

**THE EXECUTIVE PORTFOLIO HOLDER
FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Minutes of a meeting held on 21st January 2004

Present:

Councillor George Taylor (Portfolio Holder)

Also Present:

Councillors Bloomfield, Jenny Powell, Rod Reed, and Denise Reddin.

**85 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 3RD AND 23RD
 DECEMBER 2003**

RESOLVED that

(1) the Minutes of the meetings held on 3rd and 23rd December 2003, be confirmed subject to Minute 69 (Unlicensed street Trading) being amended by the deletion of 'Section 25 (6) (b) in the Resolution. The Portfolio Holder asked for priority to be given to enforce this decision.

(2) In respect of Minute 83 (Local Safety Schemes) it was reported that representations had been made to impose a 50 mph speed limit in Addington Road, West Wickham rather than 40 mph which had been approved. In view of the existing 40 mph limit in the adjoining Borough of Croydon and the poor accident record, the Portfolio Holder decided to adhere to the previous decision of a 40 mph limit.

86 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jenny Powell (Liberal Democrat Member) declared a personal interest in the item concerning the proposed Tesco development in Orpington. The Liberal Democrat building was opposite the site.

**87 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING
 THE MEETING**

There were none.

**88 BUDGET MONITORING 2003/04
Report ES04005**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report on the latest budget position which showed a projected underspend of £139,000. Indications were that this was likely to be exceeded but would still be very close to the overall budget. The report had been considered by the Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on 14th January.

RESOLVED that the budget variations be noted.

**89 BOROUGH SPENDING PLAN SETTLEMENT FOR 2004/05
Report ES04006**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report on the Borough Spending Plan settlement from Transport for London for the 2004/05 financial year. £3.03 million had been allocated for Bromley's own schemes, £1.46m for schemes in Bromley under the London Bus Priority Network and £1.52m as the lead borough for the SELTRANS regional partnership. Funding from the BSWP settlement represented the vast majority of spending on transport schemes outside of routine highway maintenance. It was noted that although funding had increased, the aspirations of the boroughs still significantly exceeded Transport for London's ability to fund them.

It was noted in particular that provision had been made for the following:-

- £1.94m for principal road maintenance (over 80% of the bid amount)
- £1.47m for bus priority works (the highest individual settlement in London - this reflects our role as lead authority)
- £527,000 for casualty reduction measures contributing to the authority's PSA target
- £700,000 over two years for the Bromley town centre access plan through SELTRANS, funding physical access improvements in the town centre and supporting the BID proposal and the EU CIVITAS II bid
- £15,000 in support of innovative access planning work in support of the proposed World Heritage Site proposal for Darwin at Downe.
- £50,000 to start a multi-agency project through SELTRANS and led by Bromley, to increase use of the Waterlink Way and Green Chain Walk for local access by foot and bike to services, work and transport.

However there were some areas of concern which were highlighted:-

1. There was no settlement allocated for developing accessibility in Orpington town centre despite funding being agreed for initial works in 2003/04.
2. A very low settlement across London for borough proposals to encourage cycling for local journeys. Also no funding for the management of the south east sector which Bromley undertook in addition to other duties.
3. Discontinuity in the settlements to examine strategic orbital bus links in south London. It was noted that SWELTRAC (south west partnership) received funding for examining options for improvement of one half of the 726 bus route while SELTRANS did not receive funding for the other half.
4. No funding for Controlled Parking Zone schemes in Orpington, Petts Wood and Beckenham despite rail heading problems
5. Some inconsistencies whereby both the borough and SELTRANS received funding for examining improvements to accessibility in respect of the 358 bus route.
6. Failed to receive £40,000 necessary to progress the design for the replacement of Chislehurst road over rail bridge. Track possessions had been applied for in 2005/06 to replace the bridge over a 12 month period, and the bid was to progress design ahead of the possession

The Portfolio Holder agreed to make representations to Transport for London as outlined above and it was

RESOLVED accordingly.

**90 PROPOSED PARKING ARRANGEMENT IN UPPER ELMERS
END ROAD (PART ONLY) - RESULTS OF PUBLIC
CONSULTATION
Report ES03379**

The Portfolio Holder considered changes to the existing free time limited parking bays, waiting restriction and disabled bay in part of Upper Elmers End Road from near the junction with Altyre Way and The Rising Sun public house.

