



CITY COUNCIL

9 JULY 2019

WRITTEN QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Unauthorised Encampments”

Question:

What are the 50 most breached sites for unauthorised encampments over the last 10 years?

Answer:

Please find attached the excel spreadsheet of the data requested. We do not hold league tables of most affected land.



Council Land Stats
2010-11.xls



Council Land Stats
2011-12.xls



Council Land Stats
2012-13.xls



Council Land Stats
2013-14.xls



Council Land Stats
2014-15.xls



Council Land Stats
2015-16.xls



Council Land Stats
2016-17.xls



Council Land Stats
2017-18.xls



Council Land Stats
2018-19.xls



Council Land Stats
2019-20.xls

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Zaffar v Khan”

Question:

What costs has the Council incurred in total for any support provided in the High Court Case *Waseem Zaffar Vs Asaf Khan*, including officer time for any internal legal or other advice and evidence provided?

Answer:

The Court Case is not a matter handled or advised on by the Council. Therefore, there are no costs incurred by the Council and no officer time for internal legal or other advice.

A3

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Head of Leader’s Office”

Question:

Has the role of ‘Head of Leader’s Office’ now been filled?

Answer:

Yes

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Head of Leader’s Office cost”

Question:

What is the cost, including on costs, of the post of Head of Leader’s Office?

Answer:

The post has been assessed as a Grade 7 which has a salary range of £56,154.06 to £72,883.08. With on costs including national insurance contributions this ranges from, £81,860.00 to £106,602.00

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Head of Leader’s Office Political Restrictions”

Question:

Is the post of ‘Head of Leader’s Office’ politically restricted?

Answer:

Yes

A6

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR MORRIAM JAN

"Changing Boundaries of Land - Perry Barr A34 Transport Project"

Question:

What is the scope for changing the boundaries of the land assigned to the Perry Barr A34 Transport Project in response to the current consultation?

Answer:

The land assigned to the Perry Barr A34 project is a combination of existing public highway, land included in the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and part of the Gailey Park site that was acquired by the City Council for development.

The CPO has been made and the public inquiry opened on 2nd July 2019. The scheme is constrained by the CPO and public highway boundaries; there is no scope to extend beyond these boundaries.

The Gailey Park site has been acquired for the overall village development and was granted planning consent in December 2018. The preferred scheme as set out in the February 2019 Cabinet Report includes slithers of the site to facilitate widening of Harrier Way and Walsall Road, there is very little scope to extend the road widening further into the site without adverse impact on the consented development.

Within the boundaries set out above the City Council will consider any suggested changes submitted as part of the consultation process providing the overall scheme benefits are not compromised.

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Centenary Square Development - Anticipated Economic Benefits"

Question:

Given that the Centenary Square development is part of an Enterprise Zone, financed by a tax incremental finance model (which pays for borrowing through future uplifts in business rates), could the Leader set out its anticipated economic benefits, in numbers not words?

Answer:

It is not possible to answer this question without words.

Business leaders in the city who pay business rates certainly believe that the investment in Centenary Square will provide an economic benefit and jobs for the city.

GBSLEP were partners in funding Centenary Square and Simon Marks, Director for optimising assets at the LEP, described Centenary Square as a 'shrewd investment' stating that 'people often underestimate the value you generate from public realm'.

He said the scheme had helped generate investment in surrounding developments such as Paradise, the HSBC and HMRC buildings as well as the forthcoming revamp of Symphony Hall and added: "The reality is everybody is entitled to their opinion, some people think why are you spending on that? Couldn't you spend it elsewhere?"

"The LEP is really, really focused on making sure the investment we make in schemes, be they public realm, open space and some of the buildings we see, that actually we get a return on the investment.

"We get a return on that investment in a number of ways, through jobs, and more importantly the investment that it leverages in."

I agree with Simon Marks. Centenary Square is a public realm scheme that indirectly contributes to the economic outputs forecasted for the Enterprise Zone.

