



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL HELD  
ON TUESDAY, 12 JULY 2022 AT 1400 HOURS IN THE COUNCIL  
CHAMBER, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:-** Lord Mayor (Councillor Maureen Cornish) in the Chair.

**Councillors**

Akhlaq Ahmed	Ray Goodwin	Rick Payne
Alex Aitken	Rob Grant	David Pears
Deirdre Alden	Colin Green	Miranda Perks
Robert Alden	Fred Grindrod	Rob Pocock
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Roger Harmer	Julien Pritchard
Mohammed	Deborah Harries	Hendrina
Azim	Adam Higgs	Quinnen
Raqeeb Aziz	Des Hughes	Lauren Rainbow
David Barker	Jon Hunt	Darius Sandhu
David Barrie	Mumtaz Hussain	Shafique Shah
Baber Baz	Shabrana Hussain	Rinkal Shergill
Matt Bennett	Timothy Huxtable	Sybil Spence
Jilly	Mohammed Idrees	Ron Storer
Birmingham	Zafar Iqbal	Saima Suleman
Marcus	Katherine Iroh	Jamie Tennant
Bemasconi	Morriam Jan	Sharon
Bushra Bi	Kerry Jenkins	Thompson
Sir Albert	Meirion Jenkins	Paul Tilsley
Bore	Brigid Jones	Lisa Trickett
Nicky	Mariam Khan	Penny Wagg
Brennan	Izzy Knowles	Ian Ward
Kerry Brewer	Chaman Lal	Ken Wood
Marje Bridle	Bruce Lines	Alex Yip
Martin Brooks	Mary Locke	Waseem Zaffar
Zaker Choudhry	Basharat	
Debbie Clancy	Mahmood	
Liz Clements	Majid Mahmood	
John Cotton	Rashad Mahmood	
Phil Davis	Lee Marsham	
Jack Deakin	Karen McCarthy	
Adrian Delaney	Saddak Miah	
Diane Donaldson	Shehla Moledina	
Barbara Dring	Gareth Moore	
Jayne Francis	Simon Morrall	
Sam Forsyth	Yvonne Mosquito	

\*\*\*\*\*

## **NOTICE OF RECORDING**

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

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

- 14 The Lord Mayor reminded Members that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests relating to any items of business to be discussed at the meeting.
- 

## **MINUTES**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and –

- 15 **RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 14 June 2022 be taken as read and confirmed and signed.

---

## **LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **1 Death of former Councillor Mohammed Fazal**

The Lord Mayor indicated her first announcement related to Councillor Mohammed Fazal, father of Councillor Akhlaq Ahmed who had passed away on 17 March 2022.

Mohammed Fazal had served as a Councillor for Sparkhill Ward from 1987 to 1995; and again from 2002-2004; for Springfield Ward from 2004 to 2018; and again for Sparkhill Ward from 2018 until his death; and the title of Honorary Alderman Posthumous was conferred on him at an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on 24 May 2022.

During his time on the Council, Councillor Fazal served on numerous Committees, Sub-Committees and outside bodies.

Councillor Fazal leaves behind 6 daughters, 2 sons, 24 grandchildren and 6 great grandchildren.

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

- 16 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council placed on record its sorrow at the death of Councillor Mohammed Fazal and its appreciation of his devoted service to the residents of Birmingham. The Council extended its deepest sympathy to members of Mohammed's family in their sad bereavement.

Members and officers stood for a minute's silence, following which a number of tributes were made by Members.

## **2 Death of former Councillor Mohammed Azam**

The Lord Mayor indicated her second announcement related to former Councillor Mohammed Azam who had passed away on 15 June 2022.

Former Councillor Mohammed Azam had served as a Councillor for Handsworth Ward from 1991 to 1995.

During his time on the Council, Councillor Azam served on numerous Committees, Sub-Committees and outside bodies.

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

17

### **RESOLVED:-**

That the Council placed on record its sorrow at the death of former Councillor Mohammed Azam and its appreciation of his devoted service to the residents of Birmingham. The Council extended its deepest sympathy to members of Mohammed's family in their sad bereavement.

Members and officers stood for a minute's silence, following which a number of tributes were made by Members.

---

## **PETITIONS**

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

The following petitions were presented:-

(See document No. 1, 'Additional Meeting Documents')

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

18

### **RESOLVED:-**

That the petitions were received and referred to the relevant Chief Officer(s).

---

### **Petitions Update**

A Petitions Update had been made available electronically:-

(See document No. 2, 'Additional Meeting Documents')

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and -

19

**RESOLVED:-**

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

---

**QUESTION TIME**

20

The Council proceeded to consider Oral Questions in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure (B4.4 F of the Constitution).

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

---

**APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNCIL**

Councillor Baber Baz addressed the Council and it was-

21

**RESOLVED:-**

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

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

Councillor Morriam Jan (Lib Dem) to replace Councillor Penny Wagg (Lib Dem) as a Member of the Education and Children's Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the period ending with the Annual Meeting of City Council in May 2026

---

**INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

A report from the City Solicitor was submitted:-

(See document No. 3, agenda item 8)

Councillor Ian Ward, Leader of the Council moved the Motion which was seconded from the floor.

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-

**RESOLVED:-**

1.) That City Council agreed to appoint the following persons to the Independent Remuneration Panel as co-opted members:

Appointee	Term of Office
Honorary Alderman Carl Rice	15 Sept 2022 – 14 Sept 2026
Former Councillor Peter Fowler	15 Sept 2022 – 14 Sept 2026

2.) That City Council agreed to recruit the following, to the Independent Remuneration Panel:

To recruit	Term of Office
One Citizen Representative	14 Sept 2022 – 13 Sept 2026
One Appointed Representative	14 Sept 2022 – 13 Sept 2026

3.) It was noted that City Council would be asked to confirm the appointments on 13 September 2022, of one Citizen Representative and one Appointed Representative following the recruitment exercise.

---

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT GOVERNANCE RULES**

A report from the Strategic Director of Council Management was submitted:-

(See document No. 4, agenda item 9)

Councillor Yvonne Mosquito, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources moved the Motion which was seconded from the floor.

Councillor Meirion Jenkins moved an amendment to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Simon Morrall:

Add to end of first paragraph:

“subject to the following changes:

- Officer procurement delegation to be brought down from £10m to £500k in line with other core cities.
- A new lower threshold of £10,000 for the procurement of management consultancy services will be introduced to enable the council to get consultancy spend back under control.
- Late approval of contracts (e.g. renewal\extension after expiry or

procurement that does not allow enough time for a full procurement exercise) to require Cabinet Member approval and a public report.

- Single contract negotiations to require Cabinet Member approval and a public report.

- All exit packages in excess of £100k to require approval of Full Council.

Further this Council notes its concern that the agreed action from Full Council on 13 June 2017 relating to a public officer register of interests has still not been implemented. Council therefore resolves that a register of 'professional' interests of all officers with delegated decision-making powers to be published annually online in accordance with the findings of John Greenwood and Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council v Information Commissioner (EA/2011/0131 and EA/2011/0137) (17-2-2012).

A debate ensued.

Councillors Lisa Trickett, Alex Yip, Paul Tilsley, Akhlaq Ahmed and Ian Ward spoke during the debate.

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

It was therefore-

23

**RESOLVED:-**

- 1.) That the changes presented in the updated Procurement and Contract Governance Rules (Appendix 1) be approved as part the new Contract Standing Orders for the Council and incorporated into the Council's Constitution.
- 2.) That delegated authority be granted to the Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer to agree any final minor changes and edits to the Contract Standing Orders and supporting procedural notes in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources.

---

**(OTHER) CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION**

A report from the City Solicitor was submitted:-

(See document No. 5, agenda item 10)

Councillor Ian Ward, Leader of the Council moved the Motion which was seconded from the floor.

Councillor Jon Hunt moved an amendment to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Roger Harmer:

‘Add to motion:

Council further resolves that the following two areas be clarified in the next review of the constitution to reflect previous custom and practice:

- 1.) Time in Council meetings for questions: in Section B 4.4, that the rules around the time available for questions be amended to ensure that the full allocation of time, usually 70 minutes, is used for questions to ensure accountability of the executive and other office-holders. This may be done by amendment to clause (v).
- 2.) The process for making changes to the constitution, found under “Part A Changes to Constitution” and Part A, Annex 1, to ensure that significant changes to the constitution are reported to Full Council and that there is a clear process for gaining all party approval and notifying all councillors of changes when it is deemed that changes do not need approval of Full Council.’

A debate ensued.

Councillors Robert Alden and Jack Deakin spoke during the debate.

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-

24

**RESOLVED:-**

- 1.) That approval be given to the amendments to Parts A, B, C and E of the Constitution, set out via the Change Log at Appendix 1 and the tracked change versions attached at Appendix 2.
- 2.) That the City Solicitor be authorised to implement the changes.
- 3.) Noted that the proposed changes to Part D of the Constitution (Council Procurement and Contract Governance Rules) had been set out by the Assistant Director, Procurement via a standalone report (which was also on the agenda for Council to consider on 12 July).”
- 4.) That the following two areas be clarified in the next review of the constitution to reflect previous custom and practice:
  - a.) The rules around the time available for questions (Section B 4.4) be amended to ensure that the full allocation of time, usually 70 minutes, is used for questions to ensure accountability of the executive and other office-holders. This may be done by amendment to clause (v).
  - b.) Ensure that significant changes to the constitution are reported to Full Council and that there is a clear process for gaining all party approval and notifying all councillors of changes when it is deemed that changes do not need approval of Full Council.’

---

## **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded and

25

### **RESOLVED:-**

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

The Council then adjourned at 1630 hours.

At 1700 hours the Council resumed at the point where the meeting had been adjourned.

---

Lord Mayor in the Chair

## **SCRUTINY BUSINESS REPORT**

A report from the Interim Head of Scrutiny and Committee Services was submitted:-

(See document No. 6, agenda item 11)

Councillor Sir Albert Bore, Chair of the Coordinating Overview and Scrutiny Committee moved the Motion which was seconded from the floor.

Councillor Roger Harmer moved an amendment to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Paul Tilsley:

The following to be added to the Recommendations:

'This Council asks the Executive to consider proposals to increase the capacity of the Scrutiny Team to enable it to carry out one Scrutiny Inquiry per Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Currently capacity is limited to 4 Inquiries (at any one time)'.

A debate ensued.

Councillors Deirdre Alden and Brigid Jones spoke during the debate.

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-

26

### **RESOLVED:-**



- 1.) That the Scrutiny Business Report be noted.
  - 2.) That the Executive was asked to consider proposals to increase the capacity of the Scrutiny Team to enable it to carry out one Scrutiny Inquiry per Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Currently capacity is limited to 4 Inquiries (at any one time)'.
- 

### **APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Clerk's Note – Deborah Cadman left the meeting before this item started and didn't return until after it had concluded.

A report of the Council Business Management Committee (Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers Appointments Dismissals and Service Conditions Sub-Committee – JNC) was submitted:-

(See document No. 7, agenda item 12)

Councillor Ian Ward, Leader of the Council moved the Motion which was seconded by the floor.

A debate ensued.

Councillors Robert Alden Alden and John Hunt spoke during 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-

27

### **RESOLVED:-**

- 1) That the need for urgency of this appointment and the information provided via the exempt appendices to the report be noted.
  - 2) That Deborah Cadman be appointed as the Council's Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service on the terms and conditions as set out in the attached exempt appendices with a commencement date for permanent employment to be agreed.
- 

### **MOTIONS FOR DEBATE FROM INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS**

The Council proceeded to consider the Motions of which notice had been given in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure (B4.4 G of the Constitution).