There was currently a parking problem in this area due to lack of enforcement which could not be improved without a corresponding increase in

funding income. It was therefore proposed to change the present limited restrictions to 'Pay and Display' with a time restricted loading bay. Following consultation which had produced a poor response it was now proposed to limit the scheme to the existing parking control outside the shops. Further consultation had resulted in equal numbers both for and against the proposal.

RESOLVED that

(1) approval be given to the conversion of existing time limited parking bays and disabled bay into Pay and Display parking bays and waiting restriction to time limited loading ban as indicated on drawing number ETD/9690/1;

(2) the estimated cost of £ 7,650 be allocated from this year's capital budget for parking; and

(3) the success of the scheme be reviewed in 12 months time.

**91 GREEN GARDEN WASTE
Report ES03385**

The Portfolio Holder received a report on the difficulties with the collection service which included the fluctuation in demand making planning difficult, the variable quality of the material collected and the cost of the service exceeded the charge made to the customer. Also, changes had been made to the service since it had first been introduced making it more efficient but less popular.

It was therefore proposed to bring the charges more into line with costs by increasing the cost of the collection stickers. The true cost to the customer would be £1.30 but it would be critical not to let the number below 50,000 or costs would increase further. It was proposed to increase the price to £1 per sticker initially and a further increase in the future but subject to review.

The Portfolio Holder agreed that it was necessary to strike a balance between providing an efficient service to customers who could not compost at home or take material to a Satellite Site whilst avoiding the danger of attracting more waste. The Portfolio Holder supported the greater use of the Satellite Sites where the delivered waste could be composted and that resources should be directed accordingly.

RESOLVED that

(1) the current policy whereby Green Garden Waste is not collected as part of the weekly collection of household waste be continued;

(2) the budget for the Green Garden Waste Collection scheme be re-directed to provide funding for approximately 50 Garden Waste Satellite

Site weekends, to be provided at selected sites in the Borough during the 25 weekends between 17th April and 3rd October and appropriate publicity be given;

(3) the cost of Green Garden Waste stickers be increased from 1/03/04 to £1.30 each (subject to review in December 2004 or earlier) to move towards reflecting the cost to the Council of providing the service; and

(4) promotion of home composting and publicity for any changes be made through the Spring and Summer of 2004.

**92 REVIEW OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ENGAGING THE PUBLIC - FINDINGS OF THE WORKING PARTY REVIEW GROUP
Report ES03393**

A review had been carried out on the methods of consultation for traffic and transportation schemes by a working group of officers with Councillors Owen and Huntington Thresher. The report of the conclusions of the review had been considered by the Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on 14th January.

The review built on the good practice used nationally and locally. The existing methods already adopted and exceeded the minimum requirements laid down by statute. The Group had recognised that the advantage of investing in consultation at an early stage was that it saved on abortive costs at later construction stages.

The main changes were the proposal to produce an advance notice of the programme for Ward Members and to involve them in the risk assessment of the extent of the consultation. Early notification of works before expenditure had accrued would alert Members to potential works in their Ward. Members had been critical that they were unaware of works until an advanced stage. This measure would improve their awareness of pending issues. The involvement of Ward Members in the risk assessment would help to scope the size and composition of the consultation exercise. More controversial projects already had a more detailed approach and a wider scope of consultation. The involvement of Ward Members would also encourage their participation in problem solving. Details of the procedure were circulated. A chart illustrating the consultation process would be amended and referred back to the PDS Committee.

The initial review had been confined to traffic and transportation schemes but it was felt that other areas could usefully be investigated.

RESOLVED that

(1) the consultation procedures for traffic and transportation schemes be adopted as Council policy; and

(2) the review be extended to consultation on planning matters and licensing applications with the terms of reference to be agreed by the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with Councillors Owen and Huntington Thresher.

**93 OLD HILL, GREEN STREET GREEN: RESULTS OF CONSULTATION
Report ES04017**

Residents of Old Hill, Green Street Green, had requested that action be taken to prevent or restrict the volume and speed of traffic using this road to avoid congestion on the A21. Residents claimed that during peak periods Old Hill carried about 50% of the traffic volume of that on the A21 although it was far narrower and much less suitable. The most recent traffic surveys indicated 470 vehicles used Old Hill in the morning peak whilst 1250 used the A21.

Consultation had been carried out which indicated a majority of residents in favour of closing Old Hill at its junction with Shire Lane. However the Beechwood Estate Residents' Association were opposed to the proposal as were the Fire Service and the Police.

