200.00				
Tee Grove	Kings Norton	HO		£1,800.00				
Valley Parkway	Bournville	PL						
Selly Park Rec	Selly Oak	PL	£400.00					
Swanhurst Park	Billesley	PL	£400.00	£3,800.00				
Witton Lakes	Aston	PL	£400.00					
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL		£800.00				
Bells Lane (Merritts Brook)	Kings Norton	CYPF		£1,205.00				
Leasford Way	Shard End	TR	£400.00	£2,740.00				
Lydon Rec	Sheldon	PL	£400.00	£1,780.00				
Poolway	Yardley	HO						
Belchers Lane	Bordesley Green	HO	£400.00	£4,125.00				
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Leasow Drive	Edgbaston	PL	£400.00	£1,800.00				
Bordesley Green Allotments	Bordesley Green	PL	£400.00	£3,410.00				
Calthorpe Park	Ladywood	PL		£2,780.00				
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Stechford Hall Park	Hodge Hill	PL	£400.00	£5,555.00				
Leasford Way	Shard End	TR		£800.00				
S81 Tyburn Road	Erdington	EDD	£400.00	£3,100.00				
Burcote Road	Tyburn	PS	£400.00	£1,000.00				
The Former VOSA site, Granby Ave	Sheldon	Private						
DVLA Site, Granby Ave	Sheldon	Home Office						
Leasford Way	Shard End	TR						
Stechford Hall Park	Hodge Hill	TR	£400.00	£7,885.00				
Baverstock School	Brandwood	CYPF	£400.00	£4,915.00				
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Bracebridge Road	Aston	TR						
Lea Ford way	Shard End	TR	£400.00	£4,035.00				
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Lea Ford way	Shard End	TR		£4,255.00				
Idonell Street	Soho	TR						
Retrow, Road, Green	Industria	TR						

There are no further costs for this property as it has been leased to local schools

£3,902.69 Ongoing repairs and maintenance cost up to P12

£7,858.74 Ongoing repairs and maintenance cost up to P12

£1,747.16 Ongoing repairs and maintenance cost up to P12

£77,390.00 The cost includes the boarding up of the building and 24 hour security as well as minor H&S rep