The Enterprise Zone is predicted to create an additional 40,000 new jobs, the delivery of 1.3 million square metres of new floor space with uplift in GVA of £2.8bn per annum.

This project provides infrastructure to support that regeneration through the Business Rate uplift generated from developments which will be retained by the GBSLEP and used to invest in infrastructure supporting the wider economic priorities across the LEP geography.

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Key Performance Indicators - Targets"

Question:

A recent Cabinet report revealed that just 13 out of 39 key performance indicators met their targets in the last year. What is being done to get Council performance back on track?

Answer:

The Council has made some important strides in its improvement journey over the last year. Successes have included; moving up the national rankings from 59th to 7th in Adult Social Care Related Quality of Life; getting young people into employment through the Youth Promise Plus Project and Children's Social Care moving from Inadequate to Requiring Improvement to be Good. Despite these successes, the Council still faces significant challenges in a number of areas, notably in Waste and Street Cleaning, Homelessness, in Supporting Children with Special Educational Needs and Delayed Transfers of Care.

We acknowledge that the Council is not out of the woods with regard to its performance and we are continuing to undertake a number of activities aimed at addressing the underlying, systemic issues that underpin areas of poor performance. These include commissioning an external review of our waste services, undertaking a system-wide transformation programme with the STP to establish a new approach to early intervention, and continuing to refine our performance framework to improve comparability of KPIs and align our finance and performance reporting.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S
WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR EDDIE FREEMAN**

“SEN Out-of-City Places”

Question:

For each year since 2012 how many children with special educational needs have been placed in settings outside of Birmingham?

Answer:

SENAR has provided data in the table below. However, please note:

- The information relates to children with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) - previously statements of SEN.
- The data has been provided from the end of the academic year 2013/14 to correspond with the introduction of the SEND reforms which came into effect on 1 September 2014.
- SENAR is responsible for funding all children and young people with EHCPs placed in independent schools; specialist Post 16 institutions; and Other Local Authority (OLA) maintained settings where additional top-up funding is required. The placement numbers for these categories are set out in columns 2, 3 and 4 of the table below.
- SENAR has not (to date) recorded historical data for those placed in OLA maintained provision where additional funding is not required but have reported the current figure for this cohort in column 5.
- In summary, the number of children and young people currently placed in independent out of city provision is 161 (sum of columns 2 and 3) and the number placed in OLA maintained provision is 702 (sum of columns 4 and 5).

Placements	Independent	Post 16 SPI	Funded OLA Maintained (including FE Colleges)	No funding OLA Maintained (including FE Colleges)
Aug-14	144	34	258	
Aug-15	149	32	241	
Aug-16	167	42	316	
Aug-17	173	43	428	
Aug-18	162	34	437	
Current (June 19)	139	22	481	221

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S WELLBEING FROM COUNCILLOR BRUCE LINES

“SEND Capital Programme”

Question:

For each year since 2015 please list all capital projects, including total cost of each, used for the creation of additional SEND places within the City.

1. Details of SEND places created at special schools (please note that re-provided places refer to replacement of temporary and/or unsuitable accommodation):

Academic Year Places available	School Name	Number of additional SEN places	SEN places being re provided	Funding (£)
2014/15	Wilson Stuart School	20	0	£604,967
2014/15	Victoria School	10	0	£325,142
2014/15	Uffculme - Russell Road	30	0	£1,974,730
2014/15	The Dame Ellen Pinsent School	10	12	£2,334,486
2014/15	The Bridge School	10	36	£1,937,834
2014/15	Springfield House	8	8	£399,896
2014/15	Selly Oak Trust School	10	10	£601,815
2014/15	Queensbury School	8	0	£570,669
2014/15	Langley School	6	6	£846,373
2014/15	James Brindley School	12	0	£200,417
2014/15	Hamilton School	10	8	£2,174,446
2014/15	Fox Hollies School	12	0	£596,883
2014/15	Cherry Oak School	27	8	£1,984,502
2014/15	Calthorpe Teaching Academy	23	56	£1,120,594
2014/15	Brays School	33	27	£218,452
2014/15	Baskerville School	9	7	£2,423,892
2015/16	Hallmoor School	10	0	£105,255
2016/17	The Pines Special School	95	95	£8,497,453
2016/17	Calthorpe Teaching Academy	10	0	£200,000
2017/18	Lindsworth School	27	0	£806,000
2017/18	Brays School	60	0	£598,627
2017/18	Beaufort School	0	48	£3,266,868
2018/19	Victoria School	0	60	£4,078,380

2. List of SEND places created in mainstream schools (resource bases):

Academic Year Places available	School Name	Number of additional SEN places	SEN places being re provided	Funding (£)
2014/15	Paget Primary School	12	0	£579,329
2014/15	Paganel Primary School	12	0	£13,361
2015/16	Allens Croft Primary School	12	0	£70,000
2016/17	Topcliffe Primary School	0	50	£418,049
2018/19	Boldmere Junior/Infant	24		£613,611
2018/19	Saltley Academy	40	0	TBC
2018/19	Cherry Orchard	12		£96,668

C

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“School Budgets”

Question:

A calculation error by the Schools Financial Services meant that the budget allocation originally reported to Harborne Primary School for 19/20 was £79,000 short of what it should have been. Did this error affect any other schools?

Answer:

This was a one off issue which affected Harborne Primary School and did not affect any other schools.

D

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Politically Restricted Posts”

Question:

**Where a post is politically restricted for how long before taking up a post
should an employee not be an active member of a political party?**

Answer:

There are no such restrictions.

E1

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Empty Garages”

Question:

How many empty council owned garages are there currently in Birmingham (please include, as a separate figure, any that have already been declared surplus but which have not yet been disposed of?

Answer:

There are currently 3688 (void) council owned garages in Birmingham.

There are currently no garages sites that have been declared surplus which have not been disposed of.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Average Price of council property”

Question:

What is the average value of council property by type? (flat/house and number of bedrooms etc.) – please include mean, medium and mode

Answer:

Property value information is at 31st March 2019

Flats (including maisonettes)

Number of bedrooms	0	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Median (£)	40,398	0	12,082	32,253	33,311	32,017	
Mode (£)	40,398	36,861	0	32,017	33,311	32,017	
Mean (£)	34,832	27,867	17,479	34,273	33,576	32,017	
Number of properties	475	14,458	10,577	3,884	52	1	29,447

Houses (including bungalows)

Number of bedrooms	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	Total
Median (£)	48,659	48,659	54,429	55,061	61,005	61,005	61,005	61,005	
Mode (£)	48,659	48,414	55,061	55,061	87,425	87,425	43,625	61,005	
Mean (£)	48,666	47,797	53,053	55,206	62,547	69,344	57,638	61,005	
Number of properties	227	3,538	8,674	17,056	1,672	129	11	2	31,309

Notes

¹ The information is at 31st March 2019 and is provisional information as it is still subject to audit as part of the 2018/19 final accounts audit.

² The valuation was carried out by Birmingham Property Services in line with MHCLG Guidance on Stock Valuation for Resource Accounting published in November 2016. The basis of the valuation is in accordance with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors using the Existing Use Value - Social Housing basis, which takes open market value for the underlying dwellings and applies a discount factor to reflect the reduced value as a result of use for social housing for 2018/19 of 40%.

³ The valuation is based on a valuation of beacon properties which take account of specific archetypes and number of bedrooms for the HRA housing stock. Therefore the valuation is averaged across types and size of property in the portfolio rather than an individual valuation for each of the 60,756 properties.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Modular Homes”

Question:

What is the whole life cost of a modular home compared to a standard home, including average life expectancy?

Answer:

In order to establish a comprehensive whole life cost calculation we will need to monitor a range of outputs from our new modular home (that was only installed late June 2019) alongside our traditionally built BMHT homes for a period of time. We have this process set up and will report back in due course.

In terms of average life expectancy, our modular homes are guaranteed for a minimum life of 60 years, which is exactly the same as our traditionally built BMHT homes. We fully expect both types of construction to far exceed this minimum lifespan in the same way that most good quality homes built over the last 200 years have done so.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES AND
NEIGHBOURHOODS FROM COUNCILLOR ADRIAN DELANEY**

“Modular Homes Carbon”

Question:

What is the whole life carbon cost of a modular home compared to a standard home?

Answer:

At this very early stage we are still very much at a monitoring stage for assessing carbon costs for off-site manufacture, but I can report as follows.

The energy performance of the construction specification in the pre-fabricated homes is equivalent to the standard achieved in BMHT homes using traditional construction. The levels of insulation (for retaining heat), the air-tightness (for reducing drafts) and the ventilation system (for improving air quality efficiently) all meet the same standard as our previous BMHT properties.

Future phases of modular manufacturing will combine this with research into renewable energy strategies that will drive carbon emissions down further and we believe that the innovative services connection process trialled on Heaton Street will complement this.

Pre-fabrication in the construction sector can reduce carbon emissions during construction thanks to reductions in transport and waste emissions during manufacturing off-site and reduced site presence, thanks to the rapid assembly and hand over.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Green Waste Reminders”

Question:

How many reminders were sent by post for residents to renew their green waste subscription for 19/20, split between the number sent before the discount period expired and the number sent after?

Answer:

This year there was not a formal discounted period, instead charges remained at 2018 levels prior to an increase being implemented as part of the budget setting process. The 2019 cost was introduced on the 5 April and any correspondence sent between the 22 March and this date made reference to the increase in cost.

Where customers from 2018 had provided an email address and their consent under GDPR, emails were sent rather than a letter, in order to minimise waste and cost to the service. In total, email customers received up to six emails, whereas customers being sent letters have been sent up to three.

Exact sending dates have not been provided below as each batch were sent over a couple of days to reduce the impact on the contact centre. You will also note that the numbers of correspondence decreased at every mailing point, this is a result of any customers that had already subscribed being removed from the list.

- End of December 2018 – Letter (13 608 recipients) and email (51 208 recipients)
- End of January 2019 – Letter (13 608 recipients) and email (51 208 recipients)

Sales opened 1st February 2019

- Around 22nd March 2019 – Letter (3 304 recipients) and email (15 261 recipients)
- Around 29th March 2019 – email only (11 314 recipients)

Price increase 5th April 2019

- Start of May 2019 – email only (7 709 recipients)
- Start of June 2019 – email only (7 430 recipients)

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE
AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR MAUREEN CORNISH**

“Green Waste Renewal Methods”

Question:

For each year since the introduction of garden waste charges, how many people have signed up for the service via each different method (online, phone, post etc.)?

Answer:

The following is a breakdown of garden sales by channel (we don't accept requests by post). The data has been split into collection year, rather than calendar year so as to allow easy comparison. For example, some years sales have opened in December for the following year, therefore a resident subscribing in December 2015 for the 2016 season has been included in 2016 figure.

In addition, the data is based on individual transactions only and therefore represents the approximate number of residents subscribing in a year, rather than the exact total number. For example a resident may have decided part way through the year that they want an extra bin and as a result this would be counted as two separate transactions. There may also be a few residents who have requested a refund within the 14 day cooling off period and these are still included in the figures.

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019 (up to 3 July)
Website	27788	36226	42557	48575	49138	48272
Telephone	21789	21417	19119	18093	16303	15423

F3

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK

“WRCO Interventions”

Question:

In each month since the introduction of the new role, how many ‘interventions’ have been made by WRCOs to encourage recycling (broken down by whether direct face to face or via leaflet/notice drop)

Answer:

Find below the amount of direct resident engagement interventions made by the WRC Officers per month, broken down by type.

Month / Year	Total Direct Resident Engagement Interventions	Face to Face Contact		Leaflet Left	
		No	Yes	No	Yes
Sep 18	16	7	9	13	3
Oct 18	42	5	37	38	4
Nov 18	36	14	22	20	16
Dec 18	53	45	8	11	42
Jan 19	23	7	16	13	10
Feb 19	11	5	6	4	7
Mar 19	11	5	6	10	1
Apr 19	75	66	9	7	68
May 19	57	47	10	18	39
Jun 19	86	76	10	8	78

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE
AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

“Flytipping reports by waste collection crews”

Question:

How many instances of fly tipping were reported by waste collections crews whilst out on rounds per month for the last 3 years?

Answer:

Below are the amounts of flytipping incidents found on public land and or the highway which were cleared by collection crews. These values are made up of incidences which were reported both by members of the public as well as those which were discovered on district by the crews.

This data is collated quarterly and forms part of our Waste Data Flow return which is submitted to DEFRA.

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2016				1152	1151	1209	1365	1352	1342	1279	1229	1146
2017	1158	1039	1377	1269	1202	1224	1563	1533	1049	1049	1105	944
2018	1687	1395	1301	1631	1351	1473	1801	1619	1494	1371	1234	1170
2019	1520	1353	1558									

In specific relation to waste collection crews, we only hold separate data from September 2018 following the introduction of the Waste Reduction and Collection Officers.

	Total
Sep 18	89
Oct 18	197
Nov 18	323
Dec 18	186
Jan 19	260
Feb 19	167
Mar 19	123
Apr 19	337
May 19	365
Jun 19	190

F5

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE
AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID BARRIE**

“Question F6 from June 2019, overtime to waste collection crews”

Question:

In June written questions, I asked how much had been paid out in overtime to waste collection crews (including both total paid and total number of hours worked.) I was told that there was insufficient time to compile this information before the meeting but that I would be sent it directly after. I have not yet had a response but in any event a written question should have a written published answer so can you please provide an answer to that question here?

Answer:

The total amount paid and the total amount worked in overtime to waste collection crews (including Bank Holidays) since the end of the industrial action (1st April 2019) is £290,326.56 paid from 22,195.81 hours worked.

F6

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Question F12 from June 2019, Agency use in Waste Collection”

Question:

In June written questions, I asked how many agency staff were used in the waste collection service in each month since January 2017. I was told that there was insufficient time to compile this information before the meeting but that I would be sent it directly after. I have not yet had a response but in any event a written question should have a written published answer so can you please provide an answer to that question here?

Answer:

The following table shows the number of individual agency workers who have been employed each month since January 2017.

Please note: Individuals may have covered multiple vacancies, and multiple individuals may have covered the same vacancy in a month. In addition, the duration individuals are with the Department varies from being employed for part of a day to the whole month and beyond. As a result the values contained in the table do not reflect the actual number of vacancies they have covered.

To put these values into context the current number of individual agency workers stands at approximately 182 out of a total workforce of 615 in waste collection.

	2017	2018	2019
Jan	231	210	241
Feb	236	219	196
Mar	247	231	167
Apr	269	258	188
May	259	256	186
Jun	261	266	190
Jul	271	260	
Aug	261	219	
Sep	255	220	
Oct	246	215	
Nov	235	243	
Dec	229	231	

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Illegal encampments on Calder Drive and Rectory Park”

Question:

What was the total cost to the council of removing the unauthorised encampments from Calder Drive and Rectory Park, including legal costs and the costs of clear ups?

Answer:

Total costs are very difficult to give accurately because the enforcement officers undertaking the recovery of land have other duties but prioritise this work. The best estimates are as follows:

Calder Drive: Incursion date 28 May to 31 May 2019.

3 visits by enforcement officers	£150	
Bailiff costs	£400 (estimated not received)	
Clean up costs	£315	
	Total	£915

Rectory Park: Incursion date 13 June to 14 June

2 visits by enforcement officers	£100	
Bailiff costs	£0 (no bailiffs used)	
Clean up costs (crews)	£0 (No waste left on site requiring cleaning crews)	
	Total	£100

Rectory Park: Incursion date 30 June to current (eviction due 4/7/19)

2 visits by enforcement officers so far	£100	
Bailiff costs	£0 (no bailiffs used)	
Clean up costs (crews)	£0 (No waste left on site requiring cleaning crews)	
	Total	£100

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE
AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE CLANCY**

“Cannon Hill Car Parking Revenue”

Question:

How much of the parking revenue from Cannon Hill Car Park charges have been paid to the MAC in each month since the charges were introduced?

Answer:

The Car Parking scheme at Cannon Hill Car Park was introduced in October 2017. The agreement with the MAC set out that at the end of each financial year (not on a monthly basis) any net surplus that was generated on the operations of the Car Park would be split 50:50 between the City Council and The MAC.

The following amounts have been paid/committed to be paid to the MAC

2017/18: £45,877

2018/19: £70,670. This is an estimate as we are awaiting an invoice from The MAC

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE
AND PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR DAVID PEARS**

“New Bin Wagons”

Question:

For each depot within the waste collection service, how many of the new wagons proposed in the fleet procurement strategy would each different depot be allocated?

Answer:

The vehicle report has been called in and will go through the necessary process over the next few weeks.

The vehicle report included vehicles for both refuse collection and street cleansing across all depots.

The breakdown for allocations is as follows for waste collection vehicles:

- Montague Street – 18
- Lifford Lane – 13
- Perry Barr – 13
- Redfern Road – 13

F10

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Waste Collection Rounds missed in June 2019"

Question:

How many waste collection rounds were missed in June 2019, by Ward?

Answer:

Waste Collection rounds are not specifically ward based, with rounds completing collections in multiple wards each day.

During June 2019, city wide 120 whole rounds were dropped out of 2686 whole rounds scheduled.

F11

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Recycling - 9 weeks wait"

Question:

How does the Cabinet Member justify the fact that some residents are having their recycling collections every fortnight, whilst others have to wait 9 weeks?

Answer:

I cannot justify any missed collection. We have been working hard to resolve the ongoing issues and additional resources have been made available which I believe will make a difference.

F12

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Number of Missed Roads - Stats erroneous"

Question:

At the last Council meeting the Cabinet Member helpfully provided a number of spreadsheets setting out the number of missed collections by individual reports and by the number of missed roads. These were then added together to make totals – although not totals of the total number of households missed. Can the Cabinet Member confirm that previously reported statistics on the percentage of missed collections were erroneous, as they failed to include the impact of missing collections of whole roads?

Answer:

The percentage of missed collections statistic published as part of the Service Delivery Measures which is released quarterly on our website, are based on individual and whole road missed collections reported by residents.

Whole road reporting is accurate when it relates to short roads, which are covered by one collection crew / depot, and where the reporter can view / assess the whole road, but in many circumstances this is not the case. As a result each missed collection is currently collated as an individual missed collection and in the near future residents will only be able to report individual missed collections, so that we can improve the accuracy of data around those affected.

F13

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR STREET SCENE AND
PARKS FROM COUNCILLOR NEIL EUSTACE**

"How many catch-up collections in June 2019"

Question:

Could the Cabinet Member indicate how many catch-up collections were organised in June 2019 when vehicles and crews missed all or substantial parts of collections rounds, setting out the answer by Ward?

Answer:

Due to the nature of how whole road and individual missed collections are dealt with we are unable to provide the amounts of how many individual catch-up collections by ward were organised in June.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Aston Expressway Closure”

Question:

What is the total cost to the Council of closing the Aston Expressway for the day on 22 September to turn it into a ‘paved park’?

Answer:

This event is a collaboration between Birmingham City Council and The Active Wellbeing Society, with most of funding coming from the ring-fenced Sport England funded Active Communities Local Delivery Pilot programme. In addition to ‘in-kind’ officer time, the only direct cost to the council would be that of the Temporary Traffic Regulation Notice for this event which would be in the region of £600.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Aston Expressway Closure – Environmental Impact”

Question:

What impact assessment has been done on air quality and carbon emissions in other parts of the city and region as a result of the decision to close the Expressway for the day on 22 September?

