ENVIRONMENT
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 14\textsuperscript{th} October 2009

Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)
Councillor Julian Grainger (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Samaris Huntington-Thresher (part meeting),
Tom Papworth, Sarah Phillips and Denise Reddin

Also present

Councillors Colin Smith (Environment Portfolio Holder)
Councillor George Taylor (Executive Assistant)
Councillor Ruth Bennett (for item 6F)

35. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Brian Toms and Colin Willetts. Councillors Samaris Huntington-Thresher also sent her apologies for late arrival.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ruth Bennett as a visiting Member for item 6F declared a personal interest as a Governor of Princes Plain Primary School.

37. QUESTIONS FOR THE PDS CHAIRMAN FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were no questions to the PDS Chairman.

38. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21\textsuperscript{ST} SEPTEMBER 2009

The minutes were agreed subject to:

(i) the second sentence of page 41 being amended to read -

“It was also recommended by the Committee that six months of accident data needed to be available when reconsidering this scheme” and

(ii) the second sentence of resolution (i) at page 41 being amended to read -

“It was also recommended by the Committee that the scheme be reviewed in 12 months when six months of accident data would be available.”
RESOLVED that the minutes be agreed subject to the above amendments.

HOLDING THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

39. QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

Two questions had been received from Councillor Papworth for oral reply along with a further question for written reply. Councillor Getgood, Councillor Willetts and Sue Gibbens also submitted questions for written reply. Details of all questions received and responses are at Appendix A.

40. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

The Committee scrutinised proposed decisions of the Environment Portfolio Holder in the reports listed below.

(A) WINTER STRATEGY FOR FOOTWAYS
Report ES09118

Following the report on Winter Maintenance Performance for the Portfolio Holder scrutinised by the Committee on 1st June 2009, Members considered a further report on the strategy for treating footways during severe freezing weather conditions.

The Council as a Highway Authority is required under the Highways Act 1980 to maintain the highways with a duty to ensure ‘so far as is reasonably practicable’ that people travelling on a road are not endangered by snow or ice. The responsibility for salting the “highway” is not limited to the area for vehicular traffic but also to areas open to the public for foot passage, including pavements and cycle ways. However, an authority is not required to guarantee safe passage, but only to secure this where it is ‘reasonably practicable’.

The Council has a Winter Maintenance Policy and Plan in place to address its responsibilities which is reviewed annually to reflect changes to the highway network, road and footway hierarchy and methods of working. Members were informed of the different operational approaches taken for snow clearance on both carriageways and footways.

For footways during severe freezing conditions pavements are pre-treated in normal working hours in main retail centres and approaches to
transport interchanges. In the event of severe winter conditions involving snowfall, daylight operations are also carried out treating a secondary route network. An appendix to the report before the Committee detailed the streets (both priority and secondary) for snow clearance and salting treatment operations.

There were practical difficulties however in providing a comprehensive treatment for all parts of the footway network and response times could vary depending upon the severity of the prevailing weather conditions. When the priority and secondary route network pavements were treated resources would then be deployed to the remainder of the footway network.

Details were also provided of the Council’s method for footway and footpath salting. Snow clearance had developed following extensive evaluation of the range of mechanical and manual machinery on the market. Following the extreme conditions of February 2009 Members were informed that updates were being considered for the Winter Maintenance policy and plan including:

- trialling the use of a brine solution for de-icing pavements as a pre-treatment option; and
- inclusion within the footway priority network of eight ‘walking bus’ routes and pavements outside schools as a pre-treatment measure.

In discussion Members broadly supported the approach to winter service operations for footways and it was suggested that the Portfolio Holder’s decision should include reference to the pre-treatment of footways approaching stations and high streets as well as the Borough’s schools (final part of the recommendation in Report ES09118).

A Member congratulated the Department on its response to the conditions experienced during February 2009 and endorsed the proposed trialling of a brine solution in pre-treating pavements for de-icing purposes.

It was suggested that routes listed for footways and footpath treatment might benefit from further detail on geographical proximity and that the data base used for producing the list be further checked to ensure that information was as accurate as possible. A more flexible approach to treatment was also suggested e.g. treating one roadside footway rather than both.

As a further suggestion it was felt that a priority should be given to the steepest hills within the secondary list for post treatment; reference was also made to locations that are continually shaded. An enquiry was made on
whether some of the Council’s equipment for use in severe snow and ice events could be hired out for productive use by others when not used during winter conditions.

In further discussion Members were advised that Met Office services can help in targeting areas for attention although no provision was available for 24-hour standby arrangements and footway operations on the secondary route network were carried out as a reactive measure following a severe snowfall event.

An enquiry was also made on whether School Travel Plans take account of snow events and it was agreed to take this forward for consideration. A Member suggested that it might be helpful for the workforce of street cleansing and highway maintenance contractors to be available for footway clearance in advance of the evening rush hour given that travel difficulties had previously been experienced at this time during snow events.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm the approach to winter service operations involving snow clearance of footways identified in the schedule of streets for treatment contained at Appendix A of Report ES09118 - including the addition of prioritised pre-treatment of footways approaching the Borough’s schools, stations and high streets.

(B) WALNUTS ESTATE, ORPINGTON – PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
Report ES09122

The roads concerned with the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) were residential lying within an area known locally as the Walnuts Estate, Orpington (Walnuts Road, Uplands Road, Homefield Rise and Horsecroft Close). Resident concerns for vehicle parking by non-residents - believed to utilise the leisure centre, attend lessons at the college or shop at the town centre - led to investigation and subsequent consultation (undertaken in August 2009).

From a 41% response rate to the consultation, 43 residents indicated support for the proposed CPZ (Option 1) comprising residents' permit bays located primarily on the public footway and operating from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday inclusive. Only three residents favoured a second option offering marked free unrestricted parking bays (also sited primarily on the public footway). 20 residents were opposed to any type of bays being laid down.
In the light of officer investigation and consultation response, approval was being sought for implementation of the proposed CPZ described in Option 1. The CPZ would be in line with other similar parking schemes in the Borough with the cost for a resident’s permit being £75 per annum and a book containing 15 visitor vouchers costing £30.

Many unlawful vehicle manoeuvres were taking place from public highway to private premises and vice-versa in sections where no properly constructed dropped crossover existed. Members were informed that a discount could be offered to residents living in Walnuts Road and Uplands Road for a dropped crossover to be constructed as the roads were due to have footway refurbishment works carried out. Homefield Rise and Horsecroft Close had such works carried out in the last few years so a smaller discount could be offered to the residents of these roads. During consultation 27 residents expressed an interest in such a discount. It was of benefit to the Council to have as many residents as possible pay for the construction of a dropped crossover – altercations would be avoided between residents not possessing a lawful crossover and motorists parking lawfully within the bays positioned wherever dropped crossovers do not exist.

In discussion the Committee expressed its support for the scheme. A suggestion was made that some free spaces be made available for non-residents perhaps following a subsequent review of the scheme. The Chairman confirmed that such schemes were normally reviewed after about six months of operation and referring to the consultation outcomes and provision of other car parks in the Orpington area offering free parking, he confirmed his inclination to support the proposed scheme as outlined.

**RESOLVED** that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

1. implement the proposed Controlled Parking Zone as shown on Plan ESD-10462-1a comprising resident permit bays located primarily on the public footway (listed as Option 1 in the consultation process); and

2. set the cost for a resident’s permit at £75 per annum and set the cost for a book containing 15 visitor vouchers at £30 in line with other similar parking schemes in the Borough.

**C** ASHFIELD LANE/LOOP ROAD, CHISLEHURST – LOCAL SAFETY SCHEME
Report ES09123

The Ashfield Lane/Loop Road junction was located at Chislehurst Common on a busy route and used by traffic to avoid delays on the A222 particularly at the War Memorial junction of Bromley Road and Centre
Common Road. In the five years to April 2009 there had been 13 injury accidents at the Ashfield Lane/ Loop Road roundabout caused by vehicles failing to give way. Two accidents involved cyclists and the others involved injury to motor-vehicle occupants. Accidents at mini-roundabouts were not uncommon but seldom involved injury as speeds tended to be low. However, the high number of injuries at the Ashfield Lane/ Loop Road junction suggested that impact speeds had been higher.

Following public consultation there was general support for measures to improve road safety at the junction. The proposed measures comprised realignment of kerbs and provision of buff colour strips on the carriageway on all four approaches to the junction.

Members considered the proposed scheme and comment was made about the direction of deflection. Overall the scheme was supported (as detailed in drawing number 60097234/C/01) and it was **RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:**

- kerbs are realigned to provide deflection on all approaches to lower speeds;
- buff coloured strips be placed on the road on all approaches to highlight the need for caution at the roundabout – these strips not to be rumble strips;
- consideration be given at a later stage, when the scheme is reviewed, to adding yellow backing plates to the roundabout signs;
- the scheme construction and legal costs of £26k be met from the Transport for London budget for Local Safety Schemes.
- authority to make any further minor modifications which might arise as a result of any further consultations or considerations, such as the provision of yellow backing board signs, be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.

**(D) HAWTHORN GROVE – PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**  
Report ES09095

Hawthorn Grove was a residential street in Penge. An access road with a small electricity sub station beside it leads from Hawthorn Grove to three residential houses - numbers 31, 33 and 35 - and difficulties had been experienced by motorists emerging from the access road into Hawthorn Grove. Motorists had also experienced difficulties when emerging from nearby Chestnut Grove into Hawthorne Grove and requests had been received from residents in both locations, requesting ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions (double yellow lines).
In consultation with residents a majority of respondents were against a proposal for double yellow lines across the access road to 31-35 Hawthorn Grove (two for and seven against) and most of those objecting did so because too many parking spaces would be lost and there would be little alternative parking available in the vicinity. Consequently it was not proposed to implement the double yellow lines at this section of the road and there would, in any case, be a planned introduction of double yellow lines around the junction of Hawthorn Grove with Oakfield Road, to be implemented later in the year as part of a 20 mph scheme. These would have the effect of improving the sightline sufficiently for those emerging from the access road leading from house numbers 31, 33 and 35 into Hawthorn Grove.

Concerning the proposed double yellow lines at the junction with Chestnut Grove there was one respondent for the proposal and one against. The one objection was also in respect of lost parking space and it had been suggested in response that the double yellow lines should only be installed on the eastern side of the junction, outside house number 37.

Members supported the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder and to enable consideration of any subsequent Ward Councillor views it was suggested that any further modification to the scheme be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services following consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- approve the proposed waiting restrictions outside house number 37, at the junction of Chestnut Grove with Hawthorn Grove, Penge as shown on plan ESD/10422/2;
- not implement waiting restrictions in the vicinity of house numbers 31, 33 and 35; and
- delegate any further changes to the Director of Environmental Services following consultation with the Portfolio Holder, and Ward Members.

(E) BLENHEIM ROAD, ORPINGTON – PROPOSED WAITNG RESTRICTIONS
Report ES09096

Blenheim Road was a residential street with a campus containing Blenheim Primary School, a Children’s Centre, Nursery and part of the Orpington College campus.
Concerns had been raised by delivery drivers utilising the driveway to the premises that their access was being impeded by the presence of parked vehicles near the school entrance in Blenheim Road. Difficulties were also experienced turning out from the school campus on to Blenheim Road and a request via the school was made to extend existing waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on both sides of the road from the junction with Eldred Drive to the campus entrance. Implementing the extra double yellow lines would make it safer and more convenient for vehicles entering and exiting the premises. Outcomes from consultation with residents (ten letters were delivered) resulted in four replies, three of which favoured the proposed waiting restrictions with one opposed.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to implement the proposed waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) outside Blenheim Primary School as shown on map ESD10491-1.

(F) PRINCES PLAIN/CHURCH LANE – PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
Report ES09120

Princes Plain and Church Lane were residential roads, with both Princes Plain Primary School and the Education Development Centre located at the cul-de-sac section of Princes Plain. Residents had expressed concerns at dangers presented when motorists parked their vehicles close to the junction of Princes Plain with Church Lane causing sightline difficulties, particularly at times when children were dropped off or collected from school and the roads were busy. Implementing ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at this junction would improve safety. Consultation with 16 residents and the school and education development centre resulted in ten respondents in favour of the proposed waiting restrictions with no objections received.

Councillor Ruth Bennett as a visiting Member for this item expressed her support for the measures proposed and this was endorsed by the Committee.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the implementation of waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction of Princes Plain with Church Lane as shown on Plan ESD-10480-1.
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(G) HIGHCOMBE CLOSE, MOTTINGHAM – PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
Report ES09121

Highcombe Close was a residential cul de sac in Mottingham with a petrol station adjacent to its entrance.

Following concerns expressed by residents that vehicles were being parked throughout the day by commuters using Mottingham train station, Highcombe Close was initially considered for a residents’ parking scheme. However the section of road was considered unsuitable for such a scheme due to the small geographical area affected and the fact that parking opportunities existed further along the close.

The introduction of double yellow lines at the junction of Highcombe Close and Mottingham Road would provide a more suitable parking scheme which would improve safety for residents entering and exiting the close. In consultation with 30 residents on the proposal, seven residents indicated their support for the proposed waiting restrictions and no written objections were received.

In considering the report Members expressed their support for implementation of the waiting restrictions.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to implement the proposed waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction of Highcombe Close with Mottingham Lane, as shown on Plan ESD-10481-1.

(H) HOBLINGWELL WOOD RECREATION GROUND
Report ES09126

In progressing consultation for the proposals by ‘Woodland Environmental’ at Hoblingwell Wood (i.e. licensed tipping of inert fill material to produce bunding to stop cars driven by joy riders, a series of levelled raised playing fields and substantial tree planting, landscaping and general park improvements at nil cost to the Authority) two exhibitions took place in August 2009 as local public information events. At the first meeting 148 persons questioned said no to the Hoblingwell Wood proposal (with 12 indicating yes and a further 11 not knowing). At the second meeting 233 residents indicated their opposition to the proposals with 75 in support of the proposals and 13 not knowing.

During the information sharing process there were also a number of separate petitions against the proposals which have been formally received by the Director of Environmental Services. Over 1500 signatures were recorded.
against the proposals to develop the site through landfill. Strong objections to the scheme concerned the construction phase with lorries delivering the inert fill material (noise, dust, risk of accident, damage to infrastructure and loss of facilities) and the changed landscape as a result of the landfill.

The significant interest by local residents in the matter has created a strong sense of place, pride and ownership by the community and a public meeting was held at Leesons Primary School on 6th October 2009 to gauge whether a ‘Friends of Hoblingwell’ Group could be formed.

In considering the report Members supported the view that the proposals should now be abandoned. Members also received a brief update following a meeting on 6th October 2009 to establish a “Friends of Hoblingwell Wood” Group. The feeling from the 6th October meeting was that a Friends Group could be established and a steering group would take matters forward. It was hoped that the Friends Group would be constituted in the New Year.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be advised to:

- note the response from public consultations indicating a majority against the development proposals at Hoblingwell Wood;
- note that petitions were received against the proposals;
- note the view of Ward Members that the proposals should not now be taken forward;
- formally abandon proposals for the scheme; and
- note an oral update from officers following a meeting on 6th October 2009 to establish a ‘Friends of Hoblingwell Wood’.

(I) PLAYBUILDER GRANT
Report DCYP09140

The London Borough of Bromley had been allocated Playbuilder Grant Funding of £1,123,274 capital and £44,903 revenue over the financial years 2009 to 2011 to develop a stipulated minimum of 22 play facilities for improving the quality of play facilities for children aged 8 to 13 years. Development could be a mixture of refurbishment and new-build.

Award of the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) grant had been made to the Children and Young People Portfolio with the Environment Portfolio overseeing implementation of the improvement
programme to parks and open spaces. Use of the grant in Bromley would build on work undertaken in implementing the Bromley Play Strategy.

In identifying schemes (22 sites), priority had been given to those representing invest-to-save priorities for the Borough through refurbishment of existing play facilities. A significant proportion of the developments funded by Playbuilder Grant already featured on the Council’s priorities for refurbishment of park play facilities ensuring better value for money for local residents. The delivery of the Playbuilder programme would be phased as Year 1 to feature the refurbishment priorities and Year 2 to conclude the refurbishment priorities and introduce a limited number of new low cost developments incurring no additional on-going expense.

Members were informed of outcomes from consideration of the report by the Children and Young People PDS Committee the same evening. The Committee supported the CYP PDS view that Ward Members should be consulted on the proposed sites and agreed that the Portfolio Holder should be asked to note the selected sites at this stage rather than endorse them.

Councillor George Taylor speaking in a ward Member capacity outlined his misgivings that the funding was not being provided for optimum use suggesting a preference to see it being provided for schools. He also referred to the need for full consultation on the proposed sites and felt that not all the sites seemed suitable. It was important for him to know the views of his residents on the project in his ward. Another Member referred to the importance of looking at the sites and project descriptions in depth.

The Portfolio Holder also felt that the funding should have been provided for school upkeep purposes but as it had been allocated for a specific use he explained that significant efforts had been made for the Year 1 projects to feature existing park play facilities already included on the Council’s refurbishment priorities.

The Head of Parks and Greenspace outlined the reasoning behind the projects identified for Year 1 and Year 2. He also referred to the need to spend the grant money explaining that new sites could be found if necessary and referring to the availability of a reserve list of sites.

An enquiry was made on whether more could be obtained from the grant by reducing funding for an existing proposed site in order to provide a further site. Members were advised that although this was possible the grant would remain the same and that using it on a minimum of 22 sites would demonstrate visible projects.

The Chairman enquired about any environmental impact of the schemes and Members were informed that they were sympathetic to the
environment with an environmental impact assessment undertaken on each scheme. Confirmation was also provided that playground policy required facilities to be within a quarter of a mile of habitation.

In concluding discussion the Chairman recommended that consultation be undertaken with all Ward Members on the selected sites and not solely Members of Wards directly affected by the proposals given that a scheme could have impact outside of a ward boundary.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) note the selected sites for improved play facilities for children and young people in the Borough;

(2) consult all Ward Members and other interested parties on the selected sites;

(3) approve the delivery mechanism, broad timetable and staffing arrangements as set out in the body of the report; and

(4) give approval, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992, for planning applications to be submitted in respect of schemes proposed at Darrick Wood, Havelock, High Elms, Kings Road, Mottingham Woods, South Hill Wood and Sparrows Den.

(V) VICTORIA ROAD, CHISLEHURST – PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

Report ES09124

Waiting restrictions were proposed following concerns raised by Veolia, the Council’s Waste Services contractor, about access difficulties for refuse vehicles undertaking collections in Victoria Road, Chislehurst. A consultation with local residents on proposed waiting restrictions covering the period of 8am to noon on Wednesdays (the usual day for refuse collections) resulted in eleven replies of which two were in favour of the waiting restrictions and nine were against.

In view of the comments received from residents it was recommended that the waiting restrictions should not be implemented although the situation would be monitored and waiting restrictions reconsidered if the on-street parking problems worsened.
RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to note the outcome of the residents consultation and endorse the assessment that waiting restrictions should not be implemented.

41. ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO – PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Previous decisions of the Environment Portfolio Holder were noted.

42. CARBON MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME: PROGRESS REPORT 2008/09

There was no report for this item which would be taken forward to a future meeting.

43. CARBON REDUCTION COMMITMENT PREPARATION REPORT

There was no report for this item which would be taken forward to a future meeting.

In closing it was agreed that the Committee’s next meeting on 16th November 2009 should start at 7pm rather than 7.30pm.

Chairman

The meeting finished at 9.10 pm
Appendix A

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL RESPONSE

Questions from Councillor Papworth

Question 1

To ask the Portfolio Holder, in light of his report in response to my written question, to comment on whether he is satisfied with the state of cleanliness of Anerley Road and the Council's response to residents' complaints.

Reply

Taking into account the extensive efforts undertaken locally, details of which I am sure you will pass on in full to all enquiring third parties, I am extremely content with the Officers' response to local residents concerns.

Levels of cleanliness in any road in the Borough will continue to vary from time to time dependent on either the degree of anti social behaviour demonstrated by a small minority of residents living locally, or transient visitors passing through. In either case the Council's Street Services team will continue to proactively clean up any mess they cause, prosecuting offenders wherever it proves possible to do so, as swiftly as it practically can.

I would like to thank the relevant officers for their extra efforts and resource that they have expended locally in recent months and hope you feel it appropriate and able to join me in doing so.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Papworth highlighted a meeting with Officers in April at which reference was made to an increased emphasis in addressing cleanliness. Councillor Papworth enquired about the effectiveness of measures and any further action that might be taken.

Reply

The Portfolio Holder explained that efforts had been undertaken and Anerley was getting more than its fair share of resources. He confirmed that Officers would monitor the situation.
Question 2

To ask the Portfolio Holder what action the Council plans to take to improve road safety in Fox Hill and Belvedere Road, SE19, both of which are subject to speeding traffic.

Reply

Following concerns raised by residents of these roads, officers have investigated the accident history of the two roads. There have been two accidents here in the last three years, one in Belvedere Road and one in Fox Hill, neither was speed related.

This being the case any major change to the roads locally would not be appropriate given there are other roads with more accidents within the Borough that need to be prioritised on safety grounds.

That said, after liaising with L.B.Croydon (as Fox Hill is on the Borough boundary), officers have agreed to install some road side posters to alert drivers to issues of inappropriate speed and to add a temporary electronic vehicle activated sign as soon as one becomes available.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Papworth explained that the electronic vehicle activated sign was not in place by the date he had been informed of by officers.

Reply

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that he had made efforts to follow up this matter and referred to the need for repair measures but would need to check what these comprised. He highlighted the importance of keeping Members informed where deadlines had not been met - not to keep Members informed was, he felt, unacceptable.

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN ANSWER

Question from Councillor Papworth

Question 3

To ask the Portfolio Holder to provide a detailed written report on what additional measures were taken to improve the street cleanliness and waste removal, and to address fly tipping, in Anerley Road, SE19/SE20, following my meeting with officers and residents in Anerley Road on 20 April 2009; and
in addition to ask what impact this has had on road cleanliness and waste and how this was measured/monitored.

Reply

Cleansing and safety

Officers made an in-depth inspection of the area on 22\textsuperscript{nd} April following complaints of unsatisfactory street cleanliness. Additional litter bins were subsequently ordered and we now have bins as close as practically possible to all bus stops as well as in other areas and we have also introduced on street re-cycle bins. The road is scheduled to be cleansed daily but it has been agreed that an additional litter pick would be organised between 2pm and 3pm daily, as heavy footfall in the area around midday resulted in a lot of litter.

Inspections are undertaken on a weekly basis to monitor safety and to ensure the area is kept to standard and residents’ complaints have dropped.

Waste Services

On 9\textsuperscript{th} May, officers from Environmental Services carried out an operation where approx 12 bags of rubbish were found on the footway these were opened and evidence found which indicated they had been left out by local businesses. Visits have been made to the premises in question.

Follow up: The Waste Advisor visits the area 2/3 times weekly giving advice on storage of waste and information on Fixed Penalty Fines (FPFs). The contractor has reported that this has resulted in a reduction of bags being left on the highway.

Enforcement

The Enforcement Officer visits this area twice a week. Any rubbish found on the highway he inspects for evidence and if he is able to ascertain the correct address will issue FPNs. He also places stickers on the bags advertising the fact that they are being investigated. As part of the ongoing efforts to resolve the problem of fly tipped rubbish we are looking at placing signs at points where the main problems arise. These signs will be of a similar design to those recently put in at green waste sites, but obviously smaller, but we do not yet have a date when these signs will be in place.
Questions from Councillor Colin Willetts

Question

Having come across an AD HOC security contractor who was having difficulty with exterior perimeter gate key/padlock to access/inspect the Leesons Centre 6/10/09 at 1.30pm, I requested assistance from an on site English Landscape contractor to open the gate to allow AD HOC to carry out his duties whereupon he (English Landscapes) without reason became very obstreperous. In any future difficulties, could English Landscapes perhaps use their common sense, check I.D. validity (as I did) and allow contractor/s to go about their business without the need to bring the Council into disrepute.

Reply

I am in no position to know and have no intention of tying to second guess the conversation which took place that day, but am advised by English Landscapes as follows:

- At the time of the incident the Ward Member did not offer any personal ID
- The English Landscapes operative did not know either the Ward Member or officer from AD HOC security
- The EL staff member considered the request would be a breach of security and he had no authority to let anyone else on to the site
- In hindsight the matter should have been brought to the Council’s attention through the appropriate management channel

As a result, any similar requests to operatives in the future will be forwarded straight to the Council for decision/recording through English Landscapes initially.

Question

Would you be able to assist the following adjacent residents in their request for removal of litter build up on footway slope (Ms Tasha Arnold 79 Leesons Hill), removal of beer cans in alley (Ms Emily Burley 93 Leesons Hill), removal of leaves on bottom of steps/main footway (OAP Mrs Patricia Bray 157 Leesons Hill) and removal of horse chestnut debris all over highway cul de sac end (Ms Emily Brookshaw 244 Chipperfield Road)?

Reply

The Area Manager (East) advises me that he has already done so.
Questions from Councillor Getgood

Question

As you may be aware, the Royston Residents Association have been campaigning for an alley gating scheme in their area. In his response to my question at Council on 30th July, the Portfolio Holder for Public Safety confirmed that his team had identified that the Royston estate met the criteria for alley gating. He then passed the responsibility to Environment to facilitate the formal decision and identify the appropriate funding.

Has there been any progress on this?

Reply

Yes, there has been, and I'm pleased to report that the consultation with residents is due to commence this month.

The consultation requires a 28 day period before any final decision can be made, so I shall therefore be able to confirm whether we will proceed with this request, based on the residents' majority view, by early December.

If the majority of residents are in support of proceeding, ordering and installation of the gates will take approximately 10 weeks which means that they could be in situ some time during February 2010.

Question

Has the Council had to make any insurance payouts for damage incurred at the Southborough Road width restriction?

Reply

No, the Council has not had to make any insurance payouts for damage to vehicles that have collided with the width restriction in Southborough Road.

Question

What progress has been made on meeting the changes to the Highway signage as a result of the 2002 regulations?

Reply

Every few years there are changes to be made to street signage in line with new guidance from the Department for Transport, and Bromley generally makes these changes as and when opportunity arises. Aspects of the Traffic
Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 refer to changes which must all be made by April 2014.

**Question from Sue Gibbens**

**Question**

Would the Portfolio Holder have the footway frontage of Grays Farm Primary School (Grays Farm Road) swept of heavy leaf debris?

**Reply**

This will, or already has been dealt with as a standard operational matter according to the relevant work schedule.

**Question**

Would the Portfolio Holder get five sacks of branch arisings dumped on the frontage amenity green adjacent to 59 Broomwood Rd removed (in situ since 5/10/09) as soon as possible.

**Reply**

As you should recall from your time on Council, if you report fly tipping to the Council's Helpdesk, jobs such as this will be automatically undertaken as standard operational items.

Although officers will always be very happy to pass your requests on, bringing them to Committee to feature as part of your impending election campaign material, is not serving the best interest of the residents you seek to represent. Doing so slows the whole process down, resulting in the offending material sitting uncollected for longer than it needs to be.

**Question**

With regard to the fly tipping in Cotmandene Crescent car park, I appreciate that enforcement action is being/will be taken. However, having previously reported fly tipping covering the length of 2-3 parking bays on a number of occasions I seriously doubt this is inspected/removed three times a week (Mr Radmore's email 3/9/09) - thus would it be possible to have this area inspected daily for inspection/removal?

**Reply**

Routine visits to the car park are currently carried out, the waste collection contractor visits the car park three times weekly to remove any large dumped
items and the recycling bank area is also scheduled for a daily early morning clean by the street cleansing contractor.

It is not proposed to alter the existing service for this area however officers will continue to monitor the situation on an ad-hoc basis for contract compliance and enforcement purposes. If you come across any similar issues with street cleanliness, please let us know by contacting the Council’s Customer Service Centre.