



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Lynn Hill
lynn.hill@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7700

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 29 October 2010

COUNCIL

Meeting held on Monday 25 October 2010

- 6 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WHERE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN. (Pages 3 - 30)**
- 7 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings

This page is left intentionally blank

MEETING

25th OCTOBER 2010

ORAL QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Leader of the Council

What plans the Council has to support and encourage local residents groups, schools and other organisations to celebrate Her Majesty the Queen's Diamond Jubilee in 2012?

Reply:

Councillor Carr thanked the member for his question and advised that at this stage the Council had no plans to support and encourage schools, local groups or organisations to celebrate Her Majesty the Queen's Diamond Jubilee in 2012. However, as had been shown this year for the 70th Anniversary of the Battle of Britain arrangements were made for various appropriate events to mark the occasion that were well supported by local residents. The Leader had spoken to Officers and was sure that there would be suitable arrangements made to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee at that time.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett commented that it was only 14 months from the start of the Diamond Jubilee year and it would be the first time for 115 years that the nation would have celebrated such an occasion. The local residents association in his own ward had set up a committee to organise local events and he felt it was important for the Council to act in a co-ordinating role across the Borough to ensure events did not clash. He suggested some form of co-ordinating committee be set up to ensure this was the case.

Reply:

The Leader of the Council agreed with Councillor Bennett and said that in his conversations with Officers on this issue arrangements would commence over the forthcoming months to deal with this.

2. From Councillor Julian Grainger of the Chairman of the Environment PDS Committee

Displacement by parking schemes

In the last 12 months, for traffic or parking schemes considered by the PDS, please can the Chairman list those schemes that have:

- a) addressed the issue of displacement of vehicles
- b) provided an estimate of the number of cars to be displaced.

Reply:

All traffic and parking schemes consider the possible displacement of vehicles. Even the loss a few parking places to allow the introduction of a traffic calming feature can have a detrimental effect on residents which must be weighed against the increase in their quality of life from slower traffic. This was one of the purposes of the consultation process. Typically the consultation would include properties, in the same road, a short distance from the changes to capture comments which could include issues such as displacement.

Parking schemes may also displace commonly used traffic routes, increasing the flow of traffic along the road concerned. Whilst this can reduce congestion it may have other detrimental environmental effects. The consultation would also hope to address this issue.

Where this feedback was received, officers used this information in the design of the scheme, and a summary of significant residents' comments was presented to the PDS alongside the officer's response. This had been the procedure adopted over many years.

Over the past decade the majority of parking schemes had been small in scale and the expected displacement had been small. Schemes were designed to minimise inconvenience for residents whilst also avoiding displacing commuters etc. further than was necessary. Typically the result was to spread the concentration of parking over a wider area, to relieve the pressure on residents living nearest to the destination.

With any scheme it was never an exact science as to where displaced vehicles would move to. The cost of detailed parking and traffic surveys, which established where people were travelling from, was very high and often did not help with the design process, as the surveys did not establish where drivers would re-locate their parking or traffic route to.

It had, therefore, been common practice to revisit schemes to determine and address unacceptable aspects which could include unacceptable displacement and other unintended consequences.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Grainger asked whether the Chairman was aware that 9 schemes during the past 12 months referred to displacement but only one quantified that displacement in reference to the 61 bus route. He quoted various figures and said that the scheme element for these displaced cars was then dropped. Given that the Orpington Area Parking Scheme seemed likely to displace over 200 cars, he asked if the Chairman agreed that the PDS Committee should have been provided with displacement numbers and also options for managing this. He also commented that the decision of the PDS Committee to defer a displacement scheme was understandable but would the Chairman agree that there was too great a number involved just to wait and see.

Reply:

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher replied that as he had already indicated assessment of the displacement was not an exact science as to where the displaced cars would move to or where they came from and it was also an expensive exercise. It may involve a variety of factors which he briefly referred to. However, there had been examples in the past where reassessment of a traffic scheme had involved the removal of yellow lines and the addition of extra bays if that was considered appropriate. There was obviously a need to start the scheme in the first place and to delay was not he felt necessarily the best route when reassessment could bring about changes if needed.

3. From Councillor Tom Papworth of the Chairman of the Development Control Committee

1. How much was spent providing lunch to members and officers participating in the tour of the Bromley and Orpington town centres on Saturday 16 October 2010?
2. To provide an itemised bill for the lunch provided to members and officers.