# City Council – 6 November 2018

Costs to EH

Costs to Land Owning Department

Site Descriptor / Location	Ward	L/O Dept ("PL", "TR", "HO", "EDD", "CYPF")	Enforcement support costs (Enf Agents)	Eviction costs (Enf Agents)	Other Legal Costs £	Clean-up Costs £	Other site based costs e.g. protection, repair, etc £	Comment
Garrison Street		TR						
Ackers Trust		PL						
Leaford Road		TR						
Allesley Road		TR						
Bromford Drive		PL						
Pype Hayes Park		PL						
The Hollies		TR						
Cobb Lane		PL						
Hazellwell Park		PL						
Priory Road		TR						
Cherry Orchard Park		PL						
Hamstead Hill		PL						
Calshot Park		PL						
Sandwell Rec		PL						
Upper Thomas Street	Aston	PL						
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Tameside Way	Perry Barr	TR						
Soho Wharf	Soho	PL						
Sherlock Street	Ladywood	PL						
Sutton Oak Road	Kingstanding	PL		£8,750.00				
Perry Park	Perry Barr	PL		£750.00				
Hazellwell Park, Quinton		PL						
Quinton PF / Woodgate Valley CP	Quinton	CYPF		£7,000.00		£4,368.88	£5,987.17	Ongoing repairs and maintenance cost up to P12
Bordesley Green / Bachelors Farm RG		PL						
Kents Moat Recreation Ground		PL						
Gilbertstone RG		PL						
Sheldon Country Park	Sheldon	PL				£1,462.22		
Woodgate Valley CP, Clappgate Lane	Quinton	PL		£5,400.00		£1,006.11		
Tern Grove, Redditch Road	Kings Norton	HO						
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Larches Park, Larches Street	Sparkbrook	PL						
Tennel RG, Tennel Lane	Quinton	PL				£3,939.99		
Upper Thomas St, Aston	Aston	TR						
Selly Oak Park, Gibbons Road	Selly Oak	PL				£4,043.88		
Pennyacre Road	Brandwood	HO				£731.11		
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Selly Park RG	Selly Oak	PL				£1,025.66		
Highbury Park	Moseley & KH	PL				£4,243.88		
Queensbridge PF	Moseley & KH	CYPF						There are no further costs for this property as it has been leased
Upper Thomas St, Aston	Aston	TR						
Hope Street	Nechells	PL						
Allesley Street, Aston	Aston	TR						
Hazellwell Park, Hunts Road	Bourneville	PL		£1,250.00		£236.11		
Pennyacre Road	Brandwood	HO						
Upper Thomas St	Aston	TR						
Selly Park RG, Raddlebarn Road	Selly Oak	PL		£6,000.00		£1,508.44		
Manningford Park Manningford Road	Brandwood	PL						
Hope Street	Nechells	PL						
Hazellwell Park	Bourneville	PL						
Fairfax Park	Bourneville	PL		£4,500.00				
Stechford Rec	Washwood Heath	PL						
Gressel Lane	Shard End	PL		£4,500.00				
Selly Park Rec Raddlebarn	Selly Oak	PL				£110.00		
Norman Chamberlain	Shard End	PL						
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Pennyacre Road	Brandwood	HO						
Swanhurst Park Brook Lane	Billesley	PL						
Weston lane Park	Acocks Green	PL						
Selly Park Rec Raddlebarn	Selly Oak	PL				£692.22		
Manningford Park Manningford Road	Brandwood	PL						
Upper Thomas Street	Aston	PL						
Tameside Way	Perry Barr	TR						
Bangham Pit Recreation Ground off Long								
Nuke Road	Bartley Green	PL		£3,750.00				
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Gomeldon Avenue	Bartley Green	HO						
Park Road	Hockley	PL						
Hazellwell Park	Bourneville	PL				£236.11		
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Allesley street	Aston	TR						
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Selly Park Rec Raddlebarn	Selly Oak	PL				£346.11		
New Johns Street	Newtown	PL						
Manningford Park Manningford Road	Brandwood	PL						
Selly Oak Park, Gibbons Road	Selly Oak	PL		£7,500.00				
Lea Ford Way	Shard End	TR		£3,750.00				
Swanhurst Park Brook Lane	Billesley	PL						
Norman Chamberlain	Shard End	PL		£3,750.00				
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Cocks Moor Woods	Billesley	PL				£967.22		
Dee Grove	Kings Norton	HO						
Fox Hollies Leisure Centre	Acocks Green	PL						
Garrison Street	Ladywood	TR						
Upper Thomas Street	Aston	PL						
Tameside Way	Perry Barr	TR						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Aston Brook Street	Aston	TR						
Hope Street	Ladywood	PL						
Union Street	Aston	HO						
New Johns Street	Newtown	PL						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Upper Thomas Street	Aston	PL						
Union Street	Aston	HO						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Rotton Park Street	Ladywood	TR						
Leaford Road	Shard End	TR						
Aston Brook Street	Aston	TR						
Cocks Moor Woods	Billesley	PL						
Dee Grove	Kings Norton	HO						
Allesley Street	Aston	TR						
Union Street	Aston	HO						
Walkers Heath Park	Kings Norton	PL	£ 400.00	£2,360.00				
Rotton Park Street		TR						
Allesley Street		TR						
Swale Grove	Kings Norton	HO		£800.00				
Shenley Leisure Centre, Long Nuke Road		PL		£4,120.00				
ithon Grove	Kings Norton	HO		£5,680.00				
R/O Lifford House, Fordhouse Lane	Kings Norton	PL	£ 400.00	£3,500.00				
Manningford Park Manningford Road	Brandwood	PL	£ 400.00	£5,180.00				
Daisy Farm RG, Maypole Lane	Billesley	PL	£ 400.00					
River Rea Walkway, Hunts Road	Bourneville	PL	£ 400.00					
River Rea Walkway, Hunts Road	Bourneville	PL	£ 1,200.00			£2,005.55		
Swale Grove	Kings Norton	HO		£1,200.00				

# City Council – 6 November 2018

Costs to EH

Costs to Land Owning Department

Site Descriptor / Location	Ward	L/O Dept ("PL", "TR", "HO", "EDD", "CYPF")	Enforcement support costs (Enf Agents)	Bailiff Costs £	Other Legal Costs £	Clean-up Costs £	Other site based costs e.g. protection, repair, etc £	Comment
Proctor Street		TR						
Parkdale Rec		PL						
Redditch Road		TR						
Woodgate Valley		PL						
Highbury Hall		PL						
Allesley Street		TR						
Hill Topp Golf Course		PL						
Kings Norton Playing Field		PL						
Peddimore Lane		TR						
Allesley Road		TR						
Upper Thomas Street		PL						
Sommerfield Road		PL						
Barrack Street		PL						
The Hollies		TR						
Hazelwell Road/Dads Lane		PL						
Fairfax Rec		PL						
Brinklow Road		HO						
Parkdale Rec		PL						
Upper Thomas Street		PL						
Sommerfield Road		PL						
Tern Grove		HO						
Great Brook Street		PL						
Barn Piece		EDD						
Allesley Street		TR						
Winson Street		PL						
Sheldon Rec		PL						
Upper Thomas Street		PL						
Cofton Park		PL						
Lyndon Rec		PL						
Perry Park		PL						
Hazelewell Rec, Bourneville		PL						
Victoria Road, Aston		TR						
Wylde Green Road / New Hall Valley		PL						
Highbury Park, Moseley		PL						
Calthorpe Park, Cheddar Road,								
Edgbaston		PL						
Dads Lane Park Stirchley		PL						
The Hollies Aston		TR						
Great Brook Street		PL						
Tameside Way		TR						
Leaford Way		TR						
Cole Hall Lane		HO						
Pype Hayes Park		PL						
Frogget Lane		PL						
Barrack Street		PL						
Gressel   Lane		EDD						
Silvercroft Avenue, Hndsworth Wd		PL						
Hamsted Playing Fields		PL						
Perry Common Rec		PL						
Upper Thomas Street		PL						
Allesley Street		TR						
Barrack Street		PL						
Aston Brook Street		TR						
Leaford Way		TR						
Holford Way		TR						
The Hollies		TR						
Talbot Way		EDD						
The Hollies		TR						
Allesley Street		TR						
Stechford Rec		PL						
Gressel   Lane		EDD						
Ackers Trust		PL						
Sycamores Rec		PL		£2,000.00				

# City Council – 6 November 2018

Costs to EH

Costs to Land Owning Department

Site Descriptor / Location	Ward	L/O Dept ("PL", "TR", "HO", "EDD", "CYPF")	Enforcement support costs (Enf Agents)	Bailiff Costs £	Other Legal Costs £	Clean-up Costs £	Other site based costs e.g. protection, repair, etc £	Comment
Aston Brook Street		EDD						
Belmont Row		TR		£1,250.00				
Great Western Close		EDD						
Elmdon Road		EDD						
Parkdale Drive		PL		£1,250.00				
Aston Brook Street		EDD		£1,250.00		£6,900.00		
Balmoral Road		PL						
Rupert Street		PL			£2,500.00			
Great Western Close		EDD						
Priory Road		EDD						
Rupert Street		PL						
Senneleys Park		PL						
Dads Lane Rec		PL						
Parkdale Drive		PL						
Tameside Way		TR						
Vauxhall Road		PL						
Aston Brook Street		EDD						
Riverbrook Drive		PL		£1,250.00				
Hill Top		PL		£3,000.00				
Allersley Road		EDD						
Balmoral Road		PL		£1,250.00				
Aston Brook Street		EDD						
Water Orton Lane		PL						
Priory Road		EDD						
Sutton Park		PL						
Farnborough Road		PL						
Manningford Road		HO						
Oughton Road		EDD						
Aston Brook Street		TR		£1,250.00				
Calder Drive		PL						
Claggate Lane		PL						
Senneleys Park		PL						
Priory Road		TR						
Aston Brook Street		EDD						
Allersley Road		EDD						
Key Hill		EDD						
Proctor Road		TR						
Heaton Street		TR						
Allersley Road		TR						
Barrack Street		PL						
Battery Way		TR						
Tern Close		TR						
Redditch Road		TR						
Golden Hillock Road		PL						
Aston Brook Street		TR						
Allesley Street		TR						
Garrison Street		TR						
Landor Street Wheels		PL						
Barrack Street		PL						
Duddeston Manor Park Road		PL						
Allesley Street		TR						
Hilltop Golf Course		PL						
Lower Dartmouth Street		TR						
Stechford Hall Park		PL						
Leaford Way		TR						
Proctor Road		TR						

