



**MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM
CITY COUNCIL
6 DECEMBER 2016**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD
ON TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE COUNCIL
CHAMBER, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

PRESENT:- Lord Mayor (Councillor Carl Rice) in the Chair.

Councillors

Muhammad Afzal	Mick Finnegan	Mary Locke
Uzma Ahmed	Des Flood	Ewan Mackey
Mohammed Aikhlaq	Jayne Francis	Majid Mahmood
Deirdre Alden	Matthew Gregson	Karen McCarthy
Robert Alden	Carole Griffiths	James McKay
Nawaz Ali	Peter Griffiths	Gareth Moore
Tahir Ali	Paulette Hamilton	Yvonne Mosquito
Sue Anderson	Andrew Hardie	Brett O'Reilly
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Roger Harmer	John O'Shea
Mohammed Azim	Kath Hartley	David Pears
Susan Barnett	Barry Henley	Robert Pocock
David Barrie	Penny Holbrook	Victoria Quinn
Bob Beauchamp	Des Hughes	Hendrina Quinnen
Matt Bennett	Jon Hunt	Chauhdry Rashid
Kate Booth	Mahmood Hussain	Habib Rehman
Steve Booton	Shabrana Hussain	Fergus Robinson
Marje Bridle	Timothy Huxtable	Gary Sambrook
Mick Brown	Mohammed Idrees	Rob Sealey
Alex Buchanan	Zafar Iqbal	Shafique Shah
Sam Burden	Ziaul Islam	Mike Sharpe
Andy Cartwright	Meirion Jenkins	Sybil Spence
Tristan Chatfield	Simon Jevon	Claire Spencer
Zaker Choudhry	Julie Johnson	Stewart Stacey
Debbie Clancy	Brigid Jones	Ron Storer
John Clancy	Carol Jones	Martin Straker-Welds
Lynda Clinton	Josh Jones	Sharon Thompson
Lyn Collin	Nagina Kauser	Paul Tilsley
Maureen Cornish	Tony Kennedy	Karen Trench
John Cotton	Ansar Ali Khan	Lisa Trickett
Ian Cruise	Changese Khan	Anne Underwood
Basharat Dad	Mariam Khan	Margaret Waddington

City Council – 6 December 2016

Phil Davis	Narinder Kaur Kooner	Ian Ward
Diane Donaldson	Chaman Lal	Mike Ward
Peter Douglas Osborn	Mike Leddy	Fiona Williams
Barbara Dring	Bruce Lines	Ken Wood
Neil Eustace	John Lines	Alex Yip
Mohammed Fazal	Keith Linnecor	Waseem Zaffar

NOTICE OF RECORDING

18752 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.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Mick Finnegan's name did not appear in the list of those present.

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

18753 **RESOLVED:-**

That, subject to the above amendment, the Minutes of the Meeting of the City Council held on 1 November 2016, having been printed and a copy sent to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Honorary Vivienne Margaret Barton

18754 The Lord Mayor reminded the Council that, at an Extraordinary Meeting held on 24 May 2016, it had agreed to confer upon Vivienne Margaret Barton the title of Honorary Alderman of Birmingham City Council in recognition of 26 years of service as a Councillor.

The Lord Mayor presented Vivienne Margaret Barton with an engrossment of the Council's resolution to admit her to the Roll of Honorary Aldermen of the City.

B. Honorary Alderman Jeremy Evans

18755 The Lord Mayor reminded the Council that, at an Extraordinary Meeting held on 24 May 2016, it had agreed to confer upon Jeremy Evans the title of Honorary Alderman of Birmingham City Council in recognition of 13 years of service as a Councillor.

The Lord Mayor presented Jeremy Evans with an engrossment of the Council's resolution to admit his name to the Roll of Honorary Aldermen of the City.

C. Honorary Alderman Anita Alison Ward

- 18756 The Lord Mayor reminded the Council that, at an Extraordinary Meeting held on 24 May 2016, it had agreed to confer upon Anita Alison Ward the title of Honorary Alderman of Birmingham City Council in recognition of 20 years and 4 months of service as a Councillor.

The Lord Mayor presented Anita Alison Ward with an engrossment of the Council's resolution to admit her to the Roll of Honorary Aldermen of the City.

D. Death

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Councillor Winifred Caney who served as a Councillor for Newtown Ward from 1973 to 1980.

After a number of tributes had been paid by Members, it was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and:-

- 18757 **RESOLVED:-**

That this Council places on record its sorrow at the death of former Councillor Winifred Caney and its appreciation of her devoted service to the residents of Birmingham; it extends its deepest sympathy to members of Winifred's family in their sad bereavement.

E. Deputy Lord Mayor Councillor Ray Hassall and Former Lord Mayor Councillor John Alden

- 18758 The Lord Mayor informed Members that the Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Ray Hassall, was currently in hospital having undergone an operation last Thursday, and he was expected to remain in hospital for a couple of weeks.

Former Lord Mayor, Councillor John Alden is also back in hospital, having had an emergency operation on Sunday following previous surgery.

On behalf of the Council he wished them both a speedy recovery.

PETITIONS

Petition Relating to City Council Functions Presented before the Meeting

The following petition was presented before the meeting:-

(See document No 1)

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

18759 **RESOLVED:-**

That the petition be received and referred to the relevant Chief Officer.

Petitions Relating to City Council Functions Presented at the Meeting

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No 2)

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

18760 **RESOLVED:-**

That the petitions be received and referred to the relevant Chief Officers.

Petitions Update

The following Petitions Update was submitted:-

(See document No 3)

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and -

18761 **RESOLVED:-**

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

QUESTION TIME

18762 The Council proceeded to consider Oral Questions in accordance with Standing Order 9 (B).

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

APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNCIL

18763 There were no appointments to be made.

EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDERS

It was moved by Councillor Idrees, seconded and:-

18764 **RESOLVED:-**

That, pursuant to CBM Committee discussions, Standing Orders be waived as follows:

- Allocate 30 Minutes for item 8 (Children's Social Care and Education; Improvement and Challenges)
 - Allocate 15 minutes for item 9 (implementing the Devolution Agreement – Mayoral Combined Authority Functions)
 - Allocate 15 minutes for item 10 (Licensing Act 2003 – Statement of Licensing Policy)
 - Reduce the time for item 11 (Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees) to 45 minutes
 - Reduce the time for item 12 (Motions for debate from individual Members) to 75 minutes.
-

CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE AND EDUCATION:IMPROVEMENT AND CHALLENGES

The following report of the Improvement Quartet: Councillor John Clancy, Councillor Brigid Jones, Mark Rogers and Peter Hay was submitted:-

(See document No 4)

Councillor Brigid Jones moved the motion which was seconded.

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

(See document No 5)

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

A debate ensued.

Councillor Brigid Jones 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.

The original 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 -

18765 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council welcomes and notes the signs of progress in children's social care and in education, notes that an action plan in response to the September/October Ofsted inspection will be submitted to Cabinet, and notes progress on the voluntary trust arrangement for children's services, as part of the further steps in recovery, with debate and comments at this meeting informing the recommendations to Cabinet in January 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

18766 **RESOLVED:-**

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

The Council then adjourned at 1626 hours.

At 1702 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

IMPLEMENTING THE DEVOLUTION AGREEMENT – MAYORAL COMBINED AUTHORITY FUNCTIONS

The following report of the Leader was submitted:-

(See document No 6)

Councillor John Clancy moved the motion which was seconded.

A debate ensued.

Councillor John Clancy 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 -

18767 **RESOLVED:-**

Consents to the draft Mayoral West Midlands Combined Authority Order (Appendix A) being laid in Parliament, subject to approval of the Chief Executive, acting in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to:

1. The financial arrangements detailed in the awaited West Midlands Combined Authority Finance Order; and
2. Any minor and drafting amendments to the West Midlands Combined Authority Functions and Amendments) Order 2016.

LICENSING ACT 2003 - STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

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

(See document No 7)

Councillor Barbara Dring moved the motion which was seconded.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Barbara Dring 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 -

18768 **RESOLVED:-**

That the City Council approves the revised Statement of Licensing Policy and authorises:-

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

REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

Big Challenges for Health & Social Care - The Birmingham and Solihull Sustainability and Transformation Plan

The following report of the Health, Wellbeing and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee was submitted:-

(See document No 8)

Councillor John Cotton spoke to the report.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Lyn Collin and Matt Bennett gave notice of the following amendment to the report:-

(See document No 9)

Councillor Lyn Collin moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Matt Bennett.

A debate ensued.

Councillor John Cotton 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 carried.

It was therefore -

18769

RESOLVED:-

That, subject to the insertion of the following on page 15 of the report, it be noted:

11.4 The Council will not support an STP for implementation without the direct, recorded approval of the plan by the Leader and Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care.

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(A).

Councillors Robert Alden and Ken Wood have given notice of the following Motion:-

(See document No 10)

Councillor Robert Alden moved the Motion, which was seconded by Councillor Ken Wood.

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

(See document No 11)

City Council – 6 December 2016

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

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

(See document No 12)

Councillor John Clancy moved the amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Ian Ward.

A debate ensued.

THE QUESTION BE NOW PUT

It was moved by Councillor Majid Mahmood and seconded –

“That the question be put.”

The Motion was put to the vote and, by a show of hands, was declared to be carried.

It was accordingly –

18770 **RESOLVED:-**

That the question be now put.

Councillor Robert Alden replied to the debate.

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

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

It was therefore -

18771 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council notes the latest findings of the Birmingham Independent Improvement Panel and welcomes the Panel's acceptance that concerns raised by the Kerslake Review are being actively addressed and the council is strengthening how it manages its corporate performance by putting in place improved collaborative working.

Council further welcomes the findings that the:

- new skills, insights and contributions from additional senior management staff have made a positive difference;
- council has made progress in addressing its improvement priorities and handled effectively some unexpected external events and challenges;
- assistant council leaders have been praised for developing new ways of involving and listening to the views of citizens.

However, Council notes with concern the very serious financial difficulties imposed on Birmingham as a direct result of the Government's unwarranted austerity programme, which has already led to the Council workforce being reduced by over a third and cuts in public services of nearly £590M since 2010/11 and estimated further cuts of around £180 million by 2021.

Council further notes the intention of the Executive to construct a 'front-line first' budget for 2017/18, prioritising the services most valued by Birmingham citizens as far as it is possible to do so against the backdrop of unrelentingly savage cuts in local government grant and the abject failure of the Government to address or indeed even recognise the social care funding crisis.