#### **A. Councillors Liz Clements and Jayne Francis have given notice of the following Notice of Motion:-**

(See document No. 8, agenda item 13)

Councillor Liz Clements moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Jayne Francis.

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

(See document No. 9, 'Amendments – City Council')

Councillor Alex Yip moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Gareth Moore.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Izzy Knowles and Colin Green gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 10, 'Amendments – City Council')

Councillor Izzy Knowles moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Colin Green.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Julien Pritchard and Rob Grant gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 11, 'Amendments – City Council')

Councillor Julien Pritchard moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Rob Grant.

A debate ensued where the following Councillors replied to the debate: Councillors Robert Alden, Mary Locke, Jon Hunt, Nicky Brennan, John Cotton, Lee Marsham and Jack Deakin.

The Lord Mayor invited Councillor Liz Clements to sum up.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Alex Yip and Gareth Moore having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be lost.

Names were called and the Chamber doors were locked.

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

**For the Motion (18)**

Deirdre Alden  
Robert Alden  
David Barrie  
Matt Bennett  
Kerry Brewer  
Debbie Clancy

Adrian Delaney  
Adam Higgs  
Timothy Huxtable  
Bruce Lines  
Gareth Moore  
Simon Morrall

Rick Payne  
David Pears  
Darius Sandhu  
Ron Storer  
Ken Wood  
Alex Yip

### **Against the Motion (49)**

Akhlaq Ahmed	Diane Donaldson	Rashad Mahmood
Alex Aitken	Barbara Dring	Lee Marsham
Gurdial Singh Atwal	Jayne Francis	Saddak Miah
Raqeeb Aziz	Ray Goodwin	Shehla Moledina
David Barker	Fred Grindrod	Yvonne Mosquito
Jilly Bermingham	Des Hughes	Miranda Perks
Marcus Bernasconi	Jon Hunt	Rob Pocock
Bushra Bi	Shabrana Hussain	Hendrina Quinnen
Sir Albert Bore	Mohammed Idrees	Lauren Rainbow
Nicky Brennan	Zafar Iqbal	Shafique Shah
Marje Bridle	Kerry Jenkins	Rinkal Shergill
Martin Brooks	Brigid Jones	Sybil Spence
Liz Clements	Chaman Lal	Saima Suleman
John Cotton	Mary Locke	Jamie Tennant
Philip Davis	Basharat Mahmood	Sharon Thompson
Jack Deakin	Majid Mahmood	Lisa Trickett
		Ian Ward

### **Abstentions (13)**

Baber Baz	Roger Harmer	Izzy Knowles
Zaker Choudhry	Deborah Harries	Julien Pritchard
Rob Grant	Mumtaz Hussain	Paul Tilsley
Colin Green	Morriam Jan	Penny Wagg
	Jon Hunt	

Upon the completion of the voting process, the Lord Mayor declared that the amendment was lost.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Izzy Knowles and Colin Green having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Julien Pritchard and Rob Grant having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

#### **RESOLVED:-**

"The Council notes that:

- Shift work is widespread in many industries, particularly hospitality, and can often entail late-night working.

- Many workers, especially women, are increasingly worried about their safety travelling to and from work at night.
- The West Midlands Police and Crime Commissioner's Women's safety survey, conducted in 2021, found that 67% of respondents had felt unsafe on a bus, and 43% had felt unsafe in a taxi. 80% of respondents had expressed feeling unsafe following incidents such as cat calling, wolf whistling, up skirting or inappropriate behaviour, 93% did not report this to the police.
- A YouGov poll in 2019 about experiences of sexual harassment on public transport found that 37% of women had experienced someone 'deliberately pressing against them' compared to 12% of men, and 22% of women had a 'sexual statement directed against them' in comparison to 7% of men.
- Only 2% of victims go on to report sexual harassment on public transport.

The Council believes that:

- While employers may feel their duty of care to staff ends when an employee finishes a shift, they also need to take into consideration journeys home, especially during unsocial hours.
- Unite the union's 'Get Me Home Safely' campaign, which calls on employers to take all reasonable steps to ensure workers get home safely from work at night, should be supported.
- The weakness of enforcement of the law against sexual assault on public transport, including up-skirting, is failing women and girls.
- Greater numbers of trained staff and stronger enforcement of the law against sexual assault and harassment on public transport are urgently needed.
- The Government's Safety of Women at Night Fund, which limits grants to only £300,000, is wholly inadequate to tackle the important issue of the safety of women and girls in public spaces, including public transport, at night and in the night-time economy.

The Council resolves to:

- Publicly call for improvement to late night and off-peak transport service provision.
- Publicly call for the lowering of fares and oppose any cuts to public transport funding, including the early ending of the Bus Recovery Grant, and call on the West Midlands Mayor to use his political platforms to achieve this.
- Publicly support Transport for West Midlands' evaluation of the options on the future delivery of bus services, including bus franchising.
- Lobby the government for stronger enforcement of the law against sexual assault and harassment on public transport.
- Call on the West Midlands Mayor and the government to support Unite the Union's 'Get Me Home Safely' campaign.

- Call on the PCC working with the Chief Constable to review policies and resources to ensure that public transport is as safe as possible.
- Actively work with the Police and Crime Commissioner to introduce more police patrols on the transport network, especially late at night which can be achieved through better utilisation of the Safer Travel team and encouraging Neighbourhood teams, especially PCSO's, to use public transport.
- Add a facility to report crime through the Safer Travel / See Safe system, to reduce the waiting times for reporting crimes via 101 and police Live Chat and ensure all victims of sexual harassment receive a call back, referral to victim support services and ongoing support throughout the investigation.
- Investigate the possibility – as other councils have done – of making free transport home for staff a criteria for new alcohol or late night licenses in Birmingham City Council Licensing Policy.
- Ask the Executive to assess Birmingham City Council's employment policies against Unite's Get Me Home Safety campaign, to see if there is anything further Birmingham City Council could do as an employer to improve employee safety when travelling to and from work, particularly late at night.
- Lobby the West Midlands Mayor and Transport for West Midlands to investigate the introduction of evening supervisors at major bus interchanges in Birmingham to improve passenger safety.
- Lobby the West Midlands Mayor and Transport for West Midlands and bus operators for mandatory training for transport workers on gender-based violence to include practical guidance on reporting sexual harassment and assault on public transport."

**B. Councillors Bruce Lines and Darius Sandhu have given notice of the following Notice of Motion:-**

(See document No. 8, agenda item 13\)

Councillor Bruce Lines moved the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Darius Sandhu.

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

(See document No. 12, 'Amendments – City Council')

Councillor Liz Clements moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor John Cotton.

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

(See document No. 13, 'Amendments – City Council')

Councillor Roger Harmer moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Deborah Harries.

In accordance with Council Rules of Procedure, Councillors Rob Grant and Julien Pritchard gave notice of the following amendment to the Motion:-

(See document No. 14, 'Amendments – City Council')

Councillor Rob Grant moved the amendment which was seconded by Councillor Julien Pritchard.

A debate did not take place in relation to the Motion

The Lord Mayor invited Councillor Bruce Lines to sum up.

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

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Roger Harmer and Deborah Harries having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

The amendment to the Motion in the names of Councillors Rob Grant and Julien Pritchard having been moved and seconded was put to the vote and by a show of hands was declared to be carried.

It was therefore-

**RESOLVED:-**

"That this Council notes the concern of residents with the drastic increase in the number of off-road motor bikes and other mechanically propelled vehicles such as quad bikes and illegally modified motor vehicles (including the removal of front number plates) within Birmingham. These vehicles, when inappropriately used, are a risk to public safety, create a noise nuisance for residents, deter cyclists and pedestrians and cause damage to parks and footways. This Council welcomes that the Cabinet Member for Social Justice, Community Safety, and Equalities has asked the Community Safety Partnership to investigate this issue as a priority.

Therefore, the Council calls on the Executive to:

- Consult on the introduction of a City-Wide Public Space Protection Order, as has been done in authorities such as Coventry City Council and Kensington and Chelsea London Borough Council to give the police more powers to tackle problems caused by off road motor vehicles.
- Investigate the feasibility of noise triggered ANPR cameras in nuisance areas to catch those motor vehicles causing excessive noise building on the pilot site for which the council has recently applied for central government funding.

- Consider whether more stringent defensive measures could be taken to prevent off-road vehicles from causing a nuisance and damage to known sites and neighbourhoods. Whilst also ensuring that new defensive measures do not impede access for wheelchair users, prams and pedal bikes where appropriate, including investigation of new defensive designs that allow access for legitimate users.
- Work together with the Police and Crime Commissioner and other agencies to dedicate more resources to tackling this issue and notes the hard work officers are doing to tackle this issue already.
- Accelerate the delivery of average speed cameras in further locations to help reduce speeding and other forms of anti-social driving.
- Work with the police and crime commissioner to assess how the police can better work with communities to tackle nuisance and illegal motorbike use.
- Work with the police and crime commissioner to investigate how to improve cross-border police working to help tackle the issue of off-road bikes in areas around the Birmingham border, such as Walker's Heath Park".

---

The meeting ended at 1905 hours.

## **APPENDIX**

Questions and replies in accordance with Council Rules of Procedure B4.4 F  
of the Constitution

CITY COUNCIL – 12 JULY 2022



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

**“Estates Rationalisation Programme”**

**Question:**

**By building, what percentage occupancy rate is the estates rationalisation programme based on?**

**Answer:**

This is still work in progress as both staff and management are adapting to the situation post pandemic. New Ways of Working are assessing working patterns of teams and monitoring building usage, they are also surveying staff and management as to how they want to work in the future to deliver their outcomes. This work is helping to inform our property rationalisation programme and identify the need for new type of accommodation to meet the needs of hybrid workers.

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

**“Council Offices”**

**Question:**

**By building, what assessment has been made of the average occupancy rate of council offices in 2022?**

**Answer:**

In order to assess what office and collaboration space we require post pandemic, we carried out a number of surveys. Staff were surveyed twice (August 2021 and May 2022) and the Directors/Assistant Directors (December 2021). Staff were asked how they would like to work in the future: how much in the office; what would they come to the office for; hybrid working; work patterns etc. The results were analysed and extrapolated by directorate to determine how much space (office and collaborations space) the staff were telling us they needed. This was then communicated to Directors/Assistant Directors to see if they were content or if they felt they needed more space to meet their business needs. The result tells us we need a much smaller footprint than we currently have. We had responses covering 8,442 staff and after testing some of the responses (by interviewing Directors/ Assistant Directors) our analysis is telling us there is a need for approximately 480 workstations in a city centre environment and there is a need for 37 collaboration spaces of varying sizes daily in a city centre environment.

In respect to the office provision within the CAB estate the position is as follows:

**Woodcock Street** – traditional provision 2,284 desks; current provision of 977 desk made available. Average daily attendance is around 300 members of staff.

**Lancaster Circus** – traditional provision of 1,795 desks. No BCC office-based functions in situ; specialist CCTV operations remain in the basement suite (approx. 20 staff). Average daily attendance is around 27 Birmingham Children's Trust. The building is declared surplus and a sale agreed.

**Sutton New Road** – traditional provision of 344 workstations. The upper floor office accommodation is presently vacant following the vacation of the Children's Trust; 100 workstations being stood up from mid July for Adults staff. The Neighbourhood Office remains operational on the ground floor.

**New Aston House** – traditional provision of 189 workstations. The upper floor office accommodation utilised by the Children's Trust who advised of an average attendance of 115 staff a day. The Housing Options Centre on the ground floor remains operational on the ground floor.