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

**J1      Amey - Resurfacing and Replacement of Pavements & Road  
Surfaces**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member explain why he has failed to agree even a provisional programme with Amey to ensure that, at the very least, some resurfacing and replacement of pavements and road surfaces take place?**

**Answer:**

It is extremely disappointing to me and my Cabinet colleagues that Amey continues to fail to comply with its contractual obligations. You will be aware that the council has been comprehensively victorious in its main legal dispute with Amey over their failure investment properly in our roads. Amey has failed to deliver the investment required and is now nearly three and a half years beyond the date for doing this. Amey's promises to members and constituents regarding schemes to be provided have proven to be hollow.

The work programmes that have been submitted by Amey do not comply with their obligations in terms of the volume of work or where it is done. Approving these programmes would be to condone this approach and so we have rightly withheld that approval.

It follows that seeking to reach an agreement with Amey to deliver work on that basis is not a sensible proposition. In my view their track record with works in the city has been inconsistent and generally poor. In July, Cabinet accepted that Amey has no long term future in providing these services and that we need to move towards their replacement as soon as possible.

Therefore we are examining ways forward that will ensure that the investment works recommence through a different contractor as soon as possible. This will start to rectify some of the deterioration that Amey has failed to address and its neglect of our highway network. I intend to update Cabinet and the council before Christmas as to what progress is being made in this regard.

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

**J2      Parking Meters**

**Question:**

**How does the Cabinet Member justify the excess charges faced by users seeking to make cashless payments for using the city's parking meters?**

**Answer:**

On the basis that this question refers to the charges made to customers as part of our Cashless Parking system, there are a range of fees that apply dependent on the extent to which customers wish to use optional aspects of the service.

Whilst there is a 1p convenience fee that is applied to all cashless parking transactions, there is also a charge of 10p when customers use the Interactive Voice Response system (i.e. they dial the specified telephone number and register/start a parking session) and there is an optional text reminder service for which there is a charge of 30p per message. All of these charges are applied to cover the costs of our cashless parking provider (Parkmobile) in supplying the service.

Over two thirds of users now use the Parkmobile App for which customers only pay the 1p transaction fee for each parking session that they purchase.



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

**J3      Transport Infrastructure - Perry Barr**

**Question:**

**Is the Cabinet Member satisfied that the approach to transport infrastructure in Perry Barr is satisfactory given a) the benefits of having the support of the local community for the 2022 Commonwealth Games and b) the widespread unhappiness caused by the continued determination to remove the flyover, damage the excellent X51 bus service, undertake two years of highly disruptive road works and paint bus lanes causing major disruption to residents of the Walsall Road and residents of side roads struggling to cope with displaced parking?**

**Answer:**

No decision on the future of the flyover has yet been made, with a report to Cabinet expected early in the New Year. The A34 Sprint consultation has recently concluded and responses are currently being analysed by the Council and Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) to inform an updated set of proposals. These again will be reported to Cabinet early in the New Year.

The proposed Perry Barr regeneration scheme is an extremely important and long-awaited opportunity for the city, which will deliver much-needed homes and better public transport for the citizens of Birmingham. With the construction of the residential element of the Games Village, the delivery of transport schemes and other related infrastructure work, some impacts and disruption are to be expected over the next two to three years as the development progresses.

The Council and TfWM will be producing comprehensive construction management plans and implementing travel demand management to help mitigate any adverse impacts during the development period. This would include planning conditions where necessary.

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

**J4      Tree replacements**

**Question:**

**For each ward over the last 4 years (broken down by year) how many trees have been removed and how many new trees have been planted within that ward?**

**Answer:**

The information provided relates only to Highway trees and those within the remit of Parks have not been included.

Table 1 below provides a summary of Highway trees felled and replanted over the past 4 years from 2014 - 2017. It should be noted that due to the favourable seasonal considerations in relation to both the felling and planting of trees the numbers of trees removed and replaced will vary across years but will ultimately approximately balance across 2-year periods. For clarity the total number of trees (circa 75,000) on our highway network has remained constant over the period in question.

Table 1

	Trees Felled	Trees Planted
2017	1700	1512
2016	1232	1215
2015	1203	1413
2014	1564	1463

Tables 2 – 5 provide details of the trees planted and removed per ward from 2017 back to 2014. Please note that the figures relate to the Ward boundaries prior to May 2018.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT  
AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

**J5      Potholes**

**Question:**

**The Government's announcement of £420m for potholes in the recent budget is due to be allocated using the DfT's existing needs formula for highways which, because of the Highways Management and Maintenance PFI HMMPFI), the Council currently sits outside.**

**When emergency funding for potholes was made available following the winter of 2010, the then City Council administration was able to successfully lobby Government for access to this fund to use on those elements of our highways, which suffered winter damage, that sit outside the HMMPFI.**

**If the council does not anticipate receiving any funding as a result of this latest budget announcement, would the Cabinet Member commit to working with me on a cross party basis to make a case to Government for access to this fund along with additional support from their proposed centre for best practice for PFI contracts (also announced in the budget) which, whilst it is due to start in Health, could find a review of the Amey HMMPFI contract in Birmingham mutually beneficial, given its scale and scope and the legal judgements that have been made on it?**

**Answer:**

**You will recall that the purpose of the Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract was to avoid the need for the council to bid for one-off funding for its highway assets and to put our roads in a state where they are managed appropriately as an asset. I am disappointed that Amey has failed to do this and continues to refuse to acknowledge its contractual responsibilities.**

**Following the Government's announcement on the allocation of £420m towards pothole repairs we will approach the DfT with a view to putting forward a case for accessing this fund to cover repair costs for the potholes on parts of the road network which fall outside the scope of the Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract.**

**In respect of the future of the Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract, it is clear to me that Amey does not have a long term future in delivering the services under this contract. As you will appreciate from your own experience when Cabinet Member responsible for this aspect of my portfolio, making changes in PFI contracts is complex and needs to have a full understanding of the commercial consequences.**

**City Council – 6 November 2018**

Your offer of cross-party support is welcomed and any review of the contract will need to be done in the context of how it could be delivered in the future. We need to ensure that we have a deliverable and affordable way forward with these services.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE ECONOMY AND SKILLS  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR BOB  
BEAUCHAMP**

**K      Paradise Circus Cabinet Report**

**Question:**

**On what date and time were you contacted to seek your approval for the inclusion of the Paradise Circus Cabinet Report taken on 9 October and what date and time did you provide your consent as chair of scrutiny as per the constitution?**

**Answer:**

4<sup>th</sup> October at 11.25am.

5<sup>th</sup> October at 11.15am.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF THE LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES**

**L      Clean Air Compliant Taxis**

**Question:**

**What is the present number of Birmingham Council licensed Private Hire and Hackney Carriage vehicles that will not conform to the Clean Air Zone limit when it is introduced in Birmingham?**

**Answer:**

This information is not held by Licensing. A report was however prepared for the Licensing and Public Protection Committee in October 2017 which outlined the detail and included the table below. The Energy Saving Trust assisted in compiling the information by comparing the registration numbers of each vehicle to data held by the DVLA for the emission standard of each vehicle, depending on whether it was petrol or diesel.

The tables below are the 2017 figures:

<b>Private Hire Vehicles</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Non-Compliant Private Hire Petrol or non-diesel Vehicles Euro 3 or below	355	8%
Non-Compliant Private Hire Diesel vehicles Euro 5 or below	2996	69%
Compliant Private Hire Petrol Vehicles Euro 4 or above	818	19%
Compliant Private Hire Diesel Vehicles Euro 6	152	3.5%
Totals	4,321	100%

**City Council – 6 November 2018**

Hackney Carriage	Number	Percentage
Non-Compliant Hackney Carriages Euro 5 or below	1193	94%
Compliant Hackney Carriages Euro 6	7	1%
Compliant Hackney Carriages converted to LPG	65	5%
Totals	1265	100%