B. Councillors Zaker Choudry and Jon Hunt have given notice of the following Motion:-

(See document No 13)

Councillor Zaker Choudry moved the Motion, which was seconded by Councillor Jon Hunt.

In accordance with Council Standing Orders, Councillors Waseem Zaffar and Mariam Khan gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No 14)

Councillor Waseem Zaffar in moving the amendment indicated that rather than deleting paragraph 1, he wished the first 2 paragraphs of the amendment to be inserted after paragraph 1, and Councillor Mariam Khan seconded the amended amendment.

A debate ensued.

Councillor Waseem Zaffar replied to the debate.

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 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 –

18772

RESOLVED:-

Council notes serious concerns amongst residents of Kashmiri heritage about widely reported recent human rights abuses and their recent escalation in Jammu Kashmir and the many public demonstrations of those concerned.

Council recognises that the Kashmiri diaspora community in Birmingham and peace loving Brummies are deeply concerned about the recent problems in India-administered Kashmir and calls on the Government to make immediate representation to the Indian Government to express concern about the widely reported human rights abuses and violence which has recently occurred in India-administered Kashmir; urges the Indian authorities to restrain their military forces from using disproportionate force against the civilian population, and to allow non-governmental organisations, media and independent observers into the Kashmir valley in order to monitor the situation and to carry out humanitarian relief work.

Council supports the wishes of Brummie Kashmiri's who call on the Government to convey to both the India and Pakistan Governments that the views of the people of Kashmir are paramount in determining how they are governed and who shall govern them; and calls on the governments of India and Pakistan to recognise that the kingdom of Kashmir belongs to the people of Kashmir and only they can determine their future. The Right of self-determination for Kashmiris is imperative for a long term peaceful solution in South Asia.

Council further notes our region's extensive trade links with South Asia and welcomes recent UK Government attempts to extend those links.

Council further expresses concern about national immigration policy that may restrict access to good quality higher education in our city for students from the Commonwealth countries of South Asia.

Council calls on Government to pull together a coherent immigration policy following Brexit which understands and reflects the skills gap and needs of Birmingham, West Midlands and the UK.

Council believes that Birmingham, with its diverse citizenry and strong manufacturing economy, has a key role to play in maintaining good links with these countries.

However, this should not be at the expense of overlooking abuse of human rights. Indeed, respect for human rights should have a key role in ensuring economic development is for the benefit of the many, rather than the few.

Council further notes concern amongst its Kashmiri citizens that the region is subject to the Indian Armed Forces Special Powers Act 1990 and that a 1948 UN resolution called for a plebiscite of its inhabitants over its future. A resolution that to date remains unfulfilled and is the major cause of tension in the Region.

City Council – 6 December 2016

Council, therefore, would ask the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transparency, Openness and Equality to set up a meeting with the Indian High Commissioner, the Pakistan High Commissioner, Birmingham MP's and other relevant stakeholders (including representatives of the opposition parties) to discuss:

- Trade in Birmingham
 - Support for students in Birmingham
 - Birmingham's concern about human rights abuses in Jammu Kashmir - offering lessons that could be learnt from the Northern Ireland peace process.
 - The right of self-determination for Kashmiris.
-

The meeting ended at 1935 hours.

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

A1 Replacement Savings

Question:

What is the list of replacement savings?

Answer:

The Month 4 Corporate Monitoring Report 2016/17 detailed the new savings approved to be commenced in 2016/17, identified via the Council's Mid-Year Review.

The changes to the Council's savings programme for 2017/18 and onwards will be announced and agreed via the Business Plan and Budget 2017+ process.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW**

A2 Statutory Recommendations

Question:

On how many previous occasions have the Council's external auditors felt compelled to issue a statutory recommendation under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 or its predecessor the Audit Commission Act 1988 due to concerns regarding the Council's current and/or forecast financial position?

Answer:

We are not aware of any previous occasions.

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

A3 Transitional Fund

Question:

For every year from 2012 to end of the current business plan (2020), how much has been and is allocated for the organisation transitional fund, including yearly spend/planned spend from that fund?

Answer:

The Organisational Transition Reserve was established in 2014/15 with £101.3m. This was made possible via rescheduling the provision for debt repayments (MRP) starting in 2013/14, spreading them more evenly over a fixed future period. In 2015/16, of this reserve £28.5m was utilised as planned.

The Long Term Financial Plan within the Council's Budget 2016+ assumes that a further £12.7m will be used in 2017/18.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR MEIRION JENKINS**

A4 Contingency Plans

Question:

At the March budget, £12.8m of the contingency fund was earmarked for use in 2017/18. In the gap analysis presented to the Improvement Panel later that same month it stated that CLT were looking to identify how it might avoid the need to use this. What plans were put in place, including when to attempt to deliver on this commitment?

Answer:

The Draft Business Plan 2017+ will make clear the proposals for the future use of the Organisational Transition Fund, while maintaining an appropriate level of reserves to act as a contingency for savings delivery risk and additional funding required for organisational change costs.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ANDREW HARDIE**

A5 Contingency Plans 1

Question:

At the March budget, £12.8m of the contingency fund was earmarked for use in 2017/18. In the gap analysis presented to the Improvement Panel later that same month it stated that CLT were looking to identify how it might avoid the need to use this. What plans were shared with you and when to attempt to deliver on this commitment?

Answer:

The Draft Business Plan 2017+ will make clear the proposals for the future use of the Organisational Transition Fund, while maintaining an appropriate level of reserves to act as a contingency for savings delivery risk and additional funding required for organisational change costs.

The formulation of the draft reserves strategy for 2017/18 has been part of the Budget 2017+ planning process.

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

A6 Early Warning Systems

Question:

The gap analysis presented to the improvement panel in March stated that extra support had been earmarked to get back on track any budget plans identified by ‘early warning systems’ as slipping. Which plans, if any, were brought back on track as a result of these early warning systems and extra support?

Answer:

Corporate monitoring reports to Cabinet have been clear on the deliverability issues and actions associated with the Council’s savings programme since the start of the year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR DES FLOOD**

A7 Early Warning Systems 2

Question:

The gap analysis presented to the improvement panel in March stated that extra support had been earmarked to get back on track any budget plans identified by ‘early warning systems’ as slipping. Please outline the Council’s ‘early warning systems’ in this context?

Answer:

The Council has further strengthened its performance management framework, including the arrangements for Corporate Leadership Team’s collective engagement on budget issues throughout the year.

Corporate monitoring reports to Cabinet have been clear on the deliverability issues and actions associated with the Council’s savings programme since the start of the year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

A8 Early Warning Systems 3

Question:

The gap analysis presented to the improvement panel in March stated that extra support had been earmarked to get back on track any budget plans identified by ‘early warning systems’ as slipping. In this context what extra support was put in place?

Answer:

The Council has approved £14.4m budget for improvement work for 2016/17 to fund additional support to Directorates to deliver service changes and associated budget savings, where it was considered that the demands of doing so could not be met from Directorates’ existing resources.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR LYN COLLIN**

A9 Early Warning Systems 4

Question:

The gap analysis presented to the improvement panel in March stated that extra support had been earmarked to get back on track any budget plans identified by ‘early warning systems’ as slipping. Please list all budget plans, including the date it was noticed, that were slipping as noticed by the ‘early warning systems’?

Answer:

The Corporate Budget Monitoring reports for 2016/17 collectively detail the chronology of delivery assessments of budget savings plans.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR MARGARET WADDINGTON**

A10 Overspend

Question:

What plan for driving down budget overspend has been produced?

Answer:

The Month 6 Corporate Monitoring Report 2016/17 describes the Council's in year approach to managing the budget overspend.

The Business Plan and Budget 2017+ will address the future year's implications of savings delivery issues and pressures.

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

A11 Savings - STP

Question:

What is the savings or income has directly resulted from the work done by STP Consultants?

Answer:

None.

The consultants weren't employed for this purpose. The specification for their role, as set out in the Joint Cabinet Member and Strategic Director report of 15th August 2016 is set out below:

- Develop, evaluate and challenge emerging programme plans, to ensure that they are robust, based on best evidence, and collectively able to deliver the objectives of the STP
- Ensure maximum alignment of all work-streams to deliver the overall objectives of the STP
- Identify additional opportunities for innovation and new practice which can be adopted locally to address the challenges set out in the STP, (including emerging lessons from the NHS New Care Models programme)
- Model the impact of emerging programme plans in terms of costs, benefits and deliverability
- Develop key measures which can be used to support the future delivery of programme plans, and enable the System Board to track progress to 2021
- Identify substantial additional opportunities to bridge the current financial gap and maximise the savings that can be delivered through the individual and collective work of the 5 major programmes
- Develop and deliver a framework that clearly connects the value chain from the triple aim ambition to the change programmes and organisations, which identifies the approach to measurement and accountability for delivery.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ANNE UNDERWOOD**

A12 Transfer

Question:

Prior to the budget being set, what assurances were given by NHS leaders and when, upon which the assumption of a £13m transfer from the NHS as part of the STP process would be made in 2016/17?

Answer:

The question is in error. No assurances were sought from the NHS in relation to the STP process and the transfer of £13m in setting the 2016/17 budget.

The agreement to seek to secure £13m from NHS England to alleviate Birmingham City Council's social care service/funding pressures was reached on 5 July 2016 by the STP System Board, as part of a discussion about financial pressures across the system as a whole.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR FERGUS ROBINSON**

A14 STP Plan

Question:

What response has the Council received from NHS England so far in relation to the STP Plan?

Answer:

The Council has not received a response directly.

Instead, regional NHS England and NHS Improvement representatives gave provisional written feedback via the System Leader to the Birmingham & Solihull STP partnership on 16th November 2016 (see Appendix).

A definitive response from the national moderation of the draft plan is still awaited.

A14 – Appendix



Our ref: WM/STP/BSOL
Your ref:

West Midlands
213 Hagley Road
Edgbaston
Birmingham
B16 9RG

Telephone Number: 011382 51771

Sent via email

16 November 2016

Dear Mark

Re: Birmingham and Solihull STP Formal Feedback

This letter provides a high level summary of our feedback from the review by NHS England, NHS Improvement, CQC, ADASS, Public Health England and Health Education England.