Answer:

We have not carried out a detailed impact assessment for air quality and carbon emissions for this event and it is not normal practice to do so for changes of such short duration.

Regular air quality monitoring and modelling exercises shows that air pollution in Birmingham is a major issue, particularly in the city centre and mainly as a result of road traffic emissions. One of the worst hotspots is on the A38 Expressway between Lancaster Circus and Dartmouth Circus.

We need to change the way we move people around our city and reimagining public spaces by closing streets to cars has a part to play in this. We will aim to minimise any disruption from this, and clear diversionary routes will be in place.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Aston Expressway Closure – Economic Impact”

Question:

What impact assessment has been done on the economic cost to retail businesses in the City Centre as a result of the decision to close the Aston Expressway for the day on 22 September?

Answer:

We have not undertaken a formal impact assessment on this event, and it is not normal practice to do so. Many previous events hosted in Birmingham City Centre have involved road closures, such as the Great Birmingham Run and Let's Ride. These attract thousands of visitors, participants and spectators and bring a major boost to the local economy.

We will work with stakeholders, including Retail BID and the Bull Ring, to identify how businesses can benefit from the opportunities presented by this event.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR GARY SAMBROOK

“Aston Expressway Closure – consultation”

Question:

Please list all businesses, organisations, sports and events organisers, and agencies consulted over the decision to close the Aston Expressway for the day on 22 September?

Answer:

The development of initial traffic management plans has involved consultation with Transport for West Midlands, National Express and Highways England, as well as reviewing the impact from any other events taking place in the region that weekend.

We have already been approached by a number of organisations who are interested in being involved with this event, and information has been promoted through the Birmingham Connected update sent to over 1,500 individuals and organisations as well as through social media and in local press coverage. A workshop is taking place in July with Culture Central to facilitate input from arts organisations.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“City Centre Parking”

Question:

Please list all the off-street parking locations, including the number of spaces and disabled spaces in each, serving the Broad Street entertainment area highlighted in the 2016 report that was referred to by the Leader at the call-in of the Brindley Drive Car Park sale.

Answer:

For absolute transparency and completeness a full copy of the report from the 2016 parking study referred to will be emailed to you. The parking locations and number of parking spaces are set out in that report.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR CHARLOTTE HODIVALA

“City Centre Parking”

Question:

Can you please provide a copy of the 2016 report that was referred to by the Leader at the call-in of the Brindley Drive Car Park sale which he said highlighted a surplus of parking spaces in the City Centre?

Answer:

For absolute transparency and completeness a full copy of the report from the 2016 parking study referred to will be emailed to you.

CITY COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2019

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

“Trees”

Question:

How many trees have been cut down on council owned land and the public highway since 2012?

Answer:

Responsibility for trees on council owned land falls to a number of different directorates.

Place Directorate through the Parks Tree Service have the responsibility for managing public tree assets on Leisure land (Parks and Public Open Spaces, Housing land, Bereavement Services land, Schools (still with the LA) transportation land (non- HMPE) and any other minor land holdings under the wider BCC ownership.

Trees within the Highway Maintainable at Public Expense (HMPE) are managed under the Amey PFI contract.

Within the land holdings of the city, trees are removed for a number of reasons. Generally this is because the trees have reached the end of their safe retention period; however trees may be removed for any of the following reasons; to facilitate development of new infrastructure (housing, highways, Metro etc.), to abate damage caused through direct contact or subsidence, as good practice management of existing woodlands, as part of wider habitat restoration projects (such as the heathland works at Lickey Hills Country Park and Sutton Park NNR) or as part of Plant Health notifications issued by the Forestry Commission (*Phytophthora ramorum* outbreaks at Lickey Hills Country Park).

Where we hold data on trees, these are recorded in different ways - as individual trees, as tree groups (of same species) or as woodland areas. For the latter two we do not hold data on individual numbers only the hectares (Ha) covered.

The information on trees felled also makes no differentiation between small self-set trees and those through the various life stages through to maturity. Therefore a portion of the trees felled by parks may be accounted, for example, through clearance of neglected or overgrown housing gardens.

The following is a summary of tree felling data that it has been possible to calculate:

Managing section	Trees removed 2012 – July 2019
Parks - all non-HMPE owned land	49,087
Parks - woodland thinned	35Ha (
Parks - habitat restoration by tree removal	30.6Ha
Parks – Disease control	8.6Ha (approx.)
Amey – HMPE as part of PFI contract	10,832
Transportation Infrastructure Projects (approx. since 2014)	313
Total countable trees felled (excl. areas)	60,232

NB. For trees on the HMPE the tree removals equate to approximately 14% of the tree stock. To ensure there is continuity of tree coverage and build resilience within any tree population it is essential that there are trees at all stages of development (young, early mature, mature etc.) so this figure is within accepted parameters.

However to paint the full picture we must also consider the numbers of trees that have been planted over the same period.

Managing section	Trees planted 2012 – July 2019
Parks In conjunction with partners	71,000
Landscape Practice Group – as part of projects	2,845
Amey – HMPE as part of PFI contract	10,112 (720 to be planted winter 2019)
Transportation Infrastructure Projects (approx. since 2014)	626
Total planted (including those pending)	84,583

Using numbers alone to monitor urban trees only gives a partial picture when we consider the expanse of the Urban Forest Canopy and how this will play a part in combating the predicted trends of climate change. It is for this reason that, as part of the 2017/18 tree policy review that a recommendation was made to additionally monitor the overall changes in percentage canopy cover and its distribution across the city.

Currently Birmingham has a canopy cover of around 18.6% (48.81Km² of our geographic area) with a target of 25% to work towards.

For any queries on this information contact Simon Needle, Principal Arboriculturist.

G8

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"How many Vehicle Charging Points - Paradise Circus Carpark"

Question:

How many electric vehicle charging points will there be in the new Paradise Circus car park?

Answer:

The outline planning consent at Paradise dates from 2012 and as such pre-dates the Council's current Birmingham Development Plan policies for car parking spaces within large scale developments to provide electric vehicle charging spaces.

While there will be no charging points provided as part of the Phase 1 development, the developers Argent have however committed to provide 20 in Phase 2 which is anticipated to be completed in the First Quarter of 2022.

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Perry Barr A34 Transport Project - boundaries of land"

Question:

Can the Cabinet Member state whether the boundaries of the land assigned for the Perry Barr A34 Transport project were assigned to the Transportation Department by the Regeneration Department or were determined by discussion between the two Departments?

Answer:

The land assigned to the Perry Barr A34 project is a combination of existing public highway, land included in the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and part of the Gailey Park site that was acquired by the City Council for development.

The land assigned for the scheme has been determined jointly by officers within Transport & Connectivity and Regeneration.

G10

CITY COUNCIL - 9 JULY 2019

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

"Perry Barr A34 Transport Project - scope for changing boundaries"

Question:

What is the scope for changing the boundaries of the land assigned to the Perry Barr A34 Transport project in response to the current consultation?

Answer:

The land assigned to the Perry Barr A34 project is a combination of existing public highway, land included in the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and part of the Gailey Park site that was acquired by the City Council for development.

The CPO has been made and the public inquiry opened on 2nd July 2019. The scheme is constrained by the CPO and public highway boundaries; there is no scope to extend beyond these boundaries.

The Gailey Park site has been acquired for the overall village development and was granted planning consent in December 2018. The preferred scheme as set out in the February 2019 Cabinet Report includes slithers of the site to facilitate widening of Harrier Way and Walsall Road, there is very little scope to extend the road widening further into the site without adverse impact on the consented development.

Within the boundaries set out above the City Council will consider any suggested changes submitted as part of the consultation process providing the overall scheme benefits are not compromised.

