

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

BIRMINGHAM ECONOMY, SKILLS AND SUSTAINABILITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 16 OCTOBER 2015

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BIRMINGHAM ECONOMY, SKILLS AND SUSTAINABILITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2015 AT 1000 HOURS IN COMMITTEE ROOMS 3&4, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM

PRESENT: - Councillor Quinn in the Chair;

Councillors Badley, Evans, Hughes, Huxtable, Islam, Jenkins, Jones,
O'Shea and Spencer

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor Penny Holbrook – Cabinet Member for Skills, Learning and Culture
Shilpi Akbar, Assistant Director, Employment
Baseema Begum – Scrutiny Research and Policy Officer
Calvin Biddle – DWP Work Placement
Richard Cowell - Development and Planning Manager
Craig Rowbottom, Principal Development Planning Officer.
Laura Shoaf, Strategic Director for Transport
Jake Thrush, Transport Strategy Manager, ITA
Errol Wilson – Committee Manager
Benita Wishart - Overview and Scrutiny Manager

NOTICE OF RECORDING

15

The Chairman advised and it was noted that this meeting would be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Internet site (www.birminghamnewsroom.com) and that members of the press/public may record and take photographs.

The whole of the meeting would be filmed except where there were confidential or exempt items.

APOLOGIES

- 16 Apologies for non-attendance were submitted on behalf of Councillors Barrie and Rehman. An apology for lateness was submitted on behalf of Councillor Jones.
-

MINUTES

Councillor Evans commented that there was a lengthy discussion on the work programme about the things they would like to see, but that there was no mention of this in the minutes nor was it reflected in the future work programme.

The Chairman enquired whether this was something that if they look back on the live streaming they would be able to make a complimentary note of

- 17 **RESOLVED: -**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2015, having been previously circulated, were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

MOVEMENT FOR GROWTH: THE WEST MIDLANDS STRATEGIC TRANSPORT PLAN – PUBLIC CONSULTATION DRAFT

- 18 Laura Shoaf, Strategic Director for Transport and Jake Thrush, Transport Strategy Manager, ITA was present for the item.

(See documents No 1)

Ms Shoaf highlighted that:-

- In November 2014, officers were requested by the Integrated Transport Authority (ITA), to produce a new Strategic Transport Plan, to replace local transport plan. This would set out a high level approach, that would be compatible with Midlands Connect and gives the District the opportunity to flush out the details in their own transport strategies such as the Birmingham Connected and the emerging Solihull and Coventry Connected and they would sit compatibly together.
- A draft consultation had been published which was endorsed by the ITA over the summer. It was aimed at delivering economic growth and to position the West Midlands as a Regional Powerhouse. This was an overarching mobility plan around which each Council was delivering their strategy that was suitable to their particular needs where they fit comfortably under the umbrella in this Plan.
- Four challenges for the West Midlands would be addressed through the Plan:-
 - a. Economic Growth and Economic Inclusion; recognising that the Midlands account for a quarter of England's manufacturing growth –

they had an economy that was suited towards exports and the impact this had on the networks.

- b. In trying to address population growth and housing development, the metropolitan areas of population was forecast to grow by 411,000 people by 2035. This was the size of the City of Bristol that would be added to the conurbation. The number of new homes that would need to be built was over 150,000, the scale of which increases in terms of the wider journey to work area.
 - c. Address environmental and public health in terms of air quality which was a significant issue in the West Midlands and to reduce emission through more active travel whilst recognising the importance this had to the health agenda.
 - d. Social Wellbeing – outside of more participation in the economy, they needed to improve the quality of life for people who were socially excluded or people who were not in the world of work. Improve their access to shops and services and potential job opportunities.
- The vision for the Plan (currently a draft with today being the final day of consultation with 78 responses to date, a number of focus groups had been consulted in each of the local authorities), was to make progress for a Midlands economic engine for growth, to clean air improve the quality of life for the people of the West Midlands, by creating a transport system that fits a sustainable attractive conurbation in the World's sixth largest economy.

Ms Shoaf then drew the Committee's attention to the objectives and policies in the draft document they believe would help to deliver the vision.