These points are provided to support the continued progress of your STP and the further development of a public facing summary of your plan.

Appended to this letter are the current proposed next steps, actions and support that we have jointly discussed. If you have other suggestions for the support that you would welcome please contact your Locality Director in NHS England with suggestions as soon as possible.

Overall headline feedback

The STP leadership have demonstrated over recent months the commitment to developing the STP strategy and a clearer focus on the system change programs. The STP therefore has a positive foundation to build on moving forwards.

It is however our view that the plan does not yet set out an integrated strategy to transform health and social care, and does not establish any wider vision for public sector transformation.

Whilst, it does provide a platform for focused effort on three broad program areas, these are not integrated into a coherent system vision and are not robust enough for system based operational planning. Neither do they credibly address the current operational and financial challenges across emergency care and out of hospital social and community care capacity.

You have made progress in building more productive relationships across the system, and engagement in the STP continues to improve. However, more work is required on leadership and collaboration between health leadership and with social care and wider system leaders to create a common vision and build confidence amongst partners that there is a shared commitment to own and resolve system problems collectively.

The leadership and governance of the next phase of work in the STP needs to be

reviewed and strengthened and the resulting structures should have the support of the chairs and chief executives of the STP organisations. Partners also need to clearly define the system wide delivery and programme management support now needed to enable it to further develop and implement its plans. We would like to receive your proposed revised governance, strengthened project resources and PMO arrangements by the 30th November.

There is a good analysis of the gaps in outcomes and quality but the financial analysis doesn't examine program investments and variation in spend by geography, sector or per capita. Addressing this in the coming months could provide clear direction for investment and disinvestment in the system. The plan would be strengthened if the opportunities identified early on in the plan are followed through in terms of proposed reform.

As a system BSOL is involved in wider work on public service transformation beyond social care – the progress made particularly in Children's and Mental Health services could feature more strongly.

The BSOL STP plan does set out a series of success measures for each of the identified program areas. Consideration should be given how you can bring these to 'life' in terms of everyday language and describe the real offer of service change in the system showing 'before' and 'after' this will have considerable benefit for your public facing narrative.

Public facing summary

We acknowledge the progress you have made of late on developing your proposed engagement strategy; we all therefore want to ensure it is communicated well and in terms that the public will understand and support. The current plan has been produced as a management report, and therefore is unlikely to be understood by the public and patients you serve.

As your plan is further developed you should consider producing a public facing document. NHS England is happy to provide advice and guidance to you, to support a high quality document being available to the public. You should make the decision on when is the right time for you to publish and present this information to the local public and stakeholders.

Your strategy & national alignment

Your plan high level priorities; the next phase of your STP development should include more detailed work on articulating the system health and social care vision and model of care, and the solutions that will deliver this vision and close the identified gaps. You have started public engagement and are beginning to develop your approach to clinical engagement and delivery of the plan. Everyone will need to focus on local engagement and the development of clear milestones for your identified solutions. Specialised commissioning and maternity sections of the plan are recognised as strongly aligned to national direction.

It is not clear how the plan deals with the national priorities for 7 day services, new care models and cancer for example. You should consider a clearer analysis of the priorities for change in these areas.

Delivering the Triple Aim

As you move now into the next phase of STP development, there needs to be a clear focus on ensuring organisations work jointly together, to focus on ensuring you are all clear on the work you must now progress to deliver improved wellbeing, transform the quality of care and operate within the financial resources you have available in the system. In particular the transformation envisaged for 'community care first' will require equality of commitment and leadership from all sectors in the STP leadership team. We also recognise, and will continue to support, the important work on commissioning development for a single and strategic commissioning body which will enable the development of the BSOL system as well as enable the rapid transformation of new care models in the transformed community first model.

The planning process for the next 2 years provides a good opportunity for the system to jointly focus on short term goals, particularly to address the current operational and financial challenges and plan for the longer term.

Next steps

All STPs will be formally reviewed on the 16 November by NHS England and NHS Improvement nationally. Birmingham and Solihull has been identified as one of the STPs that warrants significant support, and we will advise in due course the result of this national review.

NHS England and NHS Improvement will seek to enhance our dialogue and support programme with your STP as we support you to now move from planning to engagement and delivery. If you have any questions or would like more detailed feedback on your plan, please do contact your Locality Director in the first instance.

Yours sincerely



ALISON TONGE
Director of Commissioning Operations
NHS England – West Midlands



FRANCES SHATTOCK
Regional Lead
NHS Improvement

[DRAFT] BSOL STP support action plan



Footprint Actions	Region Actions	Proposed National Actions
<p><i>What are the footprints doing to prepare for and resource implementation?</i></p> <p>In the next three months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and strengthen PMO 2. Review and strengthen governance 3. Appoint project directors for the overall program and CCF <p>In the next six months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioning proposals for single body in place 2. Clear commissioning outcomes based approach in place along side operational 3. Proposals for new care models are agreed as agree direction <p>In the next twelve months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New care models are under development and investment, transfer of commissioning resources in place 2. New strategic commissioning body approved and implementation underway 	<p><i>What will the regional team do to support STPs prepare for implementation?</i></p> <p>In the next three months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and provide advice on governance and project leadership 2. Provide assured support for commissioning development 3. Specialised commissioners to be better embedded in system planning and governance <p>In the next six months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ALBs to release and frame support toward enabling the CCF, new care models and commissioning development 2. Reinforce single and aligned messages on leadership team accountability <p>In the next twelve months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable and support wider development of place based commissioning and public service reforms with partners 	<p><i>What should the national team do to support implementation?</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Articulate nationally the messages of team based accountability for each system 2. Reinforce aligned measures of leadership maturity and building a focus on driving outcomes

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

A15 Funding

Question:

According to the Sunday Times the ringleader of the Trojan Horse plot, Tahir Alam, has been teaching children, in Birmingham - at the Khidmat Centre in Sparkbrook - despite being banned from doing so by the government. I understand that the Khidmat Centre receives, or has received funding from the City Council. Can you confirm the amount and purpose of this funding for the past three financial years?

Answer:

The Council currently funds The Small Heath Community Forum to support Older Adults. This organisation currently own the Khidmat Centre. This service addresses social isolation and supports older people to remain independent in their own homes and provides them with information advice and guidance on wellbeing issues. The cost of this service is £73,989 per annum.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR SUE ANDERSON**

A16 No more proposals to close children's play areas

Question:

In the light of disturbing increases in child obesity, will the Leader ensure that there are no further proposals to close children's play areas?

Answer:

Play areas sit within the Parks and Nature Conservation budget. All budgets are being reviewed and proposals will be released as part of the budget consultation this week. Once the outcome of the consultation has been considered, budget proposals will be put forward to Cabinet for 17/18 onwards in February next year.

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

A17 Housing Projects - Country Garden - China

Question:

How many housing projects are under way as a result of the agreement signed with Country Garden in China in August?

Answer:

As Cllr Hunt is aware, my administration has made house building a key priority in the city, second only to safeguarding our children. Birmingham needs to build approximately 89,000 house by 2031, as set out in the Birmingham Development Plan.

It is clear that the housing market is not working for our citizens. The discrepancy between the supply of houses, and the demand, is driving up prices and prohibiting people from purchasing their own home. The problem is particularly acute for young people and Birmingham, with almost 30 per cent of our residents under 20 years old, feels this issue more keenly than other cities.

Not only do we need to deliver housing at pace and scale, we require quality homes that will hold their value, giving Birmingham citizens long term financial security.

My administration will not be passive on such matters and we have taken the lead in leveraging our global connections to bring in the capital and capacity needed to deliver on our housing need.

We hope part of the solution is a £2bn investment agreement signed with Chinese real estate developer Country Garden.

Since that agreement in August we have established an Investment Project Board that I sit on, together with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes, colleagues from the planning department and the Department for International Trade.

We have been working with Country Garden on analysis of housing demand and helping them build their advisory and delivery teams in Birmingham through Marketing Birmingham.

We are in advanced discussions, through this Investment Project Board, on the first large scale housing investment in Birmingham. The scheme involves sensitive commercial negotiations and we are not yet at a stage where we can disclose all the particulars to the market.

Country Garden will not provide a total solution to our housing issue but they have shown an admirable level of commitment to our city and I hope we can all welcome their future contribution to Birmingham.

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

A18 Agreement

Question:

Could the Leader provide a copy of the agreement he signed on behalf of the City with Country Garden?

Answer:

I have instructed officers to forward a copy of the agreement to you.

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

A19 Petitions

Question:

Does the Leader know if there were any incidences of Council Officers contacting signatories of a petition on the removal of support officers at sheltered housing schemes to ask why they signed and if they understood what they were signing?

Answer:

I am aware that petitions have been submitted regarding the sheltered housing schemes.

To clarify, the petitions received were against the “removal of support officers” whereas the proposals presented to all residents during the consultation at no time included the removal of the Sheltered Officer role and this caused some confusion for some residents.

It was deemed important therefore, in order to respond to the petition, to check that residents understood the proposals put to them.

A briefing note on the Sheltered Housing Review was sent to all Members by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes on 24th November 2016.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ROB SEALEY**

A20 Petitions 2

Question:

If the Leader is aware of any incidences of Council Officers contacting signatories of a petition on the removal of support officers at sheltered housing schemes to ask why they signed and if they understood what they were signing, under the instructions of which Cabinet Member were they acting?

Answer:

As stated in the response to your colleague Cllr Jevon at A19, I am aware that petitions have been submitted regarding the sheltered housing schemes.

To clarify, the petitions received were against the “removal of support officers” whereas the proposals presented to all residents during the consultation at no time included the removal of the Sheltered Officer role and this caused some confusion for some residents.

It was deemed important therefore, in order to respond to the petition, to check that residents understood the proposals put to them.

A briefing note on the Sheltered Housing Review was sent to all Members by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Homes on 24th November 2016.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR PETER DOUGLAS OSBORN**

A21 Big Projects

Question:

Given that the Leader quoted at the November Cabinet of big things in City Centre due to number of Cabinet reports for City Centre, doesn't every Ward deserve "big projects"? Therefore all Wards should have schemes coming forward over time. Therefore what timescale is the Leader working to for each Ward to bring forward a project to Cabinet?

Answer:

There are a number of "big projects" which are currently taking place or are being planned across the city. These projects are located in wards across Birmingham and would have city-wide effects, benefitting residents throughout the city. These include:

- Advanced Manufacturing Hub in East Aston - £10m+ improvement infrastructure and land assembly on the 20 ha site. Phase 1 has secured HydraForce and created/safeguarded 500 jobs on the site. Companies Gurhing and Trebor are also now on site, delivering further investment
- New Wholesale Markets in Witton - £30m project to be completed and open in 2018.
- A34/ Perry Barr District Centre - £10m Local Growth Fund project, which has already led to improvements to connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists in the District Centre.
- Aston/ Newtown Housing Regeneration Programme (Phases 2 and 3) - £47m, BMHT is in processing of building out Phase 1 providing 260 new homes.
- A number of BMHT schemes will be delivered across the city including in Kings Norton, Yardley Brook, the Lyndhurst Estate, Jarvis Road, Erdington, Bromford Estate, Druid's Heath and Bartley Green etc.

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

A22 Energy Services

Question:

What plans were shared with you and when, upon which the figure of £400k from a reduction in the Council's energy bill and a £650k saving from the establishment of an Energy Services Company were based and how this would be delivered in 2016/17?

Answer:

- **£400k Council Energy Bill Saving**

A BCC Utilities Management Strategy and a high level action plan was agreed by Cabinet on 17th November 2014, which identified the actions and resources required to deliver the savings. The BCC Business Plan and Budget for 2014+ included the financial targets of:

Year	2014/15 - £m	2015/16 - £m	2016/17 - £m	2017/18 - £m
Saving	0.200	0.400	0.600	0.800
Percentage of 2013 spend	0.645%	1.29%	1.935%	2.58%

These reductions were deemed possible, based on the simple predictions and assumptions within the Utilities Management Strategy. Savings have not materialised as predicted. The savings require an amalgamation of energy budgets across the Council and appointment of a Utilities Manager. The post was advertised in April but Procurement were not able to appoint a suitable candidate. The savings also rested on an understanding of a clear understanding of the buildings and assets that would be retained or disposed of. This has not been made available. The work is currently being managed by the Procurement Team.

- **£650k Energy Services Company**

This figure was based on speculative income generation of an energy services company without the completion of a formal business case or understanding of how it would be delivered.

The Sustainability Team are currently working on a business case for the development of the energy company that will be completed by summer 2017.

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

A23 Major Incident

Question:

A major incident involving a burst water pipe in Selly Oak on 23 November, caused gridlock around the whole area, flooded homes and delayed ambulances trying to reach the Queen Elizabeth hospital. A huge chunk of the central reservation opposite the traffic island collapsed into itself under the weight of the water, taking street signs and a lamppost with it, while other parts of the pavement were broken up by the torrent.

When contacted by the local press about this incident Birmingham City Council declined to comment, instead a press officer insisted that all enquiries should be referred to Severn Trent Water.

Does the Leader agree that, given the anxiety and disruption that an event like this creates, that this response was unacceptable and that the Council has a duty to show public leadership during such a major incident regardless of who is responsible for the plumbing?

Answer:

When the council's press office was made aware of this incident, contact was made with Severn Trent Water's press office to discuss the approach in dealing with any media enquiries arising from this incident, in keeping with the council's ethos of working with partners.

It was agreed that Severn Trent Water's press office would lead on this, given that the incident related to a burst water pipe and Severn Trent Water would be responsible for the clean-up, repairs and traffic management while work took place. However, the council took a proactive approach in sharing key messages about the incident, such as road closures, on Facebook and Twitter.

When the Birmingham Mail called the council's press office to ask about the incident, the council did not decline to comment, but explained that Severn Trent Water's press office was leading on media enquiries regarding this incident and would be better placed to answer any questions regarding the scale of the work, road closures and related matters.

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

A24 Running Costs

Question:

Broken down by individual buildings, what are the running costs for Council buildings to include rent, rates, heating etc?

Answer:

It is not evidently clear from Cllr Lines' question what the parameters of his enquiry are, so it would be helpful if he could provide further clarification on the detail required and exactly what parts of the Council's portfolio he is referring to. I would then be pleased to request information on that basis from officers and provide him with it before the next Council meeting.

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

A25 Leases

Question:

How many buildings does the City Council lease including their yearly rent?

Answer:

As at 1st December 2016 there are 19 buildings with leases to the City Council, at a total yearly rent of £823,025.

Over the last 10 years the City Council has vacated 36 buildings, saving yearly rental expenditure on leases totalling £4.75m.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR LYN COLLIN**

B1 Libraries

Question:

On top of the currently savings regarding libraries, what further savings has the Council considered from community libraries as part of its current budget considerations for 2017/2021?

Answer:

Details of the Council's further savings proposals for 2017/18 – 2020/21 will be released as part of the Council's forthcoming budget consultation process.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ANDREW HARDIE**

B2 It takes a whole lot of money 2

Question:

How many staff have a 'Charge card' including the amount spent on those cards, listed for 2015/2016 and 2016/2017?

Answer:

The table below shows the number of procurement cards in issue and amount spent on those cards in 2015/16 and 2016/17 to date (7 months - April to October)

Year	No of Cards	Expenditure	No of Transactions	Average Transaction value
April- Oct 2016	667	£4,253,122.53	16,931	£251.20
2015/16	736	£5,068,319.95	24,520	£206.71

Transaction volumes – the trend in the volume of transactions is upward because we encourage directorates to pay for goods and services under £500 by card in preference to requesting an invoice. Payment by card costs the council less than processing a paper invoice.

Card Expenditure – of the £5.068m expenditure in 2015/16, £2.6m relates to Local Welfare grants to vulnerable young adults moving out of care into the community. The Council eliminated delays in providing white goods to these service users, which was previously a barrier to them moving into accommodation, by paying the supplier by procurement card. In the current year expenditure is £0.8m.

Travel expense cards – included in the summary above are cards specifically designated as travel expense cards. In 2015/16, there were 11 cards with a total expenditure of £5,629.92. In the current financial year there are 16 cards with a total expenditure of £9,053.65 to October 2016.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR DEIDRE ALDEN**

B3 Leisure Centres

Question:

How late are the proposed new leisure centres currently running behind schedule, including current estimated opening days?

Answer:

The replacement of Erdington Pool, Northfield Pool and Stechford Cascades are all under construction and making good progress. The construction of the new pool at Icknield Port Loop is due to start on site in April 2017.

All pools are currently on target to meet the contractual service availability dates as follows:

New Build	Service Availability
Erdington Pool	September 2017
Stechford Cascades	March 2018
Northfield Pool	April 2018
IPL	August 2018

The replacement of Sparkhill Pool is also making good progress with the building due to be wind and water tight by the end of this year. There are no expected further delays on this build and service availability will be in June 2017. The report to Cabinet of November 2015 gave an estimated service availability of May 2017.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ANNE UNDERWOOD**

B4 Closure of Libraries

Question:

Including in any draft consultations or internal budget discussions, how many libraries are being considered for closure after 2018?

Answer:

The current community library consultation covers the budget savings required from 2015/16 – 2017/18 and it proposes two closures.

The Council's proposed budget for 2017/18 and beyond will be launched on Wednesday 7th December 2016 with public consultation taking place from this date; the approval of that proposed budget will be put before a full Council meeting in February/March 2017. The proposals contained in that budget will then be subject to the necessary service specific consultation and/or the Council's decision making process as required.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR ROB SEALEY**

B5 Ranking

Question:

What is the ranking of number of libraries by distance from a Ward by City rank?

Answer:

Eleven criteria have been used in a needs assessment to prioritise the current 37 libraries. We were keen to apply a methodology used in other library authorities to assess each site.

One of the criteria used made an assessment of the number of libraries within 2 miles of the library being assessed. The assessment used walking distance and used Google maps for consistency. Libraries with no other site within 2 miles scored a 1, libraries with 1 site within 2 miles scored a 9 and libraries with 2 sites within 2 miles scored a 19.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW**

B6 Figures

Question:

What is the population for each Ward and Constituency versus the number of Library hours in that area for the City as percentages?

Answer:

The comparison for population compared to opening hours for each constituency is on the Be Heard Website and forms part of the consultation. It shows for example in the two locations affected by proposed closures that Sutton Coldfield Constituency has 8.5% of the population but is proposed to have 8.8% of the city's opening hours whereas Ladywood Constituency has 12.4% of the city's population but only 10.4% of the opening hours.

People move across political boundaries and therefore between wards and constituency to access library services. Some libraries sit in one ward or constituency and only the width of a road separates them from being in another ward or constituency. Data when considered by ward becomes even less meaningful, as the impact of residents moving from one ward to the next becomes more significant and therefore the percentage of hours by ward compared to ward population has not been used in the consultation.

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

B7 Cabinet Office Budget Spend

Question:

At a recent Cabinet meeting, Councillor Brew asked the question as to the under/overspend status on the budget for Cabinet Officer Support and Policy staff, having been concerned in earlier revenue monitoring reports, overspends have been reported.

I noted that since the budget was drawn up, the Cabinet Office has been extended by four Assistant Leaders at £10,000 each, a Leader's Press Officer and also appointed a Chief of Staff?

Can the Deputy Leader advise the underspend/overspend for this Department?

Answer:

Cabinet Office

The pressures reported for the Cabinet Office in 2015/16 related to previous years' savings targets. At that point, the re-design of the Cabinet Office had not been completed. Subsequently the re-design has been completed – deleting two posts and saving £100,000. In addition, the allocation of some additional resources, approved as part of the 2016/17 budget, means that the pressure has now been addressed.

The Assistant Leaders are Councillors, not officers, and their Special Responsibility Allowance, as set by the Independent Remuneration Panel, is not funded from the Cabinet Office budget.

The Chief of Staff and Press Secretary roles are also not funded from the Cabinet Office budget.

Policy and Performance

The 2015/16 pressure for Policy and Performance mainly related to staffing due to savings from the review of the service not being delivered and also pension fund strain costs. This pressure is now being mitigated through a number of measures including not filling vacant posts, a reduction in spend (including on third sector infrastructure support, and additional income (including from the European and International Division) and so a balanced position is expected to be delivered.

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

B8 Overspend

Question:

As of 1st December 2016, how much is the unmitigated overspend of the City Council expected to be?

Answer:

The Month 6 Corporate Revenue Budget Monitoring Report 2016/17 went to Cabinet on 15th November 2016.

This reported that the combined impact of pressures (£11m) and savings non-delivery (£27.2m net of mitigations) gave a forecast overspend of £38.2m, and made clear that the Council was committed to continue to work to reduce this position.

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

B9 Savings

Question:

For each budget from 2012/2013 to the current approved budget and business plan, how many savings (in value and savings title) were listed as savings yet to be identified?

Answer:

The Budget Reports to Council for the years from 2012/13 detailed the savings plans agreed for each of those years and the corporate budget monitoring reports for those years reported on the achievement of those savings.

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

B10 Money Talks

Question:

For each budget from 2012/2013 to the current approved budget and business plan, how many savings (in value and savings title) were listed as savings yet to be identified?

Answer:

I refer you to the written answer to Question B9.

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

B11 Money, Money, Money

Question:

What is the list of savings from 2017/2018, 2018/2019, 2019/2020 which have already been identified as undeliverable, including how much is still subject to further savings being identified?

Answer:

The Council included in its preparations for the 2017/18 budget a review of all the savings planned to commence in 2017/18, to assess whether they were still deliverable as planned.

The draft Business Plan and Budget 2017+ will remove undeliverable savings from the future financial plan and reprofile other savings if necessary. Similarly it will address the impact of the non-delivery of savings and ongoing pressures from 2016/17.

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

B12 2016/2017 Savings

Question:

When was the Deputy Leader first advised either verbally or in writing that aspects of the 2016/2017 savings were undeliverable?

Answer:

The Month 2 Corporate Monitoring report to Cabinet in July 2016 flagged a number of difficulties in the delivery of the planned savings programme for 2016/17. The preparatory process leading to the Mid-Year Review undertaken as part of the Month 4 (September 2016) identified that number of savings were non-deliverable and at Cabinet it was agreed that the financial forecasts be amended accordingly.

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

B13 2016 Budget

Question:

Was the Deputy Leader advised either verbally or in writing before the 2016 budget debate that any savings proposed were undeliverable or yet to be identified, including which ones with values?

Answer:

No

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

B14 Previous Year's Budget

Question:

Was the Deputy Leader advised either verbally or in writing before the 2016 budget debate that any of the previous years' that were being carried forward were undeliverable?

Answer:

No

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

B15 Money on my Mind

Question:

At how many meetings have Council Officers briefed Members of the Labour Group about 2017/2018 budget?

Answer:

Council Officers have not attended any Labour Group meetings and briefed them about the 2017/2018 budget.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM
COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

B16 Commonwealth Games

Question:

At the City Council meeting on 1st November 2016, Councillor I Ward commented that a successfully 2026 Commonwealth Games Bid would accelerate transport infrastructure projects connecting to the Birmingham Curzon Street High Speed 2 Station.

Could the Cabinet Member confirm that such transport infrastructure would include re-opening

- i) The Camp Hill Line**
- ii) The Tamworth Line**
- iii) the Sutton Park Line**

and the relevant local railway station along these links to Birmingham residents/passengers?

Answer:

Discussions are continuing regarding the impact of the potential 2026 Commonwealth Games Bid on transport infrastructure projects. As part of West Midlands Rail the City Council is seeking further improvements to rail services through the new local franchise which is due to start in October 2017. In particular it is a high priority for the City Council that the Bordesley Chords and other Midlands Rail Hub infrastructure measures are delivered to allow new local rail services on the Camp Hill, Birmingham-Tamworth and potentially Sutton Park, Lines including new local stations in Birmingham.

Local funding for the implementation of Bordesley Chords and local stations on the Camp Hill and Birmingham-Tamworth Lines is included in the HS2 Connectivity Programme, as part of the West Midlands Combined Authority Devolution Deal. Early work is about to commence with the Black Country Local Authorities examining how local rail services and stations may also be taken forward on the Sutton Park Line as part of the HS2 Connectivity Programme. We continue to engage with Network Rail to seek to ensure that these schemes form part of Network Rail's Control Period 6 delivery plans.

In the 2016 Autumn Statement the Chancellor announced £5m of development funding for the Midlands Rail Hub. Discussion is being undertaken with Midlands Connect on how to make use of the extra capacity released by the Midlands Rail Hub, and with Network Rail on its infrastructure enhancements programme including seeking to implement the Midlands Rail Hub by 2026 as a key enabler of the Midlands Growth Strategy, the Birmingham Development Plan, and Birmingham Connected, in particular.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE DEPUTY LEADER FROM COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE

B17 Top Heavy Organisation

Question:

Will the Cabinet Member provide details of the total and ratio of JNC officers compared to non-JNC staff employed by Birmingham City Council in both May 2010 and November 2016?

Answer:

The shape and size of the City Council will have changed during the times requested due to the Comprehensive Spending Review and the severity of funding cuts since. The City Council has been required to provide sufficient strategic capacity to address the challenges faced following the reviews completed by Lord Warner and Sir Bob Kerslake. The ratio of NJC and JNC employees is currently being reviewed.

May 2010

	Employees Full Time Equivalents	% JNC	Ratio
Non - JNC	20195		217:1
JNC	93	0.46%	

Nov 2016

	Employees Full Time Equivalents	% JNC	Ratio	Decrease FTE from 2010
Non - JNC	11651		185:1	42%
JNC	63	0.54%		32%

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE**

C1 Correct Assessment

Question:

Will the Cabinet Member provide information of the number of Children in Birmingham assessed under the Children Act 1989; Section 17, the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 since May 2012 and the number of challenges/appeals received in that period by the Council where there is a belief the Child has been incorrectly assessed?

Answer:

Since April 2012 to date there have been several changes of assessment form and a number of restructures. To establish the numbers we have extracted data where the team code contains the word "Disabled" or "O T". The total no of S17 assessments (initial, core, single assessment and family assessment) for that period is 5,406. For the O T team only the number of assessments is 587.

There is no appeals process. However there is a statutory complaints procedure under the Children's Act. We are seeking data about the number of complaints received in this period. This data will take some time to collate.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES
AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

C2 CP Initial Conferences

Question:

What is the current performance scorecard position (including overall performance against target and trend) for CP initial conferences convened and taken place within timescales?

Answer:

79% CP initial conferences convened and taken place within timescales

79% Year to date

90% Target

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES
AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

C3 S47 Percentages

Question:

What is the current performance scorecard position (including overall performance against target and trend) for the percentage of children seen at assessment for S47 only?

Answer:

We measure the percentage of children seen at assessment. This includes both S17 and S47 assessments. The 6 monthly average is 81%. October is showing a significant improvement at 93%.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES
AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

C4 S47 Assessments

Question:

What is the current performance scorecard position (including overall performance against target and trend) for s47 assessments completed within 15 working days?

Answer:

October: 291 s47 trackers completed and closed. 193 within timescale (66%)
66% of s47 are completed in 15 days and 94% (in October – 88% in last 6 months) of all assessments are completed with the national 45 day guidelines.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

C5 Trojan Horse

Question:

According to the Sunday Times the ringleader of the Trojan Horse plot, Tahir Alam, has been teaching children in Birmingham, at the Khidmat Centre in Sparkbrook, despite being banned from doing so by the government. When did the council become aware of this and what steps did it take?

Answer:

Birmingham City Council officers were made aware of rumours that Tahir Alam was teaching at the Khidmat Centre in November 2015 with fresh rumours emerging in August 2016. The Chief Executive confirmed this in a press release in August 2016 and reported that the matter had been investigated in late 2015 and found to have no substance.

In August 2016, in view of the fresh reports, the matter was investigated once again as a matter of urgency by the Commissioning Centre for Excellence officers who part fund the operation of the Centre. It was reported that Tahir Alam had rented a room in the Centre as the administrative base for a company that he had set up. The chief executive of the Khidmat Centre reported that Mr Alam had ceased to rent a room in November 2015 and had not been in the centre since that time. It was also stated that Mr Alam had never engaged in any teaching activities with children at the centre.

Additional training was provided to officers to remind them of the No Platform Policy whereby Birmingham City Council premises and those with a relationship to BCC, in situations where the council part funds their running costs, should not provide a platform for extremist speakers. Given the events of Trojan Horse in 2014, it was made clear to officers that due to the severe reputational damage sustained by Birmingham City Council, it would be unacceptable for Mr Alam to occupy any space in the Khidmat Centre.

Officials at the Department for Education were informed of the rumours and the action taken. The Education Quartet and Prevent Co-ordinator were also informed about all of this.

A new story emerged in the Sunday Times 27 November 2016 alleging that Tahir Alam was teaching at the Centre. Once again this is currently under investigation and all the parties referred to in the above paragraphs have been informed. We cannot comment further until the investigation is complete.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN,
FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS FROM COUNCILLOR MATT BENNETT**

C6 Invoices

Question:

Please list all invoices presented since January 2015 by the consultants SEND4change, including dates, value, purpose of work and details of any competitive tendering process which will have been carried out should the total amount exceed £10,000?

Answer:

From January 2015 – October 2016 there were 6 invoices totalling £87,899.90 which related to work around high needs funding and allocation systems, partnership and information sharing and the SEN development plan.

In July 2016, a contract was drawn up by both parties for £100k to facilitate the 6 workstreams, lead consultation groups and prepare recommendations for the Inclusion Commission. This work was necessary in preparation for the anticipated Area Review of SEND provision led by OfSTED. Birmingham needed to produce a Self Evaluation Form. The deadline was set as December 2016.

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

D1 German Market

Question:

As part of the contract for the German Market, how much street cleaning are the operators of the market required to carry out?

Answer:

Operators of the market are required to carry out cleaning of all of their areas in Victoria Square, including litter picking floors, clearing tables and emptying their own litter bins on a regular basis. During peak time this does become more difficult but it is regularly monitored. Cleansing of the rest of the German Market area is carried out by Waste Management Street Cleansing.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ANDREW
HARDIE**

D2 Penalties

Question:

What penalties have been instituted following the collection of fly-posting materials in the Vesey Ward on the City Council Day of Action?

Answer:

The Sutton Vesey Ward was not specifically identified for flyposting enforcement as part of the City Council's Day of Action. However, during the day teams from Environmental Health took the opportunity to undertake a survey of illegal advertising along a number of the main arterial routes into and around the City. Environmental Health removed 129 illegal advertisements from street furniture during this exercise. Of these 10 were taken down in Sutton Vesey Ward. 9 posters were by the same company. Written warnings have been sent to these companies with regards to their illegal advertising campaigns.