**Council House** – presently subject to refurbishment with limited reoccupation from late June with further staff recanting during the course of 2022.

**Council House Extension** – traditional provision of 348 workstations; current offer of 112 desk. Average daily attendance up to late June was around 70 staff and members.

**Lifford House** – traditional provision of 413 workstations. Average attendance of around 130 staff a day (primarily Children's Trust staff but some Adults presence).

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

**“Council Office attendance”**

**Question:**

**On Friday 8 July, how many people signed into each of the Council's Central Administrative Buildings?**

Answer:

The City Council no longer operates a desk booking system within its CAB premises, with staff being able to turn up on the day and utilise a workstation. It is therefore impossible to predict in advance how many staff will be in attendance on the stated date. Please see response to A2 for the current average attendance.

The New Ways of Working programme is working closely with management, staff and the Trade Unions to implement working practices, technology, and facilities to enable all staff to operate in a fully agile way. This will ensure that we are an organisation which is more responsive, efficient and effective, by ensuring our teams have the capability, confidence and tools to continue to work where, when and how they choose, with maximum flexibility and minimum constraints to optimise their performance in support of those we serve.

This will result in a realignment of the Council's office estate with the rationalisation of a number of existing locations and investment into several new sites.

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

**“Perry Barr Residential Scheme”**

**Question:**

**What is the average anticipated sale price of the phase 1 Perry Barr development sales, split by number of bedrooms?**

**Answer:**

Phase 1 of the Perry Barr Regeneration Scheme is planned as a mixed-tenure residential development providing a broad range of occupation and ownership options for a mixed community of new residents. Four of the 11 development plots within Phase 1 are under construction delivering a total of 968 1- and 2-bedroom apartments across a variety of tenures: later-living, homes for rent, open market sale, affordable discounted market sale, and the UK government First Homes initiative.

Pricing will be finalised and published closer to the completion of the construction activities to ensure the new homes are presented in the best possible way, and to ensure the new homes appeal to the broadest possible cross-section of the market. This will coincide with the completion of the new areas of public open space at the heart of the new development, and the positive impact of the new local transport infrastructure.

The new apartment buildings are peerless in this location, and the initial sales will set a new pricing benchmark for this type of development in Perry Barr. It is therefore important to underpin the future phases of development within Phase 1, and that these prices are balanced and optimised to ensure the new place and community thrives.

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

**“Fountain Repairs”**

**Question:**

**Further for question A2 from June Council, have the final costs of repairing the fountain now been established?**

**Answer:**

The project team have been managing this reactively including the investigations, impacts and costs of the associated repair works. The final costs associated with the specialist subcontractors are still to be provided.

Whilst the repair works are approaching completion the Contractors costs via their submitted formal application for works completed is not due until 20<sup>th</sup> July 2022. Once the application is

received the project team will then comprehensively review and validate the costs incurred against their accounted records before final acceptance and payment is made.

In consideration of the above, the estimated costs for the repair works is in the order of £18,000.

It is very disappointing that the council has incurred this additional cost and I hope that you will join with me in condemning such acts of vandalism.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR**

**PAUL TILSLEY**

### **‘Vandalism to City Monuments’**

#### **Question:**

**Could the Leader of the Council elaborate on the measures he will take to ensure no further acts of vandalism are taken against city monuments and fountains, especially in the run up to the Commonwealth Games?**

#### **Answer:**

The city council is custodian of a preeminent range of public art right across the city and through the Commonwealth Games and the Cultural Festival more people than ever will take pleasure in what our city has to offer. I know that the vast majority of Birmingham residents take great pride in our public art and incidents of vandalism are few and far between. Where they do occur, the city council will seek to prosecute any individuals identified.

Wherever possible, CCTV will be used to identify culprits and we will be working closely with partners including the city centre BIDS and the management of the Paradise development to protect artwork, monuments and fountains across the city.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR**

**MORRIAM JAN**

### **‘Perry Barr Masterplan’**

#### **Question:**

**In response to written question A1 in June’s written questions relating to the Perry Barr Masterplan, the Leader said ‘ .. Community and Member engagement across the three Wards which will directly benefit for this Programme will be central to the governance structure moving forward’. Does “engagement” mean serious involvement in decision making and monitoring of progress as happens with other city regeneration projects?**

Answer:

Engagement will mean bringing both the community and Ward members to the table to ensure that the vision and aspirations we set out in the 'Perry Barr 2040 master plan: A vision for legacy Plan' is achieved. To ensure this commitment is honoured, the Council has recently appointed a dedicated Regeneration Programme Director to develop a Delivery Plan for future phases of the Perry Barr Programme.

This will require good governance arrangements to be established to ensure that that all interested parties in our community, including local businesses and young people are given the opportunity to play a vital role in future development phases of Perry Barr.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR DEBORAH HARRIES**

### **'Continued Poor State of Former Stechford Cascades Site'**

Question:

Further to my question and your answer in February (please see below) about the poor state of this council-owned land – mainly the open, unhoarded area, bordering houses and the main shopping street – and despite repeated requests to officers in the meantime, could the site please be kept clear of rubbish and fly-tipping whilst you decide what to do with the vacant site?

City Council – 22 February 2022 6115 APPENDIX Questions and replies in accordance with Standing Order 10.2.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FROM COUNCILLOR DEBORAH HARRIES A1 Land at Stechford Cascades**

Question:

Can the Leader please confirm:

Question (b) that he will ask officers to keep the site - next to the main Stechford shopping area and park - which was cleared in 2020 and is partly open and vulnerable to fly-tipping, graffiti and traveller occupation, in good order;

Answer (b) While unfortunately the site has been the subject of repeated antisocial behaviour our officers have previously taken action on a number of occasions to remove fly-tipping and graffiti. Following the departure of an illegal traveller encampment from the site in November 2021 external concrete bollards were sited at the entrance and repairs to the hoarding undertaken in an effort to prevent further unauthorised access. Officers will continue to take appropriate action in response to further issues that are identified.

Answer:

The site has been secured consisting of concrete containers and metal trip rail. There has been a number of illegal activities such as fly tipping and graffiti on the site during

this year. Officers will monitor the site and any fly tipping will be removed whilst we look for a long term solution.

**PLEASE NOTE NO WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED**

**FOR THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY HUXTABLE**

**“Update”**

**Question:**

**Please provide an updated version of the table used to answer question J5 in the December 2021 council meeting. The table provided financial breakdown with the addition of the Appendices 1-3. Please bring all these up to date with data up to June 2022**

**Answer:**

The information for 2022/23 is not yet available. Officers will work with colleagues in Finance to ensure the information requested can be provided via the new Oracle system as soon as possible.

The figure for 2021/22 financial year excluding home to school transport would be £5.280m.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR ADAM HIGGS**

**“Home to School Transport spend”**

**Question:**

**Please provide a similar table in the same format as the answer to the question from Cllr Huxtable (and as answer to J5 from December 2021) for all agency/interim / consultant spend relating to Home to School Transport from June 2018 to June 2022**

**Answer:**

Unfortunately, prior year information is not available currently. Officers will work with colleagues in Finance to ensure the information requested can be provided via the new Oracle system as soon as possible.



**Actual annual general fund expenditure on interim and agency staff 2018-19 to May 2022**

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Current Year Apr- May 22
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
H2ST	0.206	0.559	1.549	2.009	0.746
	0.206	0.559	1.549	2.009	0.746

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

**‘Summer Schools’**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member provide details on proposals for summer schools during the forthcoming Summer recess?**

**Answer:**

BringitonBrum! is Birmingham’s Holiday Activity and Food Programme and will be delivered throughout the summer holidays.

Over 265 organisations (including schools) have registered to provide holiday activities and food at a variety of locations across the city.

Some schools will be providing summer school activities through this programme.

Further information on activity provision available through the Holiday Activity and Food Programme can be found <https://www.bringitonbrum.co.uk/>

Schools may also be holding summer schools outside of BringitonBrum! These will be publicised by the schools themselves.

There is also information about activities on the Birmingham Local Offer <https://www.localofferbirmingham.co.uk/>

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR IZZY KNOWLES**

**‘Unaccompanied Children’**

**Question:**

**Following the recent announcement by Michael Gove that the UK were going to allow unaccompanied children to enter the UK, could the Cabinet Member comment on the measures that will be put in place to enable Birmingham to accept such children?**

Answer:

For the purposes of this response, I have assumed that the question is referring to unaccompanied children and young people coming to the UK from Ukraine. The Children's Trust has well-established processes in place for managing arrivals of unaccompanied young people from many different countries. They will work with young people arriving from Ukraine in the same way, ensuring that their age and their needs are understood, that they are placed appropriately according to their age and their needs, and providing appropriate care and support to enable them to thrive. Young people will have access to school and college places, interpreting services and appropriate social, educational and mental health support from the point of their arrival.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**'The Coughlan Report'**

**Question:**

**Will there be a report coming to Cabinet with the Council's full response to recommendations in The Coughlan Report?**

Answer:

An action plan setting out how the council will meet the recommendations in the DfE SEND Commissioner's report will be taken to Cabinet.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**'School finances'**

**Question:**

**Could the cabinet member report how many local authority controlled schools completed the last financial year with a deficit, setting out the total of accumulated deficits?**

Answer:

Last year 2020/21 there were 29 schools in deficit, total £7.294m.  
For 2021/22 provisional figures show there are 26 schools in deficit, total £4.846m.

Please note these are provisional figures and work is still being undertaken with some individual schools to finalise the position.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR DIGITAL, CULTURE,  
HERITAGE AND TOURISM FROM COUNCILLOR EWAN MACKEY**

**“Daily News Briefing Email tracking”**

**Question:**

**It has come to our attention that access to articles listed in daily news briefing email is via a server on an Ad and Tracking server watchlist, what data is being captured by this and for what purpose?**

**Answer:**

The daily news briefing is sent out via the Gov delivery platform. The only personal data in the system is the e-mail address of recipients of the Daily News Briefing. The platform tracks who opened the bulletin, along with who has clicked on which link within the bulletin. This data is used only by Corporate Communications to track open rates and click rates of the Daily News Briefing e-mail alerts. It has been confirmed by Gov Delivery that they do not access or use the data in any way.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM  
COUNCILLOR RICHARD PARKIN**

**“Parks income and spend”**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years, what has been the total spent in (split between capital and revenue) and total income received from each of the parks\green spaces for which the council is responsible?**

**Answer:**

Please see attached spreadsheet



Parks Capex 3 Years  
2019-20 to 2021-22.x

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT  
FROM COUNCILLOR RICK PAYNE**

**“Missed Collections”**

**Question:**

**Further to question E20 from June Council, how many missed or incomplete routes were there within the waste collection service by ward, by depot and in total in each month since January 2022 when central monitoring commenced**

**Answer:**

The table below shows the number of residual and recycling routes that were reported as being incomplete. This could range from a small number of properties on part of one road that was dropped to the full round.

The reason a round is incomplete is usually due to vehicle access, adverse weather, staffing or vehicle breakdown.

The data is reported by driver team leaders of each crew to the Business Support Team at each depot and is therefore dependant on each crew reporting this accurately.

It excludes garden waste and container routes (serving shared bins at flats and apartments).

	Lifford Lane	Redfern Road	Montague Street	Perry Barr
January (from 27 <sup>th</sup> )	0	0	3	6
February	9	72	17	132
March	14	104	36	179
April	3	46	22	89
May	16	47	16	72

June	0	26	11	96
July (to 5th)	0	7	3	15

It is not possible to present this data by ward as requested because routes do not follow ward boundaries and the same route often covers multiple wards.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ**

### **‘Bulk Collections’**

#### **Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member provide full details of the number of bulk collections that have been requested, by Ward, and also the income these generated for the financial year 2021/22?**

#### **Answer:**

For the financial year 2021/22 there were 25806 bookings. 3156 of these were made via the contact centre at £35 and 22650 were online at £33. The total income originally received before received (excluding any subsequent cancellations and refunds) was £857,910.

A booking allows for collection of electrical and/or non-electrical bulky items. These are collected separately by different crews and classed as two separate collections. The total number of collections made per ward is listed in the following table.

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Number of bulky collections (electrical and non-electrical combined)</b>
Acocks Green	839
Allens Cross	448
Alum Rock	487
Aston	467
Balsall Heath West	301
Bartley Green	860
Billesley	751
Birchfield	259
Bordesley & Highgate	231
Bordesley Green	274
Bournbrook & Selly Park	407
Bournville & Cotteridge	643
Brandwood & Kings Heath	675

Bromford & Hodge Hill	564
Castle Vale	244
Druids Heath & Monyhull	317
Edgbaston	348
Erdington	627
Frankley Great Park	370
Garretts Green	391
Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	901
Gravelly Hill	360
Hall Green North	621
Hall Green South	313
Handsworth	230
Handsworth Wood	423
Harborne	682
Heartlands	348
Highters Heath	404
Holyhead	236
Kings Norton North	396
Kings Norton South	440
Kingstanding	752
Ladywood	388
Longbridge & West Heath	800
Lozells	270
Moseley	613
Nechells	327
Newtown	186
North Edgbaston	541
Northfield	372
Oscott	733
Perry Barr	665
Perry Common	459
Pype Hayes	429
Quinton	704
Rubery & Rednal	415
Shard End	508
Sheldon	653
Small Heath	376
Soho & Jewellery Quarter	533
South Yardley	353
Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East	488
Sparkhill	420
Stirchley	412
Stockland Green	687
Sutton Four Oaks	289
Sutton Mere Green	380
Sutton Reddicap	350
Sutton Roughley	320
Sutton Trinity	262

Sutton Vesey	576
Sutton Walmley & Minworth	461
Sutton Wylde Green	284
Tyseley & Hay Mills	321
Ward End	313
Weoley & Selly Oak	922
Yardley East	336
Yardley West & Stechford	345

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM  
COUNCILLOR PAUL TILSLEY**

**‘Recycling Levels’**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give a full breakdown of recycling levels in the City during 2022?**

**Answer:**

These recycling rates are for the period January 2022 to May 2022, please note that some May's figures contain estimates for some of the smaller recycling elements.

The overall recycling rate has also been calculated in three different ways; one including all post incineration recycling, one including only the post incineration recycled metals but not the recycled ash, and a third that excludes all the post incineration recycling.

**Overall Recycling Rate (January 2022 to May 2022)**

Calculation	Recycling Rate (% of total amount disposed of)
Including post incineration ash and metals.	39.26%
Including post incineration metals.	23.22%
Excluding post incineration recycling.	20.85%

**Post Incineration Recycling (January 2022 to May 2022)**

The post incineration materials that were recycled calculated as a percentage of the waste incinerated (with energy recovery) and as a percentage of the total waste disposed of

Calculation	Recycling Rate
Post incineration recycling as a percentage of incinerated waste.	23.79%
Post incineration recycling as a percentage of the total waste disposed of.	18.41%

### Specific Service Areas/Waste Streams

The recycling figures have been broken down by service area/waste stream and the recycling rates have been calculated both as a percentage of the total for that particular service area/waste stream, and as a percentage of the total amount of waste disposed of by Birmingham City Council's Waste Management department.

#### Kerbside Collection Services Recycling Rate (January 2022 to May 2022)

The kerbside collection recycling rate includes the kerbside green garden service. The residual waste is the that which was collected directly from households and does not include trade or commercial waste. Materials collected as recycling but later rejected have been counted as residual waste not recycling.

Calculation	Recycling Rate
Recycling as a percentage of the total kerbside collected.	16.68%
Recycling as a percentage of the total waste disposed of.	11.83%

#### Street Cleansing Services Recycling Rate (January 2022 to May 2022)



The road sweepings that are collected by the street cleansing service are sent for recycling, unsuitable materials are rejected, and these rejects are counted as residual waste not recycling.

Calculation	Recycling Rate
Recycling as a percentage of the total waste collected by street cleansing.	26.28%
Recycling as a percentage of the total waste disposed of.	1.70%

#### Household Recycling Centre (HRC) Recycling Rate (January 2022 to May 2022)

The HRC recycling rate includes the segregated materials deposited in the containers in the main area of the HRC sites and segregated materials deposited in the on-site recycling banks. Items deposited for reuse at the HRC sites are included in these figures as are the materials collected for recycling by the mobile HRCs. Materials collected for recycling which were rejected are counted as residual waste not recycling.

Calculation	Recycling Rate
Recycling as a percentage of the total HRC waste.	64.81%
Recycling as a percentage of the total waste disposed of.	7.32%

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR COLIN GREEN**

##### **‘Fly Tipped Fridge Freezers’**

##### **Question:**

**How many fly-tipped fridges/freezers have been collected by month, by ward by the specialist crew employed for this purpose during municipal year 2021/22?**

Answer:

There are two crews that collect both paid for electrical bulky waste items and fly tipped electrical items. We do not record the exact amount of fly tipped items that we collect as there are no disposal costs to the city.

The following is a table showing the amount of worksheets we have received each month in relation to fly tipped fridges and freezers. We have excluded any worksheets that have been marked as a duplicate, to avoid double counting. Please be aware that quite frequently there are more than one dumped fridge or freezer at the site of fly tipping and therefore this is an underestimate of the actual number collected.

This data also excludes any fridges or freezers which are collected by other street cleansing crews when they are found during of their daily work but are unreported.

	T o t a l	04/ 20 21	05/ 20 21	06/ 20 21	07/ 20 21	08/ 20 21	09/ 20 21	10/ 20 21	11/ 20 21	12/ 20 21	01/ 20 22	02/ 20 22	03/ 20 22
--	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Total	2 , 2 2 6	49	12 3	19 7	16 1	14 1	20 6	20 3	27 2	25 2	18 7	18 1	25 4
Acocks Green	7 7	1	2	10	8	4	10	9	13	5	6	3	6
Allens Cross	2 2	0	0	0	2	11	2	2	0	1	0	2	2
Alum Rock	5 2	0	3	7	11	9	2	2	6	4	4	1	3
Aston	6 6	0	0	1	5	3	1	6	10	21	7	6	6
Balsall Heath West	5 1	0	7	2	1	1	8	8	8	5	5	3	3

Bartley Green	2 8	0	0	3	2	4	3	5	1	0	3	3	4
Billesley	5 5	2	7	7	3	4	5	7	4	7	1	5	3
Birchfield	4 0	5	1	4	2	0	1	6	6	9	2	2	2
Bordesley & Highgate	6 6	2	7	0	3	6	8	3	5	8	6	10	8
Bordesley Green	5 6	1	4	6	0	5	5	4	6	3	9	4	9
Bournbrook & Selly Park	4 9	0	1	2	6	2	6	3	4	9	4	6	6
Bournville & Cotteridge	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
Brandwood & Kings Heath	3 6	1	5	2	2	0	3	5	5	3	5	2	3
Bromford & Hodge Hill	3 6	4	1	0	2	3	3	4	2	2	4	4	7

Castle Vale	2 3	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	6	3	0	4
Druids Heath & Monyhull	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0
Edgbaston	1 5	0	2	0	2	0	4	2	1	0	0	3	1
Erdington	2 5	0	0	3	2	1	5	1	3	1	1	4	4
Frankley Great Park	1 5	0	3	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	1	2

Garretts Green	1 5	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3	0	2	2
Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	5 3	0	3	2	1	2	5	6	4	6	10	10	4
Gravelly Hill	1 3	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	0	1	3
Hall Green North	4 9	1	5	5	6	6	4	6	3	1	2	4	6
Hall Green South	1 6	0	1	2	0	0	2	2	3	3	1	1	1
Handsworth	3 4	1	5	3	0	2	2	2	8	5	2	2	2
Handsworth Wood	4 7	3	1	2	3	5	7	4	6	2	3	3	8
Harborne	4 6	0	2	3	1	8	7	2	4	4	4	1	10
Heartlands	4 5	1	4	3	2	2	7	3	8	6	3	4	2
Highters Heath	1 4	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	5	0	3	0
Holyhead	4 4	0	1	4	0	1	0	3	4	19	3	2	7

Kings Norton North	1 2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	1	1	0
Kings Norton South	3 2	4	3	0	0	0	4	5	9	3	2	0	2
Kingstanding	2 1	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	1	6	2

Ladywood	3 4	2	3	4	2	1	2	7	5	3	1	2	2
Longbridge & West Heath	2 1	2	0	1	1	0	6	1	4	1	4	0	1
Lozells	2 8	1	4	6	0	2	0	0	5	4	3	3	0
Moseley	5 6	0	7	6	8	2	10	3	1	2	5	3	9
Nechells	3 5	4	1	5	2	1	3	3	2	4	4	2	4
Newtown	1 3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	0	3
North Edgbaston	7 0	1	3	7	3	4	3	3	6	8	5	7	20
Northfield	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Oscott	1 5	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	1	2	1
Perry Barr	2 5	1	0	2	0	1	4	1	8	2	3	2	1
Perry Common	1 1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0
Pype Hayes	1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	1	1	5
Quinton	5 2	0	2	7	3	7	2	0	2	3	0	10	16

Rubery & Rednal	1 1	1	3	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0
Shard End	2 6	0	0	4	4	3	5	1	2	2	2	2	1

Sheldon	3 4	0	1	2	4	3	3	1	5	4	3	4	4
Small Heath	5 9	1	4	11	15	5	4	4	5	6	1	1	2
Soho & Jewellery Quarter	4 5	0	2	2	1	1	1	3	14	7	4	5	5
South Yardley	1 8	0	3	3	3	1	2	3	1	0	1	1	0
Sparkbrook &Balsall Heath East	1 1 1	0	5	24	5	2	2	8	8	18	15	11	13
Sparkhill	8 7	1	8	8	11	6	11	9	4	1	9	7	12
Stirchley	1 9	2	0	2	3	1	3	1	2	0	2	0	3
Stockland Green	5 9	1	0	1	0	8	6	8	10	11	7	0	7
Sutton Four Oaks	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Sutton Mere Green	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton Reddicap	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton Roughley	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Sutton Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton Vesey	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	1	0
Sutton Walmley & Minworth	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Sutton Wylde Green	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tyseley & Hay Mills	5 5	0	1	9	10	3	4	5	6	5	4	5	3
Ward End	2 4	0	2	4	4	2	1	4	4	3	0	0	0
Weoley & Selly Oak	5 6	1	1	9	2	2	4	2	7	3	9	4	12
Yardley East	2 2	0	1	3	4	0	1	3	4	1	2	2	1
Yardley West & Stechford	3 3	0	0	1	6	1	2	5	5	3	5	1	4

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

**‘Mobile Household Recycling Centre’**

**Question:**

**Could the cabinet member provide daily details of tonnage collected from MHRC, by depot, along with details of the wards visited each day?**

Answer:

The attached gives the daily location breakdown per depot for June.



E6 locations.pdf

Due to the size and complexity of the information, recycling and residual Tonnages are collated monthly by depot.

<b>Residual</b>	<b>Lifford</b>	<b>Montague Street</b>	<b>Perry Barr</b>	<b>Redfern Road</b>
<b>Jun-22</b>	48.7	87.14	59.6	44.02

  

<b>Recycling</b>	<b>Lifford</b>	<b>Montague Street</b>	<b>Perry Barr</b>	<b>Redfern Road</b>
<b>Jun-22</b>	2.32	1.88	1.62	1.2

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**‘Mobile Household Recycling Centre’**

**Question:**

**Given the £1m underspend in last year’s fly tipping allocation, will the cabinet member undertake to secure the printing of decent quality leaflets for councillors to issue to constituents with details of MHRCs?**

**Answer:**

The MHRC has been a tremendous success and we are currently thinking of ways to improve the service following our manifesto to make this a permanent service. We are looking at a number of options to improve the offer one being for the service to produce and distribute the leaflets supported by the local councillor. We will trial this approach in the next few weeks to see if this changes the collection rate before rolling it out across the City.

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

**‘Mobile Household Recycling Centre’**

**Question:**

**Will the cabinet member provide councillors with reasonable advance details of MHRC visits so that publicity can be organised according to local circumstances?**

**Answer:**

Forward schedules for specific Wards are communicated to relevant Members approximately three weeks in advance of a planned visit.



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

**‘Perry Barr Depot’**

**Question:**

**Given residents in north west Birmingham have not had access to their local HRC for well over 12 months and are currently reliant on the HMRC to dispose of any unwanted items, can the Cabinet Member give detailed reasons as to what the hold-up is and how long it will be before this facility will be open once more?**

**Answer:**

Birmingham City Council is working in partnership with Veolia to redevelop the Perry Barr Household Recycling Centre (HRC) and Waste Transfer Station. The current site was at the end of its economic life and in need of a complete rebuild. The new site will have improved facilities available to the public that will enhance the user experience, increase recycling, and continue the processing of waste and recycling with minimal disruption to the environment and area. The Perry Barr HRC will be closed for redevelopment until Spring 2023.

The closest recycling centre with availability is the Castle Bromwich Household Recycling Centre (HRC) located at Tameside Drive, Castle Bromwich, B35 7AG. However, residents do have the ability to book a slot to visit any of the Birmingham HRC's, the locations for these are detailed below:

- Sutton Coldfield - Norris Way, Sutton Coldfield, B75 7BB
- Tyseley - James Road, Tyseley, B11 2BA
- Kings Norton - Lifford Lane, Kings Norton, B30 3JJ

In addition to the Mobile Household Recycle Centre (MHRC), residents can also book bulky waste collection and although there is a cost to this waste will be collected directly from the property.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM  
COUNCILLOR IZZY KNOWLES**

**‘Missed Collections’**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member provide a full break down of the number of missed waste, recycling and green collection rounds there have been during the last 24 months?  
Could this information be displayed by category and depot?**

**Answer:**

We don't hold that specific type of data, however the data we do hold is for missed collections based on roads or properties. The closest data that would go some way to answering your question is repeated below from the answer given to E2.

The table below shows the number of residual and recycling routes that were reported as being incomplete. This could range from a small number of properties on part of one road that was dropped to the full round.

The reason a round is incomplete is usually due to vehicle access, adverse weather, staffing or vehicle breakdown.

The data is reported by driver team leaders of each crew to the Business Support Team at each depot and is therefore dependant on each crew reporting this accurately.

It excludes garden waste and container routes (serving shared bins at flats and apartments).

	Lifford Lane	Redfern Road	Montague Street	Perry Barr
January (from 27 <sup>th</sup> )	0	0	3	6
February	9	72	17	132
March	14	104	36	179
April	3	46	22	89
May	16	47	16	72
June	0	26	11	96
July (to 5 <sup>th</sup> )	0	7	3	15

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT FROM  
COUNCILLOR DEBORAH HARRIES**

**‘All Parks Are Created Equal But Some Parks Are More Equal Than Others’**

**Question:**

**Could you please explain the current approach to funding our parks, recreation grounds and green spaces, and identify how much is spent on each, either in absolute or percentage terms.**

**It is clear that as savings/cuts have been made over the last decade, some (major) parks – about 10 per cent of the total – continue to be well maintained and well stocked with seasonal bedding plants, for example, whilst other ‘lesser’ green spaces struggle for basic amenities such as bins, benches, play equipment and sufficient grass/hedge cutting, or are even left to go to rack and ruin such as Old Yardley Park Rose Garden, which is in a Conservation Area.**

**Why has the decreasing budget pot not been more fairly distributed, as all green spaces are valuable to our residents, particularly those close to them, and which may not necessarily be one of the city’s half-a-dozen prestigious parks?**

**Answer:**

The current spend on parks maintenance is based on the assets each park currently has. There has been a reduction in the grounds maintenance budget going back to 2009 however I am pleased to inform you this budget has not been reduced over the last 3 years and in fact there has been an increase in the grass cutting allocation.

There is a difference in maintaining existing revenue assets, such as flower beds and capital spending on infrastructure items such as bin, benches and play areas. I am currently working with officers to identify opportunities to bid for development money to improve the infrastructure of more of our parks and I am particularly keen to invest in those parks in areas of greatest need.

I have been really pleased to hear about the money generated by our local friends groups supported by Birmingham Open Spaces Forum. They have turned a £10,000 seed corn fund into over £100,000 of investment into local parks, we have continued this during this financial year and I am keen to support this going forward.

The city does need a wide range of parks that meet a local and citywide need. I am keen to work with Friends of Parks groups and local councillors to ensure their local park has the assets and infrastructure that meets both their needs and aspirations.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND  
RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR RICHARD PARKIN**

**“Council Tax”**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years please provide a breakdown by ward of number of properties by council tax band, amount of council tax owed, amount of council tax collected in year, and cumulative figure of council tax outstanding**

**Answer:**

Please find below information in terms of the overall arrears position at the end of each applicable year requested.

- What the current arrears position is now
- The total number of dwellings per band

More time is needed to prepare the reports at an individual ward level. This is due to the volume of data and the 207 reports needed to present the data. These will not be ready until after the full council meeting and will be distributed to Cllr Parkin subsequently.

<b>Year</b>	<b>CTAX charged</b>	<b>Amount owed at the year end</b>	<b>Outstanding now</b>
<b>2019/20</b>	£420,871,323.64	£25,939,750.41	£20,003,469.72
<b>2020/21</b>	£431,702,143.49	£28,652,157.16	£27,136,227.11
<b>2021/22</b>	£454,046,917.75	£34,301,295.88	£34,204,245.65
<b>Totals:</b>	£1,306,620,384.88	£88,893,203.45	£81,343,942.48

**Dwellings per Band:**

- A 162,088
- B 131,074
- C 82,186
- D 42,593
- E 22,134
- F 8,993
- G 5,923

H 907

Total 455,898

## WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR BABER BAZ

### ‘Council Tax Rebates’

#### Question:

**Could the Cabinet Member provide a breakdown of how many households have been credited with the £150 Council Tax rebate, explaining delays in processing?**

#### Answer:

- There are two schemes to provide the support for the Council Tax Energy Rebate Scheme. Detailed guidance from the Government was published on **23<sup>rd</sup> February 2022** together with confirmation of funding.
- This was made up of £60.4 million for the main rebate scheme and £3.6 million for the discretionary scheme.
- Cabinet approval to pay the grant was required and this was received at the Cabinet meeting of **22<sup>nd</sup> March 2022**.
- Preparation to make the payments included securing an agreement with a third party supplier for the application process, including mandatory Government anti-fraud checks
- March and early April is the busiest time of year for the Revenues Service as around 500,000 annual bills are sent.
- Processing of payments was slightly delayed due to the implementation of the Oracle finance system replacement. This included a shut-down period for all payments from 1<sup>st</sup> until 11<sup>th</sup> April and then a catch-up period to allow for other urgent payments to be processed.
- The first payment file for energy rebates was processed on **13 May 2022** with the first batch to 20,000 people on direct debit

Payments have continued to be made regularly and as at **1 July 2022**, of the 391,363 households which are eligible for the rebate:

- 49.7% are Direct Debit Payers Bands A – D (includes E with a disabled band reduction). 193,658 payments (approx. 99.6 % of DD payments) have been processed with a value of £29,048,700. There are 849 (0.4%) accounts subject to outstanding queries, for example where we have not been able to verify their bank details or Council Tax direct debit payments have not been cleared in April and May. We have been contacting these households and requesting they submit an application on line so that verification can be completed in accordance with government guidelines.
- 50.3% are Non-Direct Debit households. Of these :-
- 40,492 have requested a £150 payment via an application - To date 31,809 (approx. 78.5%) payments have been processed with a value of £4,771,350. There are 704

that are subject to queries with the bank account or liable party and the team continue to check and verify these at the same time as processing the remainder of new applications. The remainder 7,979(19.7%) are currently being processed.

- 6,168 households have requested a £150 reduction on their Council Tax Account – To date 2,007 (approx. 32.5%) credit adjustments have been processed with a value of £301,050. The team will continue to check and process the remainder of new and existing applications.

We have also introduced the discretionary scheme which went live on 22nd June. As at 1<sup>st</sup> July we had received 207 applications. The scheme includes automatic awards for certain groups, such as pensioners on low incomes, some students, and households on low incomes in council tax banded properties E-H. Full details of the scheme are on the BCC website.

In summary we have paid or are processing an application from 61.6% of eligible households and are still waiting for 38.4% or 150,196 households to apply. An extensive digital communication exercise took place which resulted in all households with a valid email address receiving an invitation to apply. We have also issued targeted SMS messages containing the application form web link to eligible households. Approximately 109,934 SMS Text messages have been sent. As the SMS campaign has been completed, we will review all remaining eligible households that are yet to apply and are not on Direct Debit; arrangements will be made to send a Post Office rebate voucher in the mail. After ID verification has taken place at their local post office branch, the voucher can be cashed without the need to complete an online application. The voucher will have an expiry date by which time it needs to be claimed. Details of the timescales for this will be published once finalised.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES FROM COUNCILLOR IZZY KNOWLES**

**‘Oracle’**

**Question:**

**All of the LA controlled schools in Moseley ward have reported real frustration with the Oracle system of issuing payments. This has resulted in schools being unable to pay contractors or to commission new ones. Schools have reported staff having to spend hours of school time trying to understand the system and inadequate training. Could the Deputy Leader please explain the reason for the difficulties the schools are facing and what steps are being taken to urgently address these failures?**

**Answer:**

We are aware that some of our school customers continue to be impacted by the new way of processing invoices within Oracle. This has been compounded by the need to stop processing payments for a time whilst we cut over to our new system.

We sincerely apologise for this and recognise the frustration this will have caused. Whilst a number of issues have been resolved, we know we have more to do to support them. Below are some key points to note, and some information on what we are doing to respond to these challenges.

- The root cause of the issues Schools have experienced differ and include things like out-of-date email addresses in our old solution which prevented access for some people as our new system did not recognise their newer(correct) email, queries on having the right access for different tasks and some technical issues with the tool that they now use to facilitate making payments to their suppliers.
- Each root cause has and continues to be investigated for resolution by a multidisciplinary team in the Council which includes staff from across Finance, HR, Procurement and IT&D.
- We have put significant effort into fixing the access issues (emails, process to log in), as well as the technical issues with the solution but have a number of items we are working on before we can confidently say we are providing what schools need – we provide weekly updates on these items to school using their bulletin.
- Following feedback from the initial set of training we developed a step-by-step reference guide to assist users in understanding and feeling confident to use the new system and processes for making payments. This was also supported with Drop-in sessions where schools were able to get hands on help. Since the publishing of this guide and the drop ins we have seen a dramatic reduction in queries on using this new process.
- To support other finance topics, we have also provided drop-in sessions on how to bank income, and how to complete internal billing processes

We will shortly be starting a pilot to allow school employees to access their payslips online which is a great step forwards. An example of recent bulletin that give guidance on different issues, was shared directly with schools w/c 4 July include the following:

- New HR Dashboards to improve information and performance within Oracle can and recent guidance document issued
- Payroll costs report – This report is now ready and has been tested, it will be released soon. Where it is applicable Cheque Book Schools will have their direct debit re-started for services.
- Income Banking – A drop-in session on income banking is arranged for 7th July.
- Reconciliation Files – the 1B team continue to work on providing reconciliation files. The integration is currently in the build phase being tested to ensure it is fit for its purpose.
- Payments (revalidation invoices) – On 21 June Schools Finance Users were provided with a spreadsheet of invoices processed via Oracle. This was shared following requests from schools wanting to check the status of invoices. Additional tips on searching this report have been sent on 5 July.
- All invoices that have not been validated are being investigated by the schools' payments team. They are working on these invoices in order of submission to the Simplified Loader.
- New Simplified Loader Version – All Simplified Loader users should have received instructions to download version 1.77 on the Simplified Loader.
- Internal Billing: We can confirm the correct approvers of internal invoices to schools have been identified and applied to each school. We will now restart processing internal invoices, which will begin to workflow through to you for approval. A Drop-In session to support school



with processing internal bills will be held the week commencing 11th July

· Payslips: June Payslips have been processed and will begin arriving at schools the week commencing 11th July

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

### **‘Support for Residents with Disabilities’**

#### **Question:**

**I have recently been approached by residents who have received no support for friends and family in the City who are suddenly in need of adaptations due to their disabilities, and are being left to cope and live with their conditions with no provision from the Council, which is a truly appalling situation for someone to find themselves in. Could the Cabinet Member outline how the Council will support residents who find themselves in this situation and advise if any further support or advice could be made available in these circumstances?**

#### **Answer:**

The Council supports residents with disabilities to adapt their home through the provision of Disabled Facilities Grants following an assessment to determine the citizen's needs.

Disabled Facilities Grants help towards the costs of making changes to people's homes so that they can continue to live there. Examples of changes that can be funded through a grant include:

- widening doors and installing ramps
- improving access to rooms and facilities, for example, adding a stair lift or a downstairs bathroom
- adapting heating or lighting controls to make them easier to use

To be eligible, the applicant or someone living in the property must be disabled and must either own the property or be a tenant.

In order for the grant to be approved the Council need to be assured that the work is:

- necessary and appropriate to meet the disabled person's needs
- reasonable and can be done - depending on the age and condition of the property

In some cases, an adaptation to the property may not be the best course of action. As part of the assessment process it may be appropriate to explore other ways of achieving the best outcome including provision of equipment or a care package. This will be discussed with the applicant.

In addition to the statutory duty to provide Disabled Facilities Grants, the Council introduced a new Staying Independent at Home policy in April 2022 to extend the support with housing that is available to disabled and other vulnerable citizens:

- Approving the use of additional “top-up” grant when the cost of necessary works exceeds the statutory limit of £30,000. This additional assistance is now available.
- Introducing two new forms of discretionary assistance for lower value works – scheduled to be available from October 2022. This support will be more flexible and less complex to administer than the statutory Disabled Facilities Grant process:
  - o Discharge assistance - Securing prompt discharge from hospital of citizens who might, due to accommodation difficulties, otherwise remain in hospital longer than necessary
  - o Independent and safe assistance - Addressing accommodation difficulties which, if not resolved, might lead to an avoidable admission to hospital, or residential care or which impact upon the ability of a citizen to live safely and independently at home.

If required and appropriate the service will offer alternative accommodation whilst work is carried out.

For further advice and support the team can be contacted in writing at OTDFG, PO Box 16606, Birmingham B2 2FD or by telephone on 0121 303 5870.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS FROM COUNCILLOR KERRY BREWER**

**“BMHT PLANNING DETERMINATIONS”**

**Question:**

**In the last 5 years what has been the average number of weeks for BMHT to receive a decision on a planning application and what proportion of these were beyond 8 weeks (minor) or 13 weeks (major) either with or without agreement?**

**Answer:**

Over the last five years, notwithstanding Planning Performance Agreement or Extension of Time agreements (see below), 73% of minor application have been issued over the 8 week statutory deadline (average 134.4 days/19.2 weeks) and 82% of major application have been issued over the 13 week statutory deadline (average 241.4 days/34.5 weeks).

These BMHT schemes often have complex issues associated with them and it is not unusual for schemes of that nature to go beyond the statutory time frame for determination with agreed Extension of Time agreements, which effectively establishes a new formal decision period that is recognised in our government returns. The majority of the BMHT schemes are decided within the agreed Extension of Time agreements.

A fuller response may be provided by Friday 15<sup>th</sup> July

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS FROM COUNCILLOR COLIN GREEN**

**‘Energy Performance Certificates’**

**Question:**

**Social Landlords have until 2025 to upgrade properties to meet Energy Performance Certificate rating of "band C" and 2028 for existing lets. Could the Cabinet Member give details of how the Council is helping Social Landlords to make these changes?**

**Answer: Answer:**

All social landlords are working towards this government target. Birmingham City Council is actively seeking grant funding from the government's Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund to this end. To achieve the target by the deadline, further investment borrowing against the HRA will be necessary as grant funding is only part funding up to a maximum of 50%.

We have raised the potential opportunity to work across the Social Housing Sector with our key RP partners on the Birmingham Social Housing Partnership and we will also be exploring the opportunities around supporting joint bids to the upcoming Social Housing Decarbonisation fund. We will be meeting with partners in July to explore this further.

## **WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER CHOUDHRY**

### **‘Support for Residents with Disabilities’**

#### **Question:**

**I have recently been approached by residents who have received no support for friends and family in the City who are suddenly in need of alternative accommodation due to their disabilities, and are being left to cope and live with their conditions with no provision from the Council, which is a truly appalling situation for someone to find themselves in. Could the Cabinet Member outline how the Council will support residents who find themselves in this situation and advise if any further support or advice could be made available in these circumstances?**

#### **Answer:**

The City Housing Directorate supports housing applicants and current tenants with disabilities, wherever possible, to remain in their homes. Assessments are arranged with specialist Housing Occupational Therapists to determine if their homes can be adapted, either through the provision of an Aids and Adaptations facility to meet tenants needs or the Disabled Facilities Grant.

Aids and Adaptations are arranged for City Housing tenants' homes so that they can continue to live there. This provision replicates the Disabled Facilities Grant provided to someone with a disability who either owns their own homes or be a private sector tenant. This includes:

- widening doors and installing ramps
- improving access to rooms and facilities, for example, adding a stair lift or a downstairs bathroom
- adapting heating or lighting controls to make them easier to use
- 

If required and appropriate the service will offer alternative accommodation whilst work is carried out.

As part of the assessment process it may be appropriate to explore other ways of achieving the best outcome including provision of equipment or a care package. This will be discussed with the applicant.

In some cases, an adaptation to their current home may not be the best course of action or feasible. For example, the needs of the disabled person cannot be met due to the age or structure of the property. The Occupational Therapists' will identify and recommend the adaptations required to support housing applicants moving to alternative accommodation.

A move to alternative accommodation is facilitated through an application to join the housing register. There are several pathways to support a move including a hospital discharge pathway, older persons support and to Extra Care Housing.

A move to alternative accommodation will be provided by expressing an interest in empty

properties advertised through the choice based letting scheme. Properties already adapted or feasible for adaptations are clearly identified to help inform housing applicants of their preference and to meet each persons' individual disabilities' and needs.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE,  
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR DEBBIE  
CLANCY**

**“Overtime”**

**Question:**

**Further to question I20 from June Council, please list all Grade 1-3 roles in which an agreed business case for overtime is in place**

**Answer:**

All Grades 1 to 3 are eligible under the terms of their employment contract to claim overtime. In order to be paid overtime a Workforce Review Board (WRB) Business Case needs to be completed to authorise the overtime – signed by the People Partner, Finance Business Partner and Director. Each directorate holds their own business cases. When the request for overtime is submitted to payroll it should include the WRB Business Case to enable the overtime to be paid.

Attached is a report with all the grade 1-3 job roles listed that have attracted an overtime payment this financial year.



Overtime i1 July  
2022.xlsx

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE,  
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR RON STORER**

**“JNC diversity”**

**Question:**

**Please list all JNC positions (permanent and interim) that have been advertised since you committed to Everyone’s Battle, Everyone’s Business: Tackling Inequalities in Birmingham, identifying any where the resulting shortlist did not contain a diverse makeup of candidates being interviewed.**

**Answer:**

The diversity data currently collected for JNC campaigns is the overall candidate profile, the recommended shortlist from the search agent and the profile of the candidate ultimately appointed. In the last 12 months we have made 21 JNC appointments, with equalities data as detailed below:

**10 B01 appointments (Assistant Directors)**

20% Black, Asian, Marginalised Ethnic

80% female

**8 B02 (Director)**

25% Black, Asian, Marginalised Ethnic

38% female

**3 B03 (Strategic Director)**

0% Black, Asian, Marginalised Ethnic

67% female

We are currently collating information re shortlists and will be able to share full datasets shortly.

In line with our commitment to Everyone’s Battle, Everyone’s Business we will ensure that this data collection is part of our standard reporting for the search agents we work with and any internal processes going forward.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE,  
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR ZAKER  
CHOUDHRY**

**'Registry Office'**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member explain why there has been such a delay for residents trying to contact the Registry Office? We have been made aware of local residents having to complete online forms multiple times and of calling the publicised numbers and not being able to get through which has caused additional stress at, what could already be, a sensitive and upsetting time.**

**Answer:**

As I set out during the debate at the last meeting of the City Council, Birmingham Register Office is continuing to address the very significant backlogs caused by the pandemic, whilst also dealing with new business against a backdrop of stretched staffing resources. This has obvious implications for all Register Office services.

Enquiries to give notice of intention to marry or form a civil partnership have more than tripled, compared to pre-pandemic levels, whilst the number of required death and birth registrations and applications for certified copy certificates continues to be above usual levels. In order to respond to these increased demands available resources have to be shared across all areas of the service.

Staff and management are very much aware of the impact that difficulties in accessing the service has on service users. To address this situation, where possible staff resources are being diverted to enable enquiries and telephone calls to be responded to more promptly. Messaging on the Birmingham Register Office webpages and online forms has also been improved in order to reduce unnecessary multiple contacts. Managers are working with the City Council's Telephony team with the aim of introducing a new telephony system with improved functionality which will assist customers to accessing the correct aspect of the Service more quickly.

Furthermore, to help meet the needs of our customers, staff are working additional hours, a recruitment drive is proving fruitful and has resulted in a number of additional staff recently being employed within the Service. Additional support is also being provided from within our Regulation and Enforcement Division and Solihull Register Office, which has an arrangement in place to register births on behalf of Birmingham, will shortly be doubling its capacity.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE,  
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND EQUALITIES FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUNT**

**‘Srebrenica’**

**Question:**

**This month marks the 27th anniversary of the genocide at Srebrenica in which over 8,000 Muslim men and boys were systematically murdered on the basis of their identity in July 1995. Can the Leader set out what steps the Council will take to recognise 11th July as the Annual Day of Commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide and commit to supporting the work of communities and schools across Birmingham to tackle hatred and intolerance.**

**Answer:**

Birmingham City Council is committed to supporting the work of communities and schools across the city to tackle hatred and intolerance by raising awareness and educating people about the genocide that took place in Srebrenica and each year, we have been proud to participate in local and national events to mark the Annual Day of Commemoration.

I would like to thank Councillors Hunt, Ward and Alden, as the leaders of the three political groups represented on the Council, for the powerful joint statement they issued on the Annual Day of Commemoration yesterday. I know that this collective pledge by our civic leaders to use the lessons from Srebrenica to combat all forms of prejudice and discrimination that targets anyone because of their religion, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, or any other characteristic, has been warmly welcomed by communities across the city and the wider country.

Yesterday, we also commemorated the thousands who lost their lives during the 11day massacre in Srebrenica, in what was the worst atrocity on European soil since the Second World War, by lighting the Library of Birmingham.

It is vital that the horrors of Srebrenica, which were the direct result of racism, hatred and discrimination are never forgotten. We are committed to continuing to work with the Remembering Srebrenica, together with other organisations in our city to ensure that we do all in our power to eradicate any form of hatred and prejudice that targets groups based on their religion, ethnicity, gender, sexuality or any other characteristic. This is the ethos that drives forward the work we are doing with schools, communities, faith groups and other partners to target the root causes of hate crime through our “Tackling Hate, Taking Action” strategy, and to tackle structural inequalities in our city through “Everyone’s Battle, Everyone’s Business”.

We know that we still have much to do to eradicate hatred, racism and discrimination from our society and it is incumbent on every single member of this Council to play their full part in ensuring that we achieve this vital objective.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT FROM  
COUNCILLOR RICHARD PARKIN**

**“Repairs and Maintenance”**

**Question:**

**For each of the last 3 years, how much has been spent in each ward on highways repairs and maintenance?**

**Answer:**

The council has spent the following amounts on highway maintenance and management services in the last three financial years:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Spending</b>
2019-20	£50,343,543.92
2020-21	£53,437,129.17
2021-22	£94,152,746.95

**Notes:**

- The amounts shown do not include VAT.
- The spending shown is for services within the scope of the Highway Maintenance and Management PFI contract, which covers the majority of the highway assets for which the council is responsible (i.e. roads, pavements, lighting, signals, structures, etc.).
- It includes all services to carry out routine, reactive and programmed maintenance, as well as associated services such as to inspect and maintain inventory and carry out winter maintenance.
- This information is not separable by ward.
- Costs from July 2019 exclude (where possible) costs not directly associated with delivery of highway maintenance and management services, such as the cost of financing and the PFI structure. These costs cannot be separated from April to June 2019.

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

**“Highways Local Improvement Budget”**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of all approved and rejected schemes by ward for the Highways Local Improvement Budget as of 28 March 2022, including the cost of each**

**Answer:**

Attached is the list of schemes which are intended to be completed with respect to the Local Improvement Budget programme for 2022.

A number of proposals were submitted by elected members for consideration following the announcement of the programme. This resulted in the total value of all proposals (that were sufficiently developed in design to enable cost estimation) being in excess of the value of the programme. So, whilst none of those proposals have been rejected from those submitted by elected members, the proposals not contained on the attached list form a list of reserve schemes for further development as part of any future LIB programme.

**Local Improvement Budget Schemes to be Delivered - 2022**

<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Yardley subway gating	Coventry Road	South Yardley	£28,000
Billesley Lane Safety Measures	Moseley	Moseley	£39,000
Traffic Calming	Cranes Park Road	Sheldon	£120,000
Chilcote Primary School	Chilcote Close	Hall Green South	£65,000
Traffic Calming	Wyndhurst Rd	Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	£45,000
Traffic Calming	Camp Lane	Handsworth Wood	£44,000
Crossing/pedestrian refuge	Alvechurch Rd/Cedar Drive	Longbridge & West Heath	£50,000
Dropped kerbs	Various	Sutton Vesey	£25,000
Traffic Regulation Order	Nursery Road	Harborne	£50,000
Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN)	Holyhead	Holyhead	£75,000
Stirchley Traffic Calming	Pineapple Road	Stirchley	£60,000
Highway Improvements	Various	Oscott	£30,000
A38 Layby Closure	Minworth	Sutton Walmley & M'worth	£38,000
<b>Sub Total</b>			<b>£669,000</b>
<b>Vehicle Activated Speed Signs (VASS)</b>			

Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Lozells Road	Lozells	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	West Boulevard	Edgbaston/B'Green/Quinton	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Hagley Rd West	Quinton	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Garretts Green Lane, Sheldon Heath Road & Lea Hall Road	Garretts Green	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	North Edgbaston	North Edgbaston	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	College Road by Moseley School	Sparkhill	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Stratford Road	Hall Green North	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Umberslade Road	Bournbrook & Selly Park	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Deakin Road	Tyseley & Hay Mills	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Cotterills Lane	Glebe Farm	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Brownfield Road	Shard End	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Middleton Hall Rd/Bunbury Rd junction or Raddlebarn Rd between Willow Rd and Elm Rd	Bournville & Cotteridge	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Jewellery Quarter	Soho & Jewellery Quarter	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Dolphin Lane and Fox Hollies Road	Acocks Green	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Green Lane	Sutton Wylde Green	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Spring Lane near Church Road and near number 129	Erdington	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Four Oaks Road and Park View Road	Sutton Four Oaks	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Bristol Road South	Rubery and Rednal	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Westbourne Rd & St James Rd	Edgbaston	-

Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Cliveden Avenue	Perry Barr	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Moat Lane	Yardley East	-
<b>Summarised VASS Sub Total</b>			<b>£295,270</b>
<b>Current forecast LIB expenditure</b>			<b>£964,270</b>

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

**“Highways Local Improvement Budget 2”**

**Question:**

**Please provide a list of all schemes for the Highways Local Improvement Budget that are progressing as of 1 July 2022, along with any previously approved schemes that are no longer progressing (with reasons) and the cost of each**

**Answer:**

Attached is the list of schemes which are intended to be completed with respect to the Local Improvement Budget programme for 2022.

A number of proposals were submitted by elected members for consideration following the announcement of the programme. This resulted in the total value of all proposals (that were sufficiently developed in design to enable cost estimation) being in excess of the value of the programme. So, whilst none of those proposals have been rejected from those submitted by elected members, the proposals not contained on the attached list form a list of reserve schemes for further development as part of any future LIB programme.

**Local Improvement Budget Schemes to be Delivered - 2022**

<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Yardley subway gating	Coventry Road	South Yardley	£28,000
Billesley Lane Safety Measures	Moseley	Moseley	£39,000
Traffic Calming	Cranes Park Road	Sheldon	£120,000
Chilcote Primary School	Chilcote Close	Hall Green South	£65,000
Traffic Calming	Wyndhurst Rd	Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	£45,000
Traffic Calming	Camp Lane	Handsworth Wood	£44,000
Crossing/pedestrian refuge	Alvechurch Rd/Cedar Drive	Longbridge & West Heath	£50,000

Dropped kerbs	Various	Sutton Vesey	£25,000
Traffic Regulation Order	Nursery Road	Harborne	£50,000
Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN)	Holyhead	Holyhead	£75,000
Stirchley Traffic Calming	Pineapple Road	Stirchley	£60,000
Highway Improvements	Various	Oscott	£30,000
A38 Layby Closure	Minworth	Sutton Walmley & M'worth	£38,000
<b>Sub Total</b>			<b>£669,000</b>
<b>Vehicle Activated Speed Signs (VASS)</b>			
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Lozells Road	Lozells	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	West Boulevard	Edgbaston/B'Green/Quinton	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Hagley Rd West	Quinton	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Garretts Green Lane, Sheldon Heath Road & Lea Hall Road	Garretts Green	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	North Edgbaston	North Edgbaston	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	College Road by Moseley School	Sparkhill	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Stratford Road	Hall Green North	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Umberslade Road	Bournbrook & Selly Park	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Deakin Road	Tyseley & Hay Mills	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Cotterills Lane	Glebe Farm	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Brownfield Road	Shard End	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Middleton Hall Rd/Bunbury Rd junction or Raddlebarn Rd between Willow Rd and Elm Rd	Bournville & Cotteridge	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Jewellery Quarter	Soho & Jewellery Quarter	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Dolphin Lane and Fox Hollies Road	Acocks Green	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Green Lane	Sutton Wylde Green	-

Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Spring Lane near Church Road and near number 129	Erdington	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Four Oaks Road and Park View Road	Sutton Four Oaks	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Bristol Road South	Rubery and Rednal	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Westbourne Rd & St James Rd	Edgbaston	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Cliveden Avenue	Perry Barr	-
Vehicle Activated Speed Sign(s)	Moat Lane	Yardley East	-
<b>Summarised VASS Sub Total</b>			<b>£295,270</b>
<b>Current forecast LIB expenditure</b>			<b>£964,270</b>

## WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT FROM COUNCILLOR ROBERT ALDEN

### “Air Quality”

#### Question:

**What percentage change in NO2 levels were recorded in Birmingham between 2019 and 2021, across all sites, broken down to include separate information for just sites within the Clean Air Zone and just sites outside of the Clean Air Zone?**

#### Answer:

On 10 March 2022 the Council published a report that reviewed the impact of the Clean Air Zone after its first six months of operation on the levels of nitrogen dioxide at all monitoring locations across the city. This report can be found at [www.brumbreathes.co.uk/CAZdata](http://www.brumbreathes.co.uk/CAZdata).

The report reviewed the ‘baseline’ data from 2019, as the last full year before the COVID pandemic, and compared it to the levels of nitrogen dioxide in 2020 and 2021. The report also compared the data from 2021 with the data from 2016 which was used to inform the original modelling for the Clean Air Zone.

When comparing the levels of nitrogen dioxide in the period June to December 2021 against 2019 the report noted an on average reduction of 13% in the levels of nitrogen dioxide across 37 monitoring locations in the zone. It also noted an on average reduction of 14% at the monitoring locations (21) on the ring road and an on average reduction of 13% at the monitoring locations (17) across the wider city.

It should be noted that at the time the six-month report was published the assessment was based on provisional data for 2021. The 2021 data will be confirmed with the publication of the Annual Status Report (ASR), which we expect to submit to Defra later this month. It is

unlikely this will produce a significant difference in the overall trend.

The data from these locations, split between the monitoring locations in the zone, ring road and wider city, are included in this response.

The data used in these reports is also available through the following website:  
[www.BirminghamAirQuality.co.uk](http://www.BirminghamAirQuality.co.uk), which is maintained by the Council's Environmental Protection Team.