There had been one accident in Old Hill involving serious injury and two with slight injuries that had occurred during the last three years. Council criteria required there to be a minimum of 5 "Killed or Seriously injured" incidents in the preceding three year period before a road would be considered for possible treatment. There was no case to make Old Hill a priority at this time or to seek funding from the Mayor of London who would have to be satisfied that there was justification for a traffic scheme. A further traffic survey would be undertaken in due course.

RESOLVED that no action be taken at the present time.

**94 TESCO DEVELOPMENT AT STATION ROAD CAR PARK
Report LDS04013**

The Development Control Committee was considering a planning application for the redevelopment of the Station Road multi storey car park. The Committee had expressed concern over the problems that could occur during the course of construction since this part of Orpington would be deprived of off-street parking spaces, there could be congestion due to the delivery of materials and there could be increased on-street parking generated by construction workers. The Portfolio Holder for the Environment was asked to consider these concerns and ensure that suitable arrangements were made to reduce the impact of the development.

The Portfolio Holder accepted that although there would be inconvenience on a temporary basis, Orpington would benefit permanently in the long term. It was reported that in order to minimise disruption the Director of Environment had been developing plans to mitigate the parking problems during this period.

Parking surveys had been carried out at the Station Road Car Park which had revealed that at peak periods the car park was only used at between 60 – 70% capacity. The most difficult period would be during the demolition and construction of the car park with the loss of 834 car parking places that were used by about 520 cars at the peak times every day.

It was therefore proposed that alternative off street car parking be provided in the following priority:-

1. The Council had an obligation to the leaseholders of spaces. Negotiations were well advanced to provide off street parking in the alternative car parks in the town centre.
2. It was proposed to utilise existing underused capacity in other car parks in the town centre for other users.
3. It was planned to create or promote the use of near/existing off street car parking away from the town centre.

However, there were not enough spaces off street to accommodate the total loss of parking caused by the closure of the car park and parking spaces would need to be provided on street. A strategy had been developed based on a zoning principle where parking nearest to the town centre would be short stay parking to satisfy and support the needs of local traders and the local economy. Further out of the town centre, spaces would be created for medium stay parking for local businesses and the furthest zone from the town centre would be designated for all day parking.

In addition it was proposed to create additional on street parking in streets close to the railway station. In developing the proposals efforts would be made to ensure that road safety was not compromised and the free flow of traffic maintained. During this development period some of the yellow line waiting restrictions originally provided to give environmental protection for local residents would be lifted on a temporary basis. The Council would also offer businesses travel plan advice on the alternative methods of travelling to the town and the benefits of promoting car sharing, cycling and walking as modes of transport.

The Portfolio Holder endorsed a policy of working with the developer and the contractors on minimising disruption to the area. It was proposed to promote a “Considerate Contractor Scheme” and to encourage the contractor to provide parking facilities off site for the construction workers.

The Development Control Committee had also highlighted issues concerning traffic management aspects of the scheme in the area - including the new traffic lights/access and egress points and delivery vehicles on Augustus Lane - which would have a consequential impact on the rest of Orpington. These matters were being considered by the Director of Environmental Services with the proposed developers.

Having considered the proposals the Portfolio Holder was confident that the Council would be able to do everything possible to mitigate the inevitable disruption and inconvenience during reconstruction in the event that planning permission was granted.

RESOLVED that the Development Control Committee be advised of the action being taken.

95 SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL – KELSEY WAY, BECKENHAM – PRIVATE STREET WORKS – RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL Report ES04020

This scheme, to provide a footpath and landscape the unadopted section of Kelsey Way had previously been approved by the Portfolio Holder and the first Resolution had been passed under the Private Street Works Code. The scheme was being funded by Transport for London as part of the Safer Routes to School programme and it was reported that it would now be possible to carry out the works during this financial year.

The possibility of installing warning signs or carriageway markings in Village Way would be considered to aid children crossing this road.

The next stage in the formal process required a further resolution by the Portfolio Holder concerning estimates and apportionment of costs.

RESOLVED that the specification, plan (Drawing No. ETD/9627/4) section and typical detail shown on Drawing No ETD/9627/5, estimate and provisional apportionment submitted by the Director of Environmental Services in respect of the scheme approved by the Portfolio Holder on 4th September 2003 be approved without modification..

George Taylor
Portfolio Holder
For the Environment

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm