

# BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

**SELLY OAK DISTRICT  
COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 18 OCTOBER 2016**

## **MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SELLY OAK DISTRICT COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 18 OCTOBER 2016 AT 1400 HOURS, IN COMMITTEE ROOM 6, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:** - Councillors Susan Barnett, Alex Buchanan, Phil Davis, Timothy Huxtable, Brigid Jones, Changese Khan, Mike Leddy and Karen McCarthy.

### **ALSO PRESENT:** -

Karen Cheney – Selly Oak District Head  
Mark Rodgers – Housing Manager  
Errol Wilson - Committee Manager

\*\*\*\*\*

### **NOTICE OF RECORDING**

- 377 The District Committee were advised that the meeting would be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Internet site and members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there were confidential or exempt items.

---

### **MINUTES**

- 378 This item has been deferred to November's District Committee meeting.

---

### **BIRMINGHAM COUNCIL HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME ENVIRONMENTAL WORKS BUDGET**

Mark Rodgers, Housing Manager introduced the item and advised that following September's District Committee meeting, Members had agreed to deferred the proposal for Fladbury Crescent pending costings for the work that was proposed for Holly Bank Road.

(See Document No. 1)

Mr Rodgers circulated a document for 2016/17 proposed projects which had the costings against them for the work proposed for Holly Bank Road which was six

## **Selly Oak District Committee – 18 October 2016**

schemes in total with a total value of £31,689.28. The question was which of these schemes the Committee wished to approve if any.

Councillor Buchanan proposed that the Holly Bank proposal be accepted as this would improve the Council properties and the whole area. Councillor Huxtable commented that the amount available to spend was £51,518.84 and the total value of the proposed projects was £83,189.00. If they went along with Councillor Buchanan's proposal which he fully supports, it would not leave enough money to do Fladbury Crescent and he did not think that they could do two things. They could substitute it for something else and deferred the £51,518.84 for a further year, but he did not think that they could make a further start on the £51,518.84 not being aware if they were going to get the Environmental budget for 2017/18.

The Chairman commented that this overlaps with her question as to whether she was correction in her question as to whether the proposal was scalable.

Mr Rodgers stated that if the Billesley projects were approved that would leave a budget of £19,800. They could start looking into the possibility of starting work on the Fladbury Crescent this year and if there was agreement from the Committee, to come to agreement for next year subject to budget being available.

The Chairman enquired whether they could deliver one of the Fladbury Crescent plans without giving a commitment to the others. Mr Rodgers advised that this was something that they could look into. They could start on the site that came close to the £19,800 so as to ensure that the Committee's maximum spends were available for this year.

In relation to the District Environmental Budget the Chairman advised that she had requested from Jonathan Antill, Acting Senior Service Manager the costing for addressing some of the parking issues in Fladbury Crescent as the Selly Oak bid for this year.

Councillor Khan commented that from his understanding, sections of Fladbury Crescent could be done in stages. There were two main sections where car parking would be allocated and it was possible to do this section by section by utilising the funds they had this year to do part of this and the rest the following year.

Chairman commented that they needed to take into account that there may not be funding next year and that she would not be prepared to take a decision today to commit the money. The Committee was aware that they roll the money around and £19k was about what Selly Oak could expect. She added that if the scheme was scalable they would request that Mr Rodgers look at it.

Councillor Huxtable stated that he had no objections, but request that given some of the proposals for Holly Bank Road, could they look at similar hardstanding for refuse and recycling facilities on the Masefield Square/ Ingoldsby Road estates for next year, should there be the budget available as this was essentially the same issue in terms of difficulties in providing the facilities for refuse and recycling in those three story walk-ups since the introduction of wheelie bins. They could look at this so that if they get money for next year, they have a project ready to go.

Mr Rodgers stated that he was happy to look at this in principle, subject to budget being available for next year.

379

**RESOLVED: -**

1. That the Holly Bank Road scheme be approved; and
  2. That Mr Rodgers look at proposal for the Fladbury Crescent Scheme to ascertain what could be delivered for the remaining budget and for an update to be presented for the next Committee meeting in November 2016
- 

**ROAD SAFETY – SELLY OAK DISTRICT NEIGHBOURHOOD CHALLENGE**

380

The Chairman advised that they had identified Road Safety as their neighbourhood challenge project for next year and that an inquiry session would be held on the Road Safety. She highlighted that they had a report that would be completed shortly from the Hall Green District concerning their Neighbourhood Challenge for last year. The question was how they would pick up the issues that were most important in Selly Oak.

In the discussions that followed, Members made the following statements: -

- a. Monday saw the launch of the 20mph zones through large parts of the City. The question was whether the bus operators had considered their new timetables as a result of the reduced speed limits – if not why not as this will have an impact on operating times for buses. The Bus Operators amongst others needed to be questioned as to what they were doing to make the roads safer.
- b. For clarification it was noted that this was 20mph limits rather than 20mph zones as they were two different concepts. The question was what was more effective and where would they get *most bang for their buck*. If they accept that they had finite resources, whether it was better from a road safety viewpoint to do a few 20mph zones in particular hotspots or sensitive areas outside of schools with traffic calming measures that were self-enforcing, whether they be vertical or horizontal or was it 20mph limits. This was work they could do with Transportation Behaviour Change Manager.
- c. In terms of every road safety schemes proposed, they needed to think outside the box and take into account where there were currently school crossing patrols, for example safer route to school and there were no road safety measures proposed section of Linden Road – there were no zebra crossing etc. no speed humps or traffic calming measures. There was a vulnerable location that had been used by school children and yet as part of the road safety scheme they still did not proposed to put anything in to help the lollipop Lady.
- d. The question was what other things they could do in relation to road safety scheme that would be beneficial given the finite resource of the City Council. If a safer route to school scheme was being done and the measures were likely to have a displacement effect, which would mean that cars started to park on grass island as they could not park where they use to any longer as a result of the restrictive measures put in place, whether grass verge protection

## **Selly Oak District Committee – 18 October 2016**

measures could be put in place at the same time to fulfil another infrastructure that they had including meeting the City Council.

- e. There was a need to think of the whole highways environment when road safety was being done. A question was whether any other space could be utilised by working in partnership and in coordination with others. The Nursery School on Tiverton Road had done a deal with the Public House on Hubert Road to use their car park because the one backs onto the other. In some places they use Public Houses car parks and in some cases they needed to look at this holistically. Some parts of the process identified that they needed to speak with the Police and then speak with Civil Enforcement Managers to ensure what could be done.
- f. It was noted that Councillor Hartley was leading on bus issues in the TDC and they could speak with her concerning this point. Of concern was the blanket 20mph speed limit approach in the context of what Councillor Huxtable had stated earlier – what was needed was a zonal approach. There may be good reasons for introducing the 20mph routes on some roads where there seem to be superfluous and unenforceable. 20mph on Holly Bank Road had some validity, but there was a need to look at resourcing approach that combines 20mph speed limits with traffic calming measures, but this cost money.
- g. There were no other measures to slow traffic and a comprehensive approach was needed, but there was a resource problem or they accept that they needed to think carefully where they put the 20mph speed limits as they had to be workable. The point was well made that they needed to focus on zones.
- h. Concerns were not just about the speed of traffic but the thoughtlessness of parking as some people just stop where they could find space. This is often around schools. Parents and children should be encouraged to walk to school as this healthier and more beneficial and was better for the environment if there was less traffic on the road.
- i. Presently, on some roads, cars were parked on both sides, blocking people's driveways and were sometimes parked 3 abreast. There had been a lot of success with children and Police working together in relation to the speed of traffic - Kids Court – The question was whether there was something similar that could be done although only the Police could enforce that type of irresponsible parking. The question was whether there was something that could be done concerning the irresponsible parking.
- j. A problem with the Kids Court was that it was not their own parents they were catching, whereas with the parking it tended to be, but it was worth consideration and how it could be developed. Children were tremendously powerful in coming home from school saying *you should stop smoking because...* and parents will listen to their own children. If this could be done it would be innovative.
- k. Councillor Jones advised that as Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Schools, they were doing a number of projects with children in school around road safety. Firstly, Kids Court which was incredible and could be seen by the video from it. Kids Court was done at two schools, one in Ward End and the other in Sparkbrook. A Police speed trap was set up in a new 20mph zone

## **Selly Oak District Committee – 18 October 2016**

around the schools. Every speeding motorist was given the choice of taking points on their licence and a fine or go to the Kids Court. The drivers would choose the Kids Court.

- l. The Kids Court consists of a number of eight year olds and they sat the speeding motorist in front of them. The kids then questioned them concerning their behaviour, whether they knew what they were doing and why they were doing it. This was one of many nudge tactics they could use as a hearts and minds thing. At the end of the day there was only so much enforcement they could do. A lot of it was about winning people around with hearts and minds in getting people on board.
- m. The Young Active Travel project was another programme and the idea was to bring together all the different work stream they had in relation to young people travelling to school in an active way and road safety and bring them all into one place so they could have a coherent look at it instead of having them in different parts of the Council going in all directions.
- n. A young Active Travel Summit was held last Friday and they had a number of delegations from several schools at the Council House to learn about road safety but also to hear from them. They presented bronze plaques to those that had reached their Mode Shift Star Programme to take back to their schools. Others were working toward their Mode Shift Stars – mode shifting was the way people travel to school.
- o. They got the young people to learn about road safety and also to hear from them. They had a *Bus Wall* and different scenarios for young people to talk about and their anxieties in travelling on a bus. They got the children who were there to help think through how they might get through their anxieties; how they might be prompted more to use the bus and how they could help the characters in the scenarios to use public transport more.
- p. Some insightful information was obtained about what young people's anxieties were about using buses and public transport that they could then take back to the people that run these. They could look at how they could use some of that thinking in Selly Oak - whether they do a local active travel summit or whether there were any ideas on learning that came out of that. A better way to get safer roads were to get cars off the roads and to get people on to public transport and how this could be made into a more attractive option for people. There was still a long way to go in terms of modal shift in getting people out of their cars.
- q. A lot of the major problems were around schools and it was not just the roads, but the infrastructure and the damage this caused to the grass verges. Older people walking could break their ankles in some of these potholes that were left in the grass verges.
- r. In terms of the Kids Court, the question was whether it would be possible for a mobile Kids Court where children could be taken from one school to another. This would not then be seen as the children judging their own parents for issues like parking where they could be pulled in by not their own children but other children.

- s. What was not mentioned was cycling and there was a need to bring forward people who could talk about safe cycling and the Green Travel Plan that was being developed for the area around the University Hospitals Birmingham (UHB). The Chairman stated that she was happy to arrange the first meeting.
- 

**LOCAL INNOVATION FUND UPDATE**

381 Karen Cheney, Selly Oak District Head drew the Committee's attention to the Local Innovation Fund (LIF) report that was submitted to Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership on the 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016.

(See Document No. 2)

Ms Cheney made the following statements: -

- I. Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership approved the report on the 20 September 2016. The Local Innovation Fund (LIF) was £2m and the Wards would receive £48,000 per Ward for 2016/17. A small amount was set aside for administration and support for the development of local innovation.
- II. Two Member Development sessions were held on the last two weeks and five information sessions for officers and Members had been undertaken. The Assistant Leaders had also sent the information out last week with some additional information that came out from request at the Member Development sessions.
- III. Ms Cheney stated that the Governance Team had put together some information on investing in neighbourhoods and whilst Members had their local meetings concerning local innovation they also had that information. This was distributed by the Assistant Leaders last week.
- IV. There was an A4 sheet that came out from the Member Development sessions that gave a summary of LIF with a blank space where Members could put details of their own Ward meetings. In terms of the timescale, the expectation was that Members were now holding their Ward meetings with local stakeholders within the next few weeks regarding discussions around LIF. It should be remembered that this was not a grant process, but was an investment into the Ward.
- V. The expectation was that Members in their local leadership role will be calling and holding Ward meetings with key stakeholders and discussions were held as to what the priorities might be between those key stakeholders of residents and community organisations within the area. Negotiations would take place and that they meet the criteria for LIF and that there would be Ward proposals that came up within the financial year.
- VI. With regard to those Ward proposals in terms of timelines, they then come to the Community Governance Team where an initial sift would be done to ensure that they meet the criteria and advised if any amendments needed to be made. Once they have gone through the Governance route, they would then be signed off for approval at the monthly Cabinet Committee – Local Leadership meetings.

- VII. In terms of the Community Governance Team, there was a Governance Manager and a Community Support and Development Officer who was assigned to support each District. They were there to support Members in the process, but they were not there to lead or to deliver the projects. The Link Officer for Selly Oak District was Austin Rodriguez.
- VIII. The focus was on partnership collaboration which needed to be sustainable - organisations working together collaboratively to put things into place. Some priorities within the Ward meetings and from stakeholders may not meet the criteria for the LIF. Appendix 4 of the report gives some idea of the things that meet the criteria. She was happy to meet with those Members who were unable to attend the Member Development Programme if Members wished for this to happen.

Members made the following comments: -

1. Councillor Huxtable advised that Bournville Ward had identified a potential opportunity for investment and had requested that officers formed this into a workable proposal. He understood that Councillor Sealey was meeting with the Area Parks Manager shortly in terms of partnership working with an organisation that looked after one of the parks in Bournville and how this could be made even better and work up some of the other issues in terms of flood alleviation.

Ms Cheney advised that as far as she was aware, no member of her citywide team except the Governance Manager had been asked to attend the Ward meetings. She stated that there will be a number of priorities that had been on-going, but it was envisaged as part of the introduction of LIF that there was some discussion with stakeholders that develop ideas that fitted into the LIF criteria.

2. Councillor Huxtable suggested that someone from Ms Cheney's team makes contact with the Area Parks Manager urgently who he believes was attending a site meeting to state that his understanding was that all the Councillors in the Ward had met with the organisation and were supportive in looking at a new innovative type of working.
3. The Chairman commented that they were all on different timeline and that Selly Oak Ward Committee was able to give an outline at their last meeting. They were now looking to set up a workshop type Ward Committee at the beginning of November 2016. It was important that they capture those ideas that could be transferred. Selly Oak Ward Jobs and Skills Panel had looked at supporting work placements and work experience which Brandwood would also take up, but may also look at other people. It was hoped that they would have some online space where people could see what others were doing.
4. Councillor Leddy stated that their meeting was on the 31 October 2016 for Brandwood and they had invited members of the public and former organisations that were on the Ward Advisory Board and Druids Heath Management Board and they will be discussing the LIF and what they would like to see happen throughout the Ward.

## **Selly Oak District Committee – 18 October 2016**

5. Councillor Buchanan stated that a date was yet to be set for Billesley Ward meeting as there were other things happening in the Ward. LIF would be a major part of the next meeting and the public and stakeholders would be invited to attend. This would be an opportunity to start the discussion to see if there were any new ideas in addition to the ones they have in mind that they want to put to people to see what they thought of them.
6. Councillor Leddy reiterated that the legacy aspect of the LIF, the fact that if the money was not available next year or the year after, what would be left, the fact that they were commissioning task to be done and hopefully they could be sustainable. He would like to see in Brandwood a scheme that sets up a number of people with no skills at present that could take on an handyman job throughout the whole Ward so that they could become self-financing.

---

### **DISTRICT WORK PROGRAMME**

382 Karen Cheney, Selly Oak District Head stated that following the last meeting she had sent out a revised work programme with the updates. The next meeting of the District Committee will be held on the 17 November 2016 and the issue was whether there were any items for the agenda. The Jobs and Skills Panel met on the 12 October 2016 and the LIF had now been introduced with the offer of a workshop for District Members.

A brief discussion then ensued and the following items were suggested for the District Committee meeting in November 2016:

- Consultation regarding the Library Service and the proposal for Selly Oak District;
- Update from the Waste Management Service;
- Feedback from the District Champions - Councillor Barnett will report back on Corporate Parenting and District Parent Partnership and Councillor Phil Davis will report back on Cultural and Heritage in terms of the current debate on heritage in conservation areas. The Chairman suggested that this could go to the Cabinet Sub-Committees or less formal meeting – Ms Cheney undertook to raise this with the Assistant Leaders.

---

### **FEEDBACK FROM SELLY OAK WARDS: BILLESLEY, BOURNVILLE, BRANDWOOD AND SELLY OAK**

383 Karen Cheney, Selly Oak District Head requested that the update on this item be deferred to November's District Committee meeting. She advised that Stirchley Baths was entered into the Grand Final of the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Awards having won the Regional Final in the Community Benefit category which was last Friday, but did not win it. Grand Central won their category and also the overall prize.

---

### **SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS 2016/2017**

384 **RESOLVED: -**



## **Selly Oak District Committee – 18 October 2016**

That the Selly Oak District Committee meet at 1030 hours, at the Council House on the following dates:-

17 November 2016

26 January 2017

16 March 2017

All meetings will be held on Thursdays, Council House, Victoria Square, Birmingham, B1 1BB

---

### **OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

385 No other urgent business was submitted.

---

### **AUTHORITY TO CHAIRMAN AND OFFICERS**

386 **RESOLVED: -**

Chairman to move:-

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

---

The meeting ended at 1500 hours.

-----  
CHAIRMAN