## AIR QUALITY MONITORING LOCATIONS: WITHIN THE CLEAN AIR ZONE

	Tube ID	2016	2019	2020	2021 (provisional)	2016 to 2021	2019 to 2020	2019 to 2021	2020 to 2021
Within the Clean Air Zone	BHM63	41.0	28.4	25.0	24.6	-40%	-12%	-13%	-1%
	BHM90	-	27.2	23.5	23.6	-	-14%	-13%	0%
	BHM26	-	22.9	16.9	17.3	-	-26%	-24%	+2%
	BHM62	49.0	33.4	26.4	26.2	-47%	-21%	-21%	-1%
	BHM61	44.0	29.7	25.8	22.7	-48%	-13%	-24%	-12%
	BHM92	-	40.2	31.4	34.1	-	-22%	-15%	+9%
	BHM51	-	35.4	27.6	30.1	-	-22%	-15%	+9%
	BHM35	-	28.3	24.2	25.2	-	-14%	-11%	+4%
	BHM16	61.5	40.8	34.7	31.5	-49%	-15%	-23%	-9%
	BHM39	54.0	36.8	31.1	32.4	-40%	-16%	-12%	+4%
	BHM34	38.0	26.3	23.2	22.2	-42%	-12%	-16%	-5%
	BHM36	54.0	31.9	28.6	27.9	-48%	-10%	-13%	-2%
	BHM30	-	34.4	26.7	35.3	-	-22%	+3%	+32%
	BHM59	-	37.2	30.0	32.8	-	-19%	-12%	+9%
	BHM65	-	37.0	29.7	30.7	-	-20%	-17%	+3%
	BHM24	-	37.8	33.0	35.3	-	-13%	-7%	+7%
	BHM28	-	44.7	38.4	37.9	-	-14%	-15%	-1%
	BHM88	-	58.1	50.6	48.4	-	-13%	-17%	-4%
	BHM89	-	39.4	32.7	32.0	-	-17%	-19%	-2%
	BHM58	-	36.6	28.8	33.2	-	-21%	-9%	+15%
	BHM45 (2)	-	35.5	39.4	39.3	-	+11%	+11%	0%
	BHM23	-	39.6	34.4	35.3	-	-13%	-11%	+3%
	BHM46 (2)	-	50.0	49.7	48.1	-	-1%	-4%	-3%
	BHM43	54.0	39.5	32.5	31.5	-42%	-18%	-20%	-3%
	BHM44	55.0	39.0	30.3	31.3	-43%	-22%	-20%	+3%
	BHM42	52.6	39.8	32.3	31.7	-40%	-19%	-20%	-2%
	BHM53	64.0	50.0	44.3	49.7	-22%	-11%	-1%	+12%

	BHM55	-	52.0	51.9	45.5	-	0%	-12%	-12%
	BHM56	55.0	33.3	27.1	27.9	-49%	-19%	-16%	+3%
	BHM08	55.7	34.8	22.2	23.7	-57%	-36%	-32%	+7%
	BHM41	66.3	50.4	41.8	49.1	-26%	-17%	-3%	+18%
	BHM40	62.8	47.4	43.8	48.3	-23%	-7%	+2%	+10%
	BHM86	-	33.7	28.7	32.0	-	-15%	-5%	+12%
	BHM33	-	36.1	26.9	28.1	-	-25%	-22%	+4%
	BHM87	-	59.6	46.5	46.9	-	-22%	-21%	+1%
	BHM64	-	33.6	38.0	33.6	-	+13%	0%	-12%
	BHM07	56.7	31.0	23.7	21.9	-61%	-24%	-29%	-7%
	BHMCL	-	-	-	53.2	-	-	-	-
	BHMWL	-	-	-	26.6	-	-	-	-
	BHMNS	-	-	-	29.7	-	-	-	-
	BHMSH	-	-	-	45.6	-	-	-	-
	BHMWL	-	-	-	26.6	-	-	-	-

Table 1 Continued Nitrogen Dioxide Diffusion Tube Results 2016, 2019, 2020 and 2021 (Provisional using a bias adjustment figure of 0.81) for the Clean Air Zone with the Percentage change compared to 2016 and 2019 baseline where possible.

## AIR QUALITY MONITORING LOCATIONS: RING ROAD

	Tube ID	2016	2019	2020	2021 (provisional)	2016 to 2021	2019 to 2020	2019 to 2021	2020 to 2021
Within the Ring Road	BHM79	-	27.7	22.0	23.7	-	-20%	-14%	+8%
	BHM80	-	35.5	29.6	28.9	-	-17%	-19%	-2%
	BHM85	-	48.0	40.6	44.4	-	-15%	-8%	+9%
	BHM82	-	28.6	35.1	31.7	-	+23%	+11%	-10%
	BHM68	-	43.9	29.6	32.6	-	-33%	-26%	+10%
	BHM69	-	37.6	27.5	29.6	-	-27%	-21%	+7%
	BHM74	-	52.6	43.0	43.6	-	-18%	-17%	+1%
	BHM21	-	48.5	37.5	38.4	-	-23%	-21%	+2%
	BHM84	-	38.3	31.9	35.4	-	-17%	-8%	+11%
	BHM78	-	31.7	25.3	27.5	-	-20%	-13%	+9%
	BHM77	-	30.6	26.4	28.6	-	-14%	-7%	+8%
	BHM75	-	34.0	29.2	31.0	-	-14%	-9%	+6%
	BHM76	-	24.8	20.5	22.1	-	-17%	-11%	+8%
	BHM72	-	22.8	17.5	18.6	-	-23%	-19%	+6%



	BHM81	-	41.3	23.7	22.2	-	-43%	-46%	-6%
	BHM67	-	31.8	24.9	27.2	-	-22%	-14%	+9%
	BHM66	-	33.2	29.2	29.3	-	-12%	-12%	0%
	BHM71	-	25.4	21.2	21.5	-	-16%	-15%	+1%
	BHM27	-	34.7	30.7	30.9	-	-11%	-11%	+1%
	BHM83	-	61.0	50.6	50.1	-	-17%	-18%	-1%
	BHM25	-	38.0	36.0	36.5	-	-5%	-4%	+2%

Table 2 Nitrogen Dioxide Diffusion Tube Results 2016, 2019, 2020 and 2021 (Provisional using a bias adjustment figure of 0.81) for the ring road with the Percentage change compared to 2016 and 2019 baseline.

## AIR QUALITY MONITORING LOCATIONS: WIDER CITY

	Tube ID	2016	2019	2020	2021 (provisional)	2016 to 2021	2019 to 2020	2019 to 2021	2020 to 2021
Wider City	BHM03	44.7	28.8	26.4	28.2	-37%	-8%	-2%	+7%
	BHM09	46.3	32.3	28.6	28.0	-40%	-11%	-13%	-2%
	BHM5(2)	-	34.0	29.3	30.2	-	-14%	-11%	+3%
	BHM20	44.6	30.4	22.2	22.9	-49%	-27%	-25%	+3%
	BHM4 (2)	-	32.8	27.8	26.9	-	-15%	-18%	-3%
	BHM57	-	28.1	20.5	21.4	-	-27%	-24%	+4%
	BHM37	-	26.3	20.4	22.9	-	-23%	-13%	+12%
	BHM19	-	38.2	32.9	33.1	-	-14%	-13%	+1%
	BHM99	-	40.0	32.1	34.8	-	-20%	-13%	+8%
	BHM11	41.7	31.2	26.1	26.5	-36%	-16%	-15%	+1%
	BHM12	42.9	31.5	26.0	26.6	-38%	-17%	-15%	+2%
	BHM17 (2)	-	34.0	30.4	29.4	-	-10%	-13%	-3%
	BHM18 (2)	-	35.3	31.3	31.3	-	-11%	-11%	0%
	BHM01	18.8	15.1	12.7	14.2	-25%	-16%	-6%	+12%
	BHM91	-	27.1	24.4	26.5	-	-10%	-3%	+8%
	BHM02	20.2	14.4	12.0	12.4	-38%	-17%	-14%	+4%
	BHM10	42.8	32.0	26.1	26.2	-39%	-19%	-18%	+1%

Table 3 Nitrogen Dioxide Diffusion Tube Results 2016, 2019, 2020 and 2021 (Provisional using a bias adjustment figure of 0.81) for the wider city with the Percentage change compared to 2016 and 2019 baseline.



**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT FROM  
COUNCILLOR IZZY KNOWLES**

**'Traffic Offences'**

**Question:**

**Now that minor traffic offences have been transferred to local Councils to impose, could the Cabinet Member provide details on how the new powers been promoted to residents and how will they be enforced?**

**Answer:**

The question assumes that minor traffic offences have been transferred to Local Authorities. I can confirm that this is not the case.

Currently the Government is considering the timeframe and scope of devolved powers with respect to moving traffic offences and obstructive parking. It is likely that these powers will be devolved at some point in 2023.

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

**'Cashless Parking'**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member give an indication of the number of cashless parking machines used by the Council and the measures that have been put in place to ensure fair access for all?**

**Answer:**

We have 17 parking machines that offer cashless parking facilities.

The option of cashless parking for all customers is available through our "pay by phone" service which is available via phone, internet and app.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT FROM  
COUNCILLOR COLIN GREEN**

**'Sprint Bus Service'**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member confirm if the Sprint service will be operational in the City in little under 30 days for the Commonwealth Games and which bus operators will be allowed to use the sprint bus lanes?**

**Answer:**

Phase 1 of the A34 and A45 Sprint projects have been completed in time for the Commonwealth Games. The new bus lanes, enhanced shelters and junction upgrades are now being used by all bus services on the corridors, accounting for approximately 20 million trips a year. Buses from Cllr Green's Sheldon ward, to and from Birmingham, are now receiving journey time and reliability benefits from the first phase of the project.

Zero emission cross city bus services are scheduled to be introduced when the Metro public realm work in Digbeth is complete. This will ensure bus services run reliably across the whole route from Walsall to Solihull. Further to this, the Department for Transport has recently awarded the West Midlands £30m for 124 more hydrogen buses. 24 of the new vehicles will be articulated tram-style buses set to run on the Sprint corridor after the completion of the Phase 2 works, expected to be at the end of 2024.

Public engagement on Phase 2 of the Sprint project is due later this year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT FROM  
COUNCILLOR ROGER HARMER**

**‘Highways Investment Schedule’**

**Question:**

**Following the publication of the draft highways investment schedule last summer, how many changes were made to the schedule as a result of Councillor submissions? Please can you list them by ward.**

**Answer:**

There was one change as a result of Councillor submissions summarised below:

- Proposal to resurface footway on Sarah Close in Sutton Mere Green ward (IWP2/FW/D09/5) was replaced by footway resurfacing of Mere Green Road (IWP2/FW/D09/8) in the same ward after discussion and agreement with the ward councillor.

Other projects originally proposed in the highways investment works programme were changed for a variety of other reasons. The full list of changes to the 2021-2022 programme, including the reasons for the change is summarised in the table below.

Table attached separately (J8)

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

**‘School Safety’**

**Question:**

**Following her response to me at the last council meeting, can the Cabinet Member confirm whether the allocation of funding per ward for school safety is, so far as possible, going to be spent within wards in consultation with ward members and local highways engineers - or whether it is going to be rolled up into a single central sum for central determination of how it is spent?**

**Answer:**

Preparation has begun to undertake a city-wide review of Car Free School Streets eligibility criteria, identifying schools where a scheme could be feasible, and what alternative measures may be suitable in non-feasible locations. This will inform strategic prioritisation of future schemes.

On a local level, officers will seek support from ward members to engage schools, to develop proposed schemes, and to build ‘buy-in’ from the local community.

Highway engineers are part of the delivery team for School Streets measures.

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

**‘Traffic Offences’**

**Question:**

**Now that minor traffic offences have been transferred to local Councils to impose, could the Cabinet Member provide details on how many fines have been issued to motorists in the first month of the new regulations and how much revenue has been generated as a result?**

**Answer:**

The question assumes that minor traffic offences have been transferred to Local Authorities. I can confirm that this is not the case.

Currently the Government is considering the timeframe and scope of devolved powers with respect to moving traffic offences and obstructive parking. It is likely that these powers will be devolved at some point in 2023.

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT FROM  
COUNCILLOR DEBORAH HARRIES**

**‘Parking and Fixed Penalty Fines’**

**Question:**

**Could the Cabinet Member provide full details of how much money has been generated in parking charges in the city either from car parks or fixed penalty fines during municipal year 2020/21 and 2021/22?**

**Answer:**

Income from car park charges (off street):

2020/21 – £2,485,756

2021/22 – £5,760,745

Income from on-street parking charges:

2020/21 - £3,109,675

2021/22 - £5,530,184

Income from Parking Penalty Charge Notices:

2020/21 – £3,509,413

2021/22 – £4,056,130