In response to questions from Members Ms Shoaf and Mr Thrush made the following points:-

- I. In relation to the HS2 Connectivity Programme, this was an intense amount of work and the partners came up with a programme and the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) endorsed it. The piece of work critical to all of this was part of the overarching strategic document for the Urban Transport System for the West Midlands. There were other schemes that had direct access to the HS2 station. This was developed in context with the on-going work in relation to the combined authority and work streams related to that. The critical paragraph relating to this was 4.32 of the document.
- II. They talked about the prioritising process for the infrastructure needs for the West Midlands Metropolitan area currently being developed by the West Midlands Combined Authority. This work was linked to the wider work in relation to the Combined Authority. HS2 was an important element of an overall programme.
- III. With regard to Park and Ride, the steer they had was a short punchy strategic document. There was a balance to be struck between that and sufficient

details. In some areas, it was recognised through consultation that this needed to be strengthened. There had been responses echoing that more details were required and this would be taken on board.

- IV. Concerning the questionnaires to date, 78% was strongly agreed or agreed with the overall approach. The thrust of the questionnaire was to get on and deliver the programme. There was an exciting potential in relation to the structures for this Metropolitan area. The message was that they were broadly agreed on the overall approach. The essence was the delivery of it.
- V. In relation to air quality, there was a lot of work with the basis of meeting new demands on sustainable modes of high quality public transport capacity, cycling and walking. With the ever changing technological innovation and they talked about smart mobility tier, working with vehicle manufacturers and universities to foster this. The West Midlands was potentially a world leader in this area. There was work in terms of responses from people concerning the lower emissions work led by Walsall Council and further technical work modelling was being done to look at the impact of things. The overall approach was based on meeting that objective and this would be taken on board.
- VI. The issue of modal share target, the approach seeks to take a long-term from overall journeys to 63% by car in the West Midlands compare to a typical European city region which had 35% - 40%. The strategy was based on the long-term approach, but there had been some debates about the modal share targets. Within the stakeholder engagement they had a primary object to restore economic and environmental objectives. The modal share target was a secondary thing and further debates/considerations were to be had regarding this.
- VII. In terms of the 20mph enforcements, the document was supportive of the overall approach which seeks to be informed by evidence on progress from Birmingham City Council and the other local authorities in the West Midlands and across the UK.
- VIII. With regard to the travel time issues, most of the investments that were set out required to achieve this strategy were based on the relevant transport network. It was estimated that 50% of the Metropolitan areas of population could get to 3 or more centres in 45 minutes. The aim was to double this, but the challenge was getting people to use buses that go 16kph average or faster and to start achieving moveable peaks and other transit services that could get people to other centres.
- IX. In relation to signage, one of the messages they had in terms of the consultation was to make the case for the big stuff that was commensurate to their needs and do not forget the attention to detail. There were a number of things that could stop, hinder and impede someone using public transport, cycling or walking. There was some positive working with public transport operators. Something that was easy to understand consistent and hassle free was integral to achieving this document.

- X. One of the questions they had included in the consultation was do you think that this was strong enough, were they going far enough or whether there was appetite for the document to be bolder.
- XI. It was useful to hear the Committee and the commitment to the modal shift and the car journeys and that the document may need to be even bolder than it was. It was significantly bolder than any other Transport Plan that they had especially at an integrated level. There seem to be a stronger commitment now than previous and a stronger recognition that they could not continue for people to continue their journeys in their cars. In order to achieve this, they needed a network that they currently did not have.
- XII. In terms of funding and delivery, they needed to see this followed up next year with a more detailed delivery plan as the strategy needed to be backed up with a delivery plan based on evidence that helps as a commitment for funding. What they did not have and what they were trying to progress through a combined authority which was important in order to be able to deliver the huge investment that would be required to achieve the vision, was what other areas had already been recipients of which was aligned and devolved transport fund that covers more than a single year settlement. It was important that in this region they fought for this and a bigger share that they were not capturing in the West Midlands.
- XIII. Until they were able to progress a more mature conversation of what the package would look like gives the ability to design a programme of schemes that would deliver them over time, they would struggle to deliver them in a way that they had.
- XIV. In terms of the route study, it was understood that this was a Network Rail issue, but they were supportive of the work and were trying to move it into their priority.
- XV. In relation to Police enforcement they would take this away as this was not something they had control of at the ITA. The work and propositions that were set up in the document were being modelled through evidence.
- XVI. With regard to the Metro from the City Centre to Birmingham International Airport, the route for this had not yet been agreed and there was a separate work stream that was looking at that Metro, how it would be developed and what the appropriate route would be.
- XVII. Ms Shoaf noted Councillor Huxtable's concern regarding the disposal of fixed assets by Centro and stated that this was a high level strategy and that they were trying to have a balance of the level of detail that was appropriate especially on a scheme based in a high level strategy versus what was more appropriate at the next tier. There was a need to be clearer in the next iteration. She stated that she took on board the point that was made earlier that they needed to make clear the notion of this hearing and the primacy of document and this would be taken up.