Our enforcement policy looks to an escalating level of interventions. Our first steps are to advise the companies to cease illegally advertising and then we would look to take either civil or criminal cases if the companies ignored the warning. As both the companies in the Vesey Ward had not previously come to our attention, formal warnings have been sent.

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

D3 It's in the Bag

Question:

How much has been spent on plastic sacks with a stripe on by the City Council?

Answer:

To date we have spent £387.25 for 8000 sacks.

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

D4 Communal Bins

Question:

Please list all locations that currently have or are due to have a communal bin installed including what areas each bin is due to cover?

Answer:

We have on street recycling bins for paper or multi material in the Bournbrook area. There is currently no widespread doorstep multi-material collections in around 8 streets as there were no locations in the front gardens to store recycling bins in the largely HMO accommodating students.

In addition, 5 x 1100 communal refuse bins were installed on the section of the Stratford Road between Henley Road and Main Street. The bins were installed as a pilot as we had been advised that this approach had worked in other core cities where presentation of waste from flats above shops was a daily occurrence. The bins are checked and emptied four times per week which works with the capacity of the bins available.

As part of the all-out day a further five locations were identified and bins have been placed on the Alum Rock Road. We are currently evaluating their success.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

D5 Self-Inflicted

Question:

As you yourself highlighted and has since been accepted the new fleet of waste vehicles are too big for many of our streets and estates. This is leading to damage being caused to verges in and around our estates with kerbs being damaged and grass verges being left with deep ruts.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that Fleet and Waste will be picking up the bill for any remedial work needed as a result of the City's "too big" vehicles?

Answer:

The city's fleet of waste management vehicles comprises of both large HGV's and smaller 'AlleyCats' so that we can send the right vehicle to collect waste according to the accessibility of the street. We cannot however predict where parked cars or roadwork's restrict access which means that a smaller vehicle is sometimes required to gain access on specific occasions. However, the majority of our fleet are the large HGV's which are more cost effective for service delivery.

HGVs are designed to safely traverse the highway network which is built to specifications to enable access and egress in respect of turning circles for such vehicles. It is the parking of vehicles which is often the root cause of potential access problems and not the size of our vehicle fleet.

It is never the drivers' intention to use the verges or kerbs when they are driving around the city, and route planning is undertaken to optimise the effective use of vehicles. However, if the service is made aware of any damage that our fleet have caused which is supported by evidence, we will take whatever remedial action is necessary and make good and repair damage for which we are responsible.

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

D6 Verge Protection 1

Question:

As you are no doubt aware there have been discussions about how best to protect our verges. You will also no doubt recall that it has been accepted that the latest fleet of waste vehicles procured by the City have been judged too big for some of our streets. It has been brought to my attention by residents that damage is being caused by the city's waste vehicles to verges and kerbs.

Can you confirm that wherever damage is being reported that it will be fixed?

Answer:

The city's fleet of waste management vehicles comprises of both large HGV's and smaller 'AlleyCats' so that we can send the right vehicle to collect waste according to the accessibility of the street. We cannot however predict where parked cars or roadwork's restrict access which means that a smaller vehicle is sometimes required to gain access on specific occasions. However, the majority of our fleet are the large HGV's which are more cost effective for service delivery.

HGVs are designed to safely traverse the highway network which is built to specifications to enable access and egress in respect of turning circles for such vehicles. It is the parking of vehicles which is often the root cause of potential access problems and not the size of our vehicle fleet.

It is never the drivers' intention to use the verges or kerbs when they are driving around the city, and route planning is undertaken to optimise the effective use of vehicles. However, if the service is made aware of any damage that our fleet have caused which is supported by evidence, we will take whatever remedial action is necessary and make good and repair damage for which we are responsible.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ALEX YIP**

D7 Verge Protection 2

Question:

As you are no doubt aware there have been discussions about how best to protect our verges. You will also no doubt recall that it has been accepted that the latest fleet of waste vehicles procured by the City have been judged too big for some of our streets. It has been brought to my attention by residents that damage is being caused by the city's waste vehicles to verges and kerbs.

Can you confirm that our contractors will be issuing invoices for the repairs these repairs?

Answer:

The city's fleet of waste management vehicles comprises of both large HGV's and smaller 'AlleyCats' so that we can send the right vehicle to collect waste according to the accessibility of the street. We cannot however predict where parked cars or roadwork's restrict access which means that a smaller vehicle is sometimes required to gain access on specific occasions. However, the majority of our fleet are the large HGV's which are more cost effective for service delivery.

HGVs are designed to safely traverse the highway network which is built to specifications to enable access and egress in respect of turning circles for such vehicles. It is the parking of vehicles which is often the root cause of potential access problems and not the size of our vehicle fleet.

It is never the drivers' intention to use the verges or kerbs when they are driving around the city, and route planning is undertaken to optimise the effective use of vehicles. However, if the service is made aware of any damage that our fleet have caused which is supported by evidence, we will take whatever remedial action is necessary and make good and repair damage for which we are responsible.

To date, as far as I am aware we have not received any invoices for repairs to kerbs from our contractor where our vehicles have been proven to be responsible.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW**

D8 Verge Protection 3

Question:

As you are no doubt aware there have been discussions about how best to protect our verges. You will also no doubt recall that it has been accepted that the latest fleet of waste vehicles procured by the City have been judged too big for some of our streets. It has been brought to my attention by residents that damage is being caused by the city's waste vehicles to verges and kerbs.

Can you confirm that reports will be issued on a monthly basis as to the costs incurred to date?

Answer:

The city's fleet of waste management vehicles comprises of both large HGV's and smaller 'AlleyCats' so that we can send the right vehicle to collect waste according to the accessibility of the street. We cannot however predict where parked cars or roadwork's restrict access which means that a smaller vehicle is sometimes required to gain access on specific occasions. However, the majority of our fleet are the large HGV's which are more cost effective for service delivery.

HGVs are designed to safely traverse the highway network which is built to specifications to enable access and egress in respect of turning circles for such vehicles. It is the parking of vehicles which is often the root cause of potential access problems and not the size of our vehicle fleet.

It is never the drivers' intention to use the verges or kerbs when they are driving around the city, and route planning is undertaken to optimise the effective use of vehicles. However, if the service is made aware of any damage that our fleet have caused which is supported by evidence, we will take whatever remedial action is necessary and make good and repair damage for which we are responsible.

To date, I am unaware that there have been any claims against the Waste Management service for cost recovery for such repairs, and therefore do not intend to issue a monthly report.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR DEIRDRE
ALDEN**

D9 Slab Cabs

Question:

In January 2015, the Portfolio Holder announced that ‘slabs in cabs’ would be in place in time for the roll out of the Green Waste service. Before making that announcement what conversations had she had with procurement officers and Service Birmingham about the appropriate timescales that would be needed for a full procurement exercise that would be both legally compliant and allow the council to ensure best value for money for taxpayers?

Answer:

The governance for decisions relating to the wheelie bin roll-out, including associated technology solutions was through the Wheelie Bin programme Board chaired by myself. A Cabinet Report was approved on 19th January 2015 which outlined the scope and outline benefits of the proposed mobile technology system and the associated tender process was outlined in point 5.16 of this report.

The procurement of all ICT is delivered through Service Birmingham.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MEIRION
JENKINS**

D10 Procurement Exercise

Question:

What consideration was given prior to the procurement exercise about the requirements of ‘slabs in cabs’ for the street cleansing, trade waste and quality inspection teams and how the process would work ‘end to end’?

Answer:

FWM Mobile aka “slab in cabs” was delivered by the BCC Wheelie Bin Programme Team (WBPT), however the scope of the wheelie bin programme only covered Residual, Recycling and Garden Waste as these were the services receiving wheelie bins. At the beginning of the FWM Mobile process it was identified by the then Director of Fleet and Waste (now Waste Management) that an IT solution should not be procured based only on these three services (residual, recycling and garden) at the exclusion of other areas of the business. The WBPT gathered requirements for FWM mobile across 5 areas of the business, these being:

- Garden
- Residual and Recycling
- Trade
- Street Cleaning
- Quality and Inspection Team

The Cabinet Report of 19th January 2015 outlines how the solution would potentially be used across all of the business areas and what benefit they would bring. The usage in each of the areas would require differing processes and the slab in the cab is just the hardware that would enable these. Specifications and processes will continue to be defined for each area as part of the programme delivery to ensure they are fit for purpose and work end to end.

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

D11 Cost of Implementation

Question:

What has been the cost to date for the implementation of the ‘slabs in cabs’ verses the project spend for this point in the process that was determined when the contract was approved?

Answer:

The Cabinet report “Mobile Technology System for Fleet and Waste Management” dated 19th January 2015 confirmed the estimated cost of the Waste Management ICT investment is £3.463m over 5 years, £2.5m of which was grant funded by DCLG. This included procurement of hardware, integration with existing systems, on-going annual operational costs and project management by Service Birmingham (SB). The actual spend on the “slabs” since the start of the project is £1.26m which covers hardware, software and services to deliver the slab solution only. The report confirmed that by year end March 2017 we were projected to spend £1.293m.

We are unable to confirm the full cost of implementation for the ‘slab in cab’ element as the overall implementation has included many elements of work whose costs are within the normal operating costs of the service such as training and officer time.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

D12 Flytipping - Number of incidents

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member update the Council on progress in tackling the problem of flytipping in the city by giving numbers of incidents and reports of flytipping by month for the last two years?

Answer:

The table below shows the service enquiries recorded in the Council's waste management and regulatory teams' databases that reference involvement of or that were categorised at the initial reporting stage as relating to waste/rubbish, and the incidents reportable under DEFRA's Waste Data Flow 'fly-tipping' arrangements. [Data for October 2016 are not reported as they have yet to be collated].

The total number of service enquiries/reports does not equate to the number of reportable incidents, which is due to a number of reasons which includes, but is not limited to: duplicate enquiries/incidents being reported more than once, by different reporters or on multiple dates or to different council teams; enquiries for which linked records are created in the electronic database for the purpose of assisting with job management; and enquiries where waste/rubbish may not subsequently be identified as the route cause or primary element of a multi-issue referral.

Month	Number of enquiries into the Council referencing waste/rubbish and recorded on waste management or regulatory teams database	Number of Incidents of fly-tipping. [Reportable under DEFRA's Waste Data Flow arrangements]
09/2014	2650	1190
10/2014	1997	1065
11/2014	1836	865
12/2014	1880	1064
01/2015	2371	1159
02/2015	2277	1016
03/2015	4335	1002
04/2015	3729	1075
05/2015	3454	1059
06/2015	5439	1192
07/2015	6582	1202
08/2015	4011	916
09/2015	3941	834

City Council – 6 December 2016

10/2015	4061	919
11/2015	3981	973
12/2015	4377	867
01/2016	3944	1086
02/2016	3644	1028
03/2016	3623	1197
04/2016	4402	1152
05/2016	4174	1151
06/2016	4347	1209
07/2016	4561	1365
08/2016	4421	1352
09/2016	2287	1342
10/2016	2030	Not available

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR MARGARET
WADDINGTON**

D13 Weekly Collections

Question:

Can the Cabinet Member guarantee the Council will have weekly refuse collections in 2020?

Answer:

Yes.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CLEAN STREETS,
RECYCLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT
ALDEN**

D14 Incidents of Flytipping Clearances

Question:

Since 1st January 2012, could the Cabinet Member set out how many incidents of flytipping clearances the Council has reported monthly, over the last three years, setting them alongside monthly reports of flytipping?

Answer:

The table below shows the service enquiries recorded in the Council's waste management and regulatory teams' databases that reference involvement of or that were categorised at the initial reporting stage as relating to waste/rubbish, and the incidents reportable under DEFRA's Waste Data Flow 'fly-tipping' arrangements. [Data for October 2016 are not reported as they have yet to be collated].

The total number of service enquiries/reports does not equate to the number of reportable incidents, which is due to a number of reasons which includes, but is not limited to: duplicate enquiries/incidents being reported more than once, by different reporters or on multiple dates or to different council teams; enquiries for which linked records are created in the electronic database for the purpose of assisting with job management; and enquiries where waste/rubbish may not subsequently be identified as the route cause or primary element of a multi-issue referral. [Data is only available back to September 2013].

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

D15 What a Load of Rubbish

Question:

For 2015/2016, what is the amount of waste sent to landfill compared to total waste generated?

Answer:

The total amount of municipal waste in 2015/16 was 488,811.19 tonnes.
The amount of waste that was sent to landfill in 2015/16 was 35,019.90 tonnes.
This equates to 7.16 percent of municipal waste being sent to landfill.

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

D16 Parks Community

Question:

On top of the current savings regarding parks, what further savings has the Council considered from parks as part of its current budget considerations for 2017/2021?

Answer:

Details of the Council's further savings proposals for 2017/18 – 2020/21 will be released as part of the Council's forthcoming budget consultation process.

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

E1 STP Approval

Question:

Will the Cabinet Member ensure the STP is taken to full Council for approval and not Cabinet?

Answer:

The STP document that we have put into the public domain is not the final document. It is the latest submission that the STP system has presented to NHS England, in line with their timescales. As and when it is made clear that the STP plans are at the point at which they require formal approval, I, in conjunction with the Leader and Chief Executive, and our counterparts in Solihull, will discuss the best forum for both of our councils to debate the STP

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL
CARE FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

E2 Public Consultation

Question:

What public consultation plans are there for the STP BEFORE it is approved by Council?

Answer:

There are no plans for formal consultation at this stage, as the STP plan has not yet been formally agreed. Members will be aware that both myself and fellow Scrutiny Councillors, both here and in Solihull, have been very clear about the need for further engagement, and our concerns about the process that STPs have had to follow so far.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL
CARE FROM COUNCILLOR LYN COLLIN**

E3 Social Care Strategy

Question:

Will the Cabinet Member agree that the Birmingham and Solihull STP plan under consultation does not deliver a Social Care strategy fit for the people of Birmingham?

Answer:

Yes, I would agree with Cllr Collin.

I would stress again here though that a Social Care strategy fit for the people of Birmingham requires proper, fair funding from Central Government.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND
SOCIAL CARE COUNCILLOR ANDREW HARDIE**

E4 STPs

Question:

David Mowat MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Community Health and Care has stated that “STPs should be regarded as incomplete and not go ahead if Councils believe they have been marginalised.”

In view of this does the portfolio holder believe that the Birmingham and Solihull STP should go ahead?

Answer:

I believe it is fair to say that this statement from the Under-Secretary of State was prompted in large part by the question I asked him at the recent National Children’s and Adults Social Services Conference in Manchester, and so I am pleased he made this public statement at the time and subsequently.

Therefore, I do also believe our local STP should go ahead, but on two provisos. Firstly, that the Councils (ourselves and Solihull) are not marginalised.

Secondly, that Adult Social Care is properly funded, as I have said several times to the Council. With that in mind, it is very disappointing that the Chancellor made no specific references to this in the recent Autumn Statement, but we remain hopeful that a way will be found to bring forward the national £1.5 billion of Better Care Fund monies promised, into the next financial year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND
SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR DES FLOOD**

E5 STP Consultants

Question:

What value has STP Consultants provided?

Answer:

Use of consultants has been of value to the development of the STP, as they have bought a wide variety of experience of health and care integration planning from working with other local authorities and NHS bodies, as well as independent challenge, to the development process. They also bought expertise around demand management and financial analysis of a very complex, multi-organisational system.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND
SOCIAL CARE FROM COUNCILLOR MAUREEN CORNISH**

E6 Better Care Fund Policy

Question:

On what dates were the 'Better Care Fund Policy Framework', published by the Department for Health on 8 January, and the subsequent planning guidance published on 23 February, shared with you and/or other cabinet members by officers, informing you of the impact the policy changes to the performance element of BCF would have on the 2016/17 budget?

Answer:

Cabinet Members and other members were first made aware of the impact in June 2016

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

F Repairs

Question:

What is the average length of time for repairs to be completed listed by year since 2015?

Answer:

Performance information is collated on a financial year basis. Currently available is the performance data for all routine repairs completed (this is Birmingham Promise 2).

Performance from April 2015 to March 2016 indicates an average of **6.31 working days** for all routine repairs. The routine repairs target for 2015/16 was 30 calendar days.

94.8% were completed within timescale against the target of 100%.

Performance from April 2016 to October 2017 indicates an average of **7.06 working days** for all routine repairs. The routine repairs target for 2016/17 is 30 working days.

93.1% were completed within timescale against the target of 92.6%.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR JOBS AND SKILLS
FROM COUNCILLOR IAN CRUISE**

G1 Qualifications?

Question:

In a recent FE Week article titled “Lack of assessment organisations ‘disrespectful’ to apprentices”, the former Civil Service Head of Education and Skills Investment criticised Government planners after analysis showed nationally there are no approved awarding organisations for over 40% of learner starts on new apprenticeship standards.

Will the Cabinet Member provide information of how many apprenticeship starts in Birmingham have no approved awarding organisation, thus preventing apprentices gaining a recognised qualification or accreditation?

Answer:

The Council does not hold information about the approval of awarding organisations for the new apprenticeship standards. This information is held by the National Apprenticeship Service and the Skills Funding Agency, who are responsible for the funding of apprenticeships. We work closely with both of these organisations and have raised the matter with the Skills Funding Agency. We also work very closely with our local colleges and training providers and locally this issue has not been flagged as a concern in our strategic discussions with them.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR JOBS AND SKILLS
FROM COUNCILLOR MIKE WARD**

G2 Make the Grade Birmingham - How many signed up for the project

Question:

Earlier in the year Make the Grade Birmingham was launched with the aim of linking businesses and schools to improve the quality of careers advice. Could the Cabinet Member say how schools and businesses have signed up to the project?

Answer:

Make the Grade is a project delivered by the Ahead Partnership, who are one of several organisations offering brokerage and careers support to schools in Birmingham. They are providing a traded offer to schools.

The City Council does not fund, nor are we accountable for, Careers brokerage organisations such as the Ahead Partnership. We do, however, maintain strategic oversight of such initiatives in the city and are in the process of collating the latest information from the Ahead Partnership for this term.

From November 2015 – to July 2016, Make the Grade has worked with 10 primary schools and 19 secondary schools, involving around 5328 students. They have recruited 40-50 businesses including 200 business volunteers. These include Birmingham Airport, Pinsent Mason and the NHS, in addition to a pool of business network associates.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPARENCY,
OPENNESS AND EQUALITY FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

H1 No Platform Policy - Any Bans?

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member say how many individuals and organisations with "political, ideological or religious" extremist views have been banned from visiting or holding events on Council premises following the introduction of a No Platform policy, which I believe was implemented sometime in the last year? Perhaps he could indicate the reasons for any bans?

Answer:

Within the No Platform Policy, there is a list of proscribed organisations, referred to on HM Government Website that will not be allowed access to council facilities. However, I am not aware that any of these organisations has approached the council for use of facilities.

In addition, to date we have not refused access to council facilities to any organisation on the grounds of discrimination with regards to, age, colour, disability, ethnic or national origin, gender, marital status, race, religion or sexual orientation or political opinion.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPARENCY,
OPENNESS AND EQUALITY FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

H2 Who is the Director of No Platform

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member provide the name of the Director of No Platform?

Answer:

The Lead Director responsible for the No Platform Policy is Jacqui Kennedy, Acting Strategic Director for Place.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPARENCY,
OPENNESS AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS**

H3 Scrutiny Reports

Question:

Per year since 2010, how many Scrutiny reports have been produced, broken down by ones that went to City Council and ones that did not?

Answer:

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Number of Committees	10 Cttees 2 sub cttee 11 review groups	11 Cttees sub cttee 10 review groups	11 Cttees 1 sub cttee 10 review groups	11 Cttees 2 Joint Health 5 review groups	11 Cttees 2 Joint Health 9 review groups	8 Cttees 2 Joint Health	8 Cttees 2 Joint Health	9 Cttees 2 Joint Health 1 Joint Scrutiny	5 Cttees 1 T&F 2 Joint Health
Number of inquiries	7	7	10	11	13	21	12	15	9
Number of reports to City Council	8	8	10	11	13	15	9	9	6

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

I1 Overcrowding

Question:

The Portfolio Holder will have seen recent press reports around severe overcrowding on the Four Oaks to Birmingham train recently, an issue local councillors are already all too aware of. What projections have been made for how demand will increase for this service over the next 15 years?

Answer:

The City Council does not hold information on specific projections of how demand will increase for the Four Oaks to Birmingham train service over the next 15 years. Network Rail's draft West Midlands and Chilterns Route Study includes the following relevant information:

- Peak hour demand on all rail commuter services into Birmingham is predicted to increase by 49% by 2023 and 114% by 2043, compared to 2013;
- It is predicted that in 2023, 70-85% of seats would be taken on Cross City North trains into Birmingham departing Four Oaks during high-peak hours, which would rise to 85-100% of seats by 2043.

It should be noted that the above predictions do not take into account any options to increase capacity; the Route Study proposes as options for funders, an increase of 10 carriages on the Cross City Line by 2023, and up to a total of 33 extra carriages by 2043.

The Route Study also proposes as an option for funders, a Midlands Rail Hub including the Bordesley Chords and other rail infrastructure improvements, to allow an extra 10 trains per hour into Central Birmingham by 2026 - discussion is being undertaken with Midlands Connect on how to make use of this extra capacity. Local funding for implementation of the Bordesley Chords is included in the HS2 Connectivity Programme as part of the West Midlands Combined Authority Devolution Deal, and in the 2016 Autumn Statement the Chancellor announced £5m of development funding to progress the Midlands Rail Hub proposals further.

Additionally the City Council is engaging with West Midlands Rail regarding the new devolved West Midlands rail franchise to start operation in October 2017. The view of the Council is that bidders will need to ensure that sufficient capacity to meet the forecast growth in passenger demand is provided.

The Invitation to Tender for the franchise as released in September 2016 includes a 30% increase in on-train capacity across the franchise area by 2022/3 but does not specify capacity requirements by route – this is left up to bidders. A public announcement regarding the preferred bidder and agreed specification for the franchise (including capacity provision), is anticipated in June 2017.

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

I2 I want to ride my bicycle

Question:

What is the grant for cycling on revenue including their value the Council currently receives?

Answer:

Growth and Transportation Service – Economy Directorate

As reported to Cabinet in September the Council will receive £1,184,613 of revenue grant from the Department for Transport to fund circa 38,000 Bikeability places for children up to the end of March 2020. Bikeability gives children appropriate skills to safely cycle on the public highway.

The Council has also received a revenue grant of £102,000 from Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) to undertake promotional/communications activity for the Birmingham Cycle Revolution. These funds have been resourced by TfWM from residual Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) monies.

Wellbeing Service – Place Directorate

A revenue grant of £25,000 towards data analysis and collection has been received from British Cycling. A further £11,000 has been received from Community Interest Company towards GPS data costs associated with tracking Big Birmingham Bikes.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER TRANSPORT AND ROADS
FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK**

I3 On your bike

Question:

What are all the grants for cycling on Capital including their value the Council should currently receives?

Answer:

Cycling capital investment is currently being undertaken through the Birmingham Cycle Revolution Programme (BCR) which is being delivered in three phases, with an overall budget of some £57.9m. These are funded through a combination of the Department for Transport (DfT) Cycle City Ambition Grant (CCAG), the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) Local Growth Fund (LGF), and local contributions from the City Council's Integrated Transport Block (ITB) capital allocation and other local sources.

A breakdown of the programme funding for each phase is provided in the table below:

<u>Phase</u>	<u>CCAG (DfT)</u>	<u>Local Growth Fund (GBSLEP)</u>	<u>Local Contributions (BCC+Others)</u>	<u>Total Programme Funding</u>
Phase 1	£17.000m	£0m	£2.900m	£19.900m
Phase 2	£0m	£6.000m	£2.000m	£8.000m
Phase 3	£22.100m	£0m	£7.900m	£30.000m
<u>Totals</u>	<u>£39.100m</u>	<u>£6.000m</u>	<u>£12.800m</u>	<u>£57.900m</u>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR VALUE FOR MONEY
AND EFFICIENCY FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

J1 Negotiations

Question:

We were informed at a Group Meeting and at Cabinet that the contractor working on options for the Children's Trust, appointed on a single contractor negotiation basis, commenced work in the Council on 11 May 2016. The contract schedule states that this contract began on 1 June, the Single Contractor Negotiation report was signed off on 23 June, and the final contract award was not agreed until the 15 July.

How does the Cabinet Member account for the discrepancy in these dates, and in particular the procurement rules within the constitution (5.2 of Standing Order B2) that requires written approval for an SCN to be obtained *prior to the commencement of negotiations*?

Answer:

The requirement is that the Planned Procurement Activities Report (PPAR) that is submitted to each Cabinet meeting needs to be approved prior to any contract award. The approval prior to PPAR sign off is common practice, as the SCN approval only allows negotiations to commence & only once PPAR has been approved by Cabinet can a contract be awarded. Therefore, if the PPAR for a particularly planned procurement is not approved then the contract cannot be awarded.

However, due to the urgency of this work, the immediate engagement of external support was required to provide expertise and experience on Trust matters. The DfE were supporting the Council and provided funding for this engagement.

As the DfE were funding this engagement there was an assumption that a report was not required. However, this is not the case and therefore compliance with the procurement governance protocol was completed retrospectively. This confirmed that there were no concerns in terms of the procurement route and the costs agreed were market rates within the Crown Commercial Services framework for this type of engagement.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR VALUE FOR MONEY
AND EFFICIENCY FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON JEVON**

J2 Contracts

Question:

On 2 November 2016 a Joint Cabinet Member and Chief Officer decision was posted on CMIS authorising the extension of the current adult social care micro-procurement software - Sproc.net - until 30 September 2017. The approval is for the contract to commence from 24 September, some 5 and half weeks prior to the 'decision' being made by the Cabinet Member. Is the Cabinet Member satisfied that retrospective procurement decisions taken in this way, after a contract has been allowed to elapse, is an appropriate way to secure the best value for Council spend?

Answer:

I was consulted at all stages of this procurement and although the lead Directorate officer was absent from work, which delayed finalising the report, I authorised the continued use of the software to maintain service delivery. My rigorous challenge during the process ensured that the Council secured a saving of 44% (from the point that the contract lapsed) thus achieving best value for the Council.

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER VALUE FOR MONEY & EFFICIENCY FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS

J3 Decisions

Question:

On 2 November 2016 a Joint Cabinet Member and Chief Officer decision was posted on CMIS authorising the extension of the current adult social care micro-procurement software - Sproc.net - until 30 September 2017. The approval is for the contract to commence from 24 September, some 5 and half weeks prior to the 'decision' being made by the Cabinet Member. What would have happened had the Cabinet Member chosen not to authorise this decision, or if that decision had been subsequently overturned via the call-in process?

Answer:

Briefings commenced with me in August 2016 about the need to extend the Sproc.net contract. Discussions commenced between Service Birmingham and the provider to secure the best value for the Council, I was consulted at all stages and provided rigorous challenge to proposals received during the negotiations and as a consequence secured a 44% saving for the City Council.

The report was drafted and circulated on 22 September 2016 for approval. Unfortunately the lead directorate officer was absent from work and this caused delays in finalising the report. In the interim I agreed to continue using the software for continuity of service.

However, should the decision have been overturned at any point, the Council would have served notice on the provider and made alternative arrangements for the commissioning of adult social care packages.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR VALUE FOR MONEY
AND EFFICIENCY FROM COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE**

J4 Approval of Decisions

Question:

On how many occasions in each of the last 3 full financial years and the current year to date, have procurement ‘decisions’ been approved (either by Cabinet, Cabinet Member and Chief Officer, or Delegated Authority) after the contract has already commenced?

Answer:

The following table details the number of decisions approved under Chief Officer delegated authority after the contract has started. We have not found any executive decisions where approval is after the contract has started nor have we or Audit found any delegated decisions where the level of delegated authority has been exceeded:

Year	Total Number of CO Decisions	Co Decisions after Contract start date
2013/14	58	1
2014/15	56	2
2015/16	61	8
2016/17 to date	59	12
Total	234	23

Analysis of the number of contracts that commenced before the authorisation has shown:

Decision Type	Comment
20 of the 23 decisions were for the award of a contract extension following the approval of single contractor negotiations by the same decision maker as for the award.	The decisions enabled a timely reaction to ensure continuity of service under terms and conditions beneficial to the Council. The procurements were all undertaken properly with rigour and correct governance. The vast majority of the delays were a matter of 2-3 weeks and under a month.
2 decisions were the award of a contract calling off a collaborative framework agreement to extend a current arrangement.	As above
Only 1 decision was for an award of a contract following a procurement process.	The timing of the delegated authority meeting with subsequent sign off did not meet with the urgent commencement of the contract.

Improved application, control and compliance to the Procurement Governance Arrangements mean there is increased visibility of decisions made after the contract commencement.

It is acknowledged that this recent increase may not be the most ideal situation but the mitigation is that there has been continuity of service and that the external services are provided on terms and conditions beneficial to the Council.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIR OF LICENSING AND PUBLIC
PROTECTION FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

K Badshah Palace - Actions after taskforce meeting

Question:

What actions have been undertaken after the meeting of the taskforce about the Badshah Palace, Walsall Road, held in September?

Answer:

Noise monitoring equipment installed in a resident's house for a two week period in October registered only 10 minutes of noise which is insufficient to qualify as a statutory noise nuisance. Environmental Health has ensured that residents have access to its out of hours noise monitoring service.

The premises have been sent a copy of the recent city-wide injunction on street racing and have been warned that it will be used. They have been invited to warn their customers of it to act as a preventative measure.

At the end of October the police put the premises on a list of premises to be paid specific attention by patrol vehicles to monitor any anti-social behaviour on Friday and Saturday nights.

Planning Enforcement has concluded, following an investigation, that there are no breaches of planning legislation in respect of the premises, and it will close its case.

A meeting between council officers and the police is taking place on 8th December, to be followed within a week by a meeting with the owners of the premises to discuss all the issues that local residents have raised around matters such as parking, fireworks, noise and street racing.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM
COUNCILLOR KEN WOOD**

L Chasing Pavements

Question:

Can you confirm what changes to the planning regulations for new developments are being put in place to accommodate the larger waste collection vehicles the city has procured and that are currently causing undue damage to pavements, kerbs and verges?

Answer:

This will not require changes to planning regulations. In general, new developments are subject to consultation, including to colleagues in Transportation and Highways. They are aware of the size of the vehicles and will apply the appropriate tracking requirements for various vehicles. They will also raise this with any consultants who provide Transport Analysis documents in support of planning applications.