- XVIII. In terms of the Tamworth Line and the Camp Hill Cords, they were huge advocate of the Camp Hill Cords and they push every chance they had and organise responses to Network Rail to prioritise Camp Hill Cords. It features in Midlands Connect and they were all on the same page with Camp Hill Cords and it was not a scheme which was in their gift to deliver effectively through the ITA and the TDC and all the Councils in the West Midlands continue to be advocates for that scheme to bring this forward.
- XIX. There was a meeting (as they speak) of West Midlands Rail which was an emerging partnership with Government looking at close classification for the next franchise for London Midland and eventually the West Midlands would take over through devolution the running and management of that franchise going forward. The ITA had little influence over the network that serves the West Midlands.
- XX. West Midlands Rail was going through individual Cabinets being established and that it was important to the DfT that it exist and was the ambition around rail services that they would see those services devolved to their control in the West Midlands that was a geography different to that of the ITA and was a wider partnership across the West Midlands. This was the way they were trying to control some of the issues they did not have control of specifically, the question concerning Virgin, it was critical to the ITA that people who used the rail network were safe, that they feel safe and that they pay their tariff and if it was found that the private operators were reducing their staff, or allow those things to happen, this was something this was something that was in all their interest to be rectified.
- XXI. In terms of signage, this had a lot to do with what the underpinning objective in the document around innovation and the assets they had. Transport was changing rapidly and the way that people travel and makes informed travel choices and choose what mode was used was changing through the use of smart phones, notifications, evolution of cleaner engines, hydrogen driverless cars and was an exciting time to be involved in transport.
- XXII. They had through innovation the ability used intelligently to ... onto different times where they had inbuilt infrastructure already. The question was how they used the infrastructure they had – the innovation and the technology that they had to ensure when there were peak times on the network that they could help spread that peak and move people onto the network in non-peak times. It was important to recognise that they needed to harness data innovation to change the way they all travel so that they could achieve the modal shift they spoke of earlier.
- XXIII. It was not meant that modal shift was secondary in terms of importance, but was in terms of the way it was laid out in the Plan. The Plan was predicated on the modal shift.

The Chairman thanked Laura Shoaf and Jake Thrush for attending the meeting and presenting the information.

PUBLIC REALM – THE CITY’S STREETS, SQUARES AND SPACES

- 19 Craig Rowbottom, Principal Development Planning Officer and Richard Cowell, Development and Planning Manager were in attendance. They drew the Committee’s attention to the presentation concerning *Transforming the Street, Squares and Spaces of the City Centre*.

(See documents No 2)

An extensive discussion took place and the following is a summary of the principal points made:-

- a. The key thing was to emphasize the importance of public realm and to start that debate, but primarily looking at the piece of work to be brought forward on the City Centre. Hence the focus on City Centre projects and the approach to the amount of money and budgets being set aside.
- b. It was important to empathize that as a department; they were also looking at the local centres and bringing forward a separate piece of work looking at local centres in the future. This was something that fits in with the local centres Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) that looked to the management of retail spaces etc. There was an opportunity there to look at this afresh and this was where they could pick up public realm in local centres.
- c. Primarily, they were focused on the City Centre, hence, the emphasis on the budgets and the projects. They could bring back a future presentation to look at the issues around local centres and the successes there and how they deal with them in the future.
- d. In relation to the funding aspect, the money that the City Council had put in had been used to leveraging money from partners. They had a lot of commitment from the GBSLEP and local Business Improvement Districts (BID) to the quality of public realm. They were able to secure a significant amount of money for the City Centre, but there was also a lot of work being done looking at local centres. They were not avoiding the important asset the City has.
- e. Looking to the future, this money being committed to schemes in the City Centre would be delivered over a number of years. There was a lot of commitment from the GBSLEP, the Growth Fund being set aside and needed to be spent over the next few years. This was particularly a priority from the GBSLEP perspective.
- f. As they go forward there may be other opportunity through the Enterprise Zone, other opportunities through the GBSLEP or the Combined Authority to access funding. The key thing from Planning and Regeneration perspective was that they had a clear strategy in place that they could then use to attract funds and demonstrate a clear strategy and vision on where that money should be spent.

- g. Members' comments were helpful in terms of the general principles they would like to see and to ensure there factors in the public realm emerging in the City Centre in the future and other locations. The comments would be incorporated into the policy development.
- h. In terms of funding, Birmingham City Council's contribution - £1.9m, was the figure that went into the Golden Square for public realm enhancement in the Jewellery Quarter which helped to levering investment from the European Development Fund (EDF) which was £0.65m in that project as well as some Section 106 money. In most of the other cases BCC money was put into public realm projects. The other amounts of money mentioned in the slide were minimal and was focused on the various LEP contributions through the EDF or local Growth Fund.
- i. The Centro contribution was part of the overall Metro budget works in delivering the improvement to the footways in the City Centre.
- j. With regard to sustainability, this would be factored into the emerging strategy in terms of the environmental gain it could achieve. It was important note that the strategy was helping to deliver what was set out in the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) which had a policy in place in terms of delivering green infrastructure across the City.
- k. In terms of the guiding principle, and the wider benefit this could have on the local centres, this offers that potential, but it was about understanding those local areas and what would work best in those areas. There was a need to understand the different partners in the local areas that contribute to bringing those strategies going forward in the future for those local areas if this was what was needed. There may be a number of options available to them in terms of how they expressed this – Neighbourhood Plans as mentioned earlier which was one option.
- l. With regard to the question of budget around how they would maintain some of the projects going forward, this needed to be seen in terms of the context with the Amey contract that was in place. Any improvement over and above that needed to be accounted for within the project. This was assessed on a project by project basis as they were brought forward and resources were needed to ensure those overall enhancements could be resourced going forward.
- m. In relation to climate change infrastructure aspect, this fits in with the BDP and the wider vision for the City in terms of how they do a climate change green infrastructure. On a specific basis looking at the City Centre, within the SPD for the streets squares and spaces, one of the key principles was how they green up the environment. There was a lot of potentially hard landscaping a number of which had been inherited from the redevelopment in the 50's and 60s.
- n. They were seeing the improvements through the East Side City Park which was an example of a City green space which was also a free space where people could go and use at their leisure. There was a variety of different

environments there, both green and harder. They needed to think about children and young people of all ages to ensure that they had different spaces for different people particularly in the City Centre to cater for the different types of people who visit the City Centre.

- o. From a climate change perspective, they were pushing a number of agendas in the direction of the document, particularly around trees. There were challenges around how they deal with the current restrictions around the Amey contract with regard to introducing trees. The reason being the maintenance cost, design aspect of this, but they were working through them where they had bespoke designs etc. shrubs and other types of green plants they could bring into this. This would figure highly in the document.
- p. They were looking at a number of specific projects, the largest of those being Birmingham Smithfield and the wider area which would have an important public realm included. They were looking at zero emissions in the city, carbon reduction, how they could deal with flood management, water and surface water management.
- q. When they drilled down into specific projects within the City Centre, they were now applying the principles set out in the BDP to deal with some of the challenges that were in a dense city such as Birmingham although not as dense as some others around the world.
- r. The points around maintenance and street furniture were important. The Amey contract was looking at standardising the approach across the City. They were working within those confines and were making emphasis in the document around having simplified quality materials, simplified street furniture and about rationalising the street furniture. This could be applied across the city equally. This was important in terms of long term maintenance.
- s. In terms of the graffiti and the welcoming environment, parts of the City Centre could be improved and they were looking at this through the Curzon Masterplan in Digbeth and how to maximise the opportunities from HS2, Birmingham Smithfield was another prime example. Graffiti could be used as a means of Art through communities particularly in the Digbeth area and how they could take ownership of that locality and use this as a means to provide Art etc.
- t. In relation to the timetable, the City Centre document would be out for consultation by year end, but before Christmas. This would be important to get an insight on the issues they needed to deal with. The local centres document was at the start and they only had an SPD for the local centres that primarily dealt with retail. This was being refreshed and there was an opportunity to come to the Committee to allow the Members to talk about the local centres and how they could bring forward the purpose document that work for those areas. They would revert back to the timetable on those local centres.
- u. With regard to how they work with other departments, there was a key link with Transportation and Place Directorate. They were in dialogue with other

parts of the Council to ensure people were clear about their involvement with this. They were building on this and applying it to key projects in the City.

Members then made the following comments: -

- ❖ Councillor Huxtable stated that they had the local centres SPD and those that were published in December 2011 and the work was taken on by the relevant Scrutiny Committee in terms of the local centres concerning the report amongst others as a basis from June 2012. He expressed disappointment that they were now in 2015 and were still talking about the SPDs from 2011 and no mention made of the conservation areas and the public realm within those conservation areas outside the City Centre, how they protect them etc.
- ❖ The Chairman advised that the SPD in terms of the local centres were due for refresh and that they were aware of their existence.

The Chairman thanked Craig Rowbottom and Richard Cowell for attending the meeting and presenting the information. The Chairman further expressed thanks to Aston Manor and Ninestiles Schools for their involvement with the Scrutiny Committee in getting the opportunity for their students to produce the document referred to earlier on the *Public Realm*.

BIRMINGHAM YOUTH PROMISE

Councillor Holbrook, Cabinet Member for Skills, Learning and Culture and Shilpi Akbar, Assistant Director, Employment presented the item. They drew the Committee's attention to the update concerning the *Landscape for Youth Skills* and *Birmingham Youth Promise Dashboard* documents circulated at the meeting.

(See documents No 3 and 4)

Councillor Holbrook highlighted that the Dashboard was only a prototype and that the figures were slightly out of date. She advised that rather than looking at the direct figures, they wanted to share the prototype with the Committee early to get the Committee's views and opinion. She stated that when the Dashboard went live it would be shared with Scrutiny on a regular basis.

The Committee expressed thanks to Councillor Holbrook and Ms Akbar for their excellent, impressive and encouraging work and the useful and clear information contained in the documents.

In response to questions from Members, Councillor Holbrook and Ms Akbar made the following statements:-

- i. The acronym NALM meant not available to the labour market.
- ii. Councillor Holbrook noted Councillor Evans' comment concerning the percentage of looked after children that went into apprenticeship and advised that they were not supporting enough of them into the world of work. Being

able to change this was about knowing about it and this was the reason it was a target on the Dashboard.

- iii. A number of looked after children got the best educational support a number of which move into academia rather than anything else. The truth was that the 2% figure that went on to apprenticeship, shows what was happening across the wider Birmingham piece that pathways either academic or technical were not equally valued or taken. This was the bigger issue that was picked up, but they were working on it
- iv. Councillor Holbrook noted Councillor Jenkins' comment regarding youth unemployment and advised that they were not getting complacent concerning the issue. They still had 5.8% of the youth population without a job or a placement in employment. What was known was that they believe they had the landscape and the mechanism. The reason they believed this to be so was that Birmingham was closing the gap than anywhere else in the UK. Although their figures were the highest they were getting close to where they wanted it to be.
- v. They were socialising the Dashboard and the work that they were doing in terms of the data being presented. The Dashboard was trying to tell the outside world and the Committee that when they look at the sum total of what deliveries were happening within the local authority and other parts of the public sector, and through the investments that was made, the discretionary funds be it at a regional or local level, and they wanted to see the impact of that work. This was important as ultimately the little training that was happening on a citywide or district level, the question was how this had affected the rate of unemployment level in young people and whether this was getting the impact shown on the graph.
- vi. What they did not want to do was to put diminishing *pots* of money into projects and programmes interventions that were not working. This would help to tell them that story and to indicate where they needed to put the investment now and the future. This captures the statutory indicators that they needed to capture as a local authority how the other part of the machinery referred to earlier was contributing to this.
- vii. The reason for the Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET) 16 – 18, was the element of service that the Birmingham Careers Service was providing to the City. The Council needed to track their own investment in services to young people and to ensure young people went right from the age of 16 years old up to 24/25 years old.
- viii. The way funding was delivered or the way policies were developed often put young people into various categories which include 16 – 18; 14 – 19 and 18 – 24. DWP measures youth from the 18 – 24 categories. They were trying to tell much of the story as possible, but there was some way to go in ensuring that it was relevant and that the data they were capturing on a monthly or quarterly basis was robust. If it is robust they wanted to share it publicly.

- ix. They were working with partners this week in the Birmingham Youth Partnership and even their public health partners were saying that they would like to include young people services around Mental Health and Learning Disability and look at the impact of what was happening in the City on those indicators. St Basil's Youth Hostel wanted to receive young homeless people or young people who were at risk and tracking some of these things. There was a need to broaden this, but unless it was robust, relevant to people, the partners and service providers, it would fall by the wayside.

At this juncture, the Chairman then invited Calvin Biddle, who was working on a Department for Work and Pensions placement with the Scrutiny Committee to address the Committee. She added that he was an example of how the City Council could be working in terms of the diagram that was presented earlier.

Mr Biddle stated that he had graduated from Aberystwyth University with a degree and had moved back to the City in July 2015. He advised that he was looking for employment and as he was claiming Universal Credit he had to visit the Job Centre. He stated that his work coach had suggested that he undertake a work experience to increase his prospect of employment. He stated he was referred to the City Council who enquired what he was interested in doing. He stated that he was interested in politics and was referred to the Scrutiny Committee where he was offered a placement. He highlighted that it was good that he had the experience of preparing for and attending an interview which was helpful.

The Chairman stated that Mr Biddle's work placement was non-political and that it was the City Council's bureaucratic machine that he works for.

In response to further questions, Councillor Holbrook and Ms Akbar made the following statements: -

1. They ensure that the people who were involved in the programme - service providers who were providing the data, but when it came to analysing the data, this was referred to their analysis to ensure that there was integrity behind the information.
2. They were not double counting, or counting things that they would report to Central Government. It was about the contributions and some of the parts and services that were impacting on the figures. Working in partnership and seeing the pathways of young people was important and behind all of this was engagement for the young persons and their travel through the various parts of provisions they wanted to pick up.
3. There may be elements where a person may start off with the Birmingham Career Service and then move on to become an apprentice. They would then be picking them up. There may be crossovers at particular points, but the information they had and counting would be in line and attune to what they would be putting out as public data.
4. One element of the Youth Promise they had been trying to pull together and was proving difficult was a transport offer. This point was raised at a previous Scrutiny Committee in relation to the universal transport offer for young

people as young people advised that the challenge for them was to get around whether it be to college, work or job opportunity or apprenticeship.

5. It was known that young people did not feel that they were part of the City and were unable to access things. This was more than being able to get on to a bus, train or cycle to get to college, work etc. It was about being able to access all the things the City had to offer and young people owning the City the same as others do.
6. Meetings were held with Centro and the different providers. There were a number of different schemes available including a *Travel to Work Scheme* operated by Centro; a number of others where free transport was provided for young people; the colleges also provide funding for free transport for their students; the DWP had an offer of free transport to work, but it was felt that the schemes were so fragmented it was difficult for people to know which of these schemes to use.
7. They were undertaking a piece of work to look into the issue and perhaps Scrutiny could take a lead on this issue to help in terms of what this looked like in other parts of the country and what they might think about in terms of joining up all the transport offer.
8. In terms of Districts, they did not have jobs in every district and it was important to get the connectivity and the transport right. There was a need to get people use to travelling. People could get to anywhere in the City within an hour. In a huge part of the country this was not an unusual commute time.

Following discussions it was

20

RESOLVED: -

- i) That the Committee include the jobs and skills plan as an item in its work programme; and
- ii) That a letter be sent to all Districts Chairs inviting them into the discussion concerning the issue.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Penny Holbrook and Shilpi Akbar for attending the meeting and presenting the information

**WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE ECONOMY, SKILLS AND SUSTAINABILITY
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2015/2016**

The following work programme was submitted:-

(See document No 4)

Councillor Huxtable commented that Councillor Holbrook had attended this Scrutiny Committee twice since the start of this Municipal Year. He stated that it was noted from the work programme that Councillor Lisa Trickett, Cabinet Member for Green

Smart and Sustainable City would be attending the Scrutiny Committee scheduled for the 23 October 2015, in relation to the Birmingham Cycle Revolution item and on the 13 November 2015. Councillor Huxtable stated that what he did not see was either Councillor Tahir Ali, Cabinet Member for Development, Transport and the Economy or Councillor Shaffique Shah, Cabinet Member for Inclusion and Community Safety. He added that the Cabinet Member for Inclusion and Community Safety would take over Councillor James McKay's role in the 20 mph and road safety strategies. He enquired when the Cabinet Members who played a fundamental part in this Committee would be invited so that the Committee could critically scrutinise their plans as an Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Chairman advised that in terms of the Road Safety item on the agenda, they had invited Councillor McKay to attend the next Committee meeting, but he would not now be attending and that an immediate invitation was extended to Councillor Shah who had expressed that he was more than happy to support in any way he could, but it needed to be understood that he was only a week into the role. She added that Councillor Shah may not be *on the ball* in terms of the *Road Safety* item as the Committee might be preparing for and this was the reason he was not yet included on the work programme.

With regard to Councillor Ali, he supports this Committee and pays a keen interest in it. He could be invited at any time and on any issues in relation to transport infrastructure. The Chairman advised that she had invited him to attend this meeting. He was listed to give a report in February 2016.

Councillor O'Shea requested that they look at the Birmingham Cycle Revolution (BCR) at New Street Station. The Chairman advised that they had an opportunity next Friday when they look into the work on Changing Gear, the Sustrans report and delve into the achievements of BCR.

Councillor Huxtable made reference to the Business Improvement Districts (BID) and stated that they were told that this would be a proposal through Cabinet and that they were coming forward and there would be consultation. He added that he had made the point that there were various local centres that were up for re-ballot in 2016, who had started the re-ballot and a consultation process, examples, Acocks Green and Northfield. He stated that the BIDs wanted certainty as to what the proposals would be and whether they would affect them from the date of the re-ballot and the new bids. Councillor Huxtable stated that he could not see this in the work programme and future Cabinet decisions. He enquired whether there had been any updates on the issues.

The Chairman stated that the BIDs could approach this Committee concerning any issues with the City Council at any time as they were assured of that. She advised that she was aware that the BIDs were in uncertain time and that there was a slot in the December's Scrutiny Committee meeting on *Local Centres Update*. BIDs were at the centre of any local centre on any discussion and the most natural place to bring them all in should this be necessary was for December's Scrutiny Committee meeting. The Chairman stated that budgetary processes and issues and different decisions in terms of the future for business in the City would have an impact. It was about the timing and ensuring that they get things right with the correct information.

Councillor O'Shea stated that the BIDs themselves needed some clarity on where things stand at the moment and the immediate future.

Councillor Huxtable stated that it was noted that from the Cabinet decisions the transportation and highways capital programme 2015/16 and 2017/18 was due to be discussed at Cabinet on the 20 October 2015. He added that it appeared strange to him that they were talking about the capital programme starting in the Municipal Year 2015/16 and yet it still did not get to Cabinet until October 2015. He further stated that in previous years the capital programme for the future Municipal Year was discussed and agreed in February/March of 2015 for implementation at the beginning of the Municipal Year 2015/16. He enquired what the delay was and whether this would have a knock on impact in terms of delivery.

The Chairman advised that as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee she had the right to attend Cabinet. She added that if the Committee would like her to do so she would be more than happy to attend and ask the Cabinet Member the reason for the delay. She further stated that if there were issues with the capital programme they had the right to call it in.

21 **RESOLVED:-**

That the work programme be noted.

**REQUEST(S) FOR CALL IN/COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION/PETITIONS
RECEIVED (IF ANY)**

22 The Chairman advised that there had been no requests for call in/councillor call for action/petitions received.

AUTHORITY TO CHAIRMAN AND OFFICERS

23 **RESOLVED:-**

That in an urgent situation between meetings the Chair, jointly with the relevant Chief Officer, has authority to act on behalf of the Committee.

The meeting ended at 1253 hours.

.....
CHAIRMAN