Reply:

The Chairman advised that the cost of the lunch was £77.50 in total. This would be covered as Members expenses. An itemised breakdown of the bill had been circulated to all members and individuals bought their own liquid refreshments. Councillor Michael commented for his information that £8.30 of that was paid for by her personally.

Councillor Papworth did not have a supplementary question.

4. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Leader of the Council

What monies have the Council lost this year due to the actions of the ConDem government?

Reply:

Councillor Carr replied – nothing and that perhaps the Councillor would like to rephrase his question to reflect what loses the Council had made this year due to the actions of the previous government.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Fookes said he would answer for him it was £4.6m. He asked whether the Leader would be making his annual pilgrimage to Whitehall this year to complain about the lack of government funding.

Reply:

Councillor Carr replied that the figure was wrong, although Councillor Fookes seemed to think he knew better. The answer to his second question was - yes he had already spoken to several Ministers and the Mayor of London on a fair settlement for not just this Borough but the London region as a whole under the Comprehensive Spending Settlement, and would await with interest more details in December.

5. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People

What are the main criteria the council uses for deciding whether local residents should be eligible to adopt children?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder advised that the reply was complicated because of the serious nature of the matter.

The eligibility criteria for local people to be assessed as foster carers was set out in the eligibility criteria updated in February 2009 entitled 'Bromley Adoption Service – Eligibility for Service'.

An Adoption Panel supported and advised the Local Authority in identifying prospective children for adoption, prospective adoptive parents and appropriately matching between the two. The Panel had an independent chairman and vice chairman and sat as an independent Committee of the Council. The Panel consisted of legal and medical advisers, local authority officers, three elected Members (currently Cllrs Smith, Arthur and Evans) an adult who was adopted as a child and an adoptive parent. The Panel when approving prospective adopters also advised on the suitability of different types of children to be adopted by them.

The service accepted applications from all Bromley residents who wished to adopt as long as they met the basic minimum criteria to be considered which were as follows.

Prospective adopters must be over the age of 21. They could be single or in a stable and permanent relationship with another person, whether married, in a civil partnership or cohabiting.

There was no upper age limit but potential carers must be able to demonstrate that they possess the health and vigour to meet the many and varied needs of children throughout their childhood. Various vetting checks were made to ensure that the applicants were of good character and had nothing in their backgrounds that would make them unsuitable as adoptive parents.

The Service also accepted applications from people who lived outside of the Borough where this met the needs of specific children.

Currently, the Service was targeting recruitment to meet a shortfall in the number of prospective adopters for children in sibling groups, children with disabilities, children over the age of 6 years and those from black and ethnic minority groups. This did not preclude applications from perspective adopters for white children under the age of six years however they may have to wait longer to be matched with a child.

Bromley Council was part of a consortium with Brighton and Hove, Kent, East Sussex, Bexley and Medway local authorities and was able to offer assessed adoptive carers to these agencies to be matched with children requiring a placement.

Supplementary question:

Councillor Bennett asked whether prospective parents could adopt across racial groups.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that it was his understanding that in the first place adoptive parents were sought with similar cultural or ethnic backgrounds to the children being considered for adoption. However, where this was not possible then suitable parents were sought who had an understanding of these needs. As part of the assessment process the type of child the prospective adopters wished to be matched with would be explored and that would include white adopters for mixed race and black children.

6. From Councillor Julian Grainger of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Orpington Area Parking Scheme

On the 26th July, the PDS voted to defer the proposed restrictions until displacement of over 230 cars had been considered. Why did the Portfolio Holder decide to proceed?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder stated that it was because he thought the PDS Committee's decision was wrong and he noted that his decision had not been called in.

Supplementary reply:

Councillor Grainger asked if the Portfolio Holder was fully aware of the situation and the affect of over 200 cars being displaced. Would he agree that contrary to the answer given by the PDS Committee Chairman it was a simply

task to visit a place intended for yellow lines and count the number of cars parked there.

Reply:

Councillor Smith replied that 'no he did not agree' – and those colleagues in Farnborough and Crofton and Orpington and Petts Wood and Knoll Wards would attest that full consultation was undertaken. Controlled Parking Zones were not a science and there might be some displacement and if there was it would have to be managed. The reason that the parking review in Orpington was undertaken was because of a promise to the people of Orpington at the time of the Tesco development. The Portfolio Holder considered it was the right thing to do to press ahead and as Councillor Grainger had already been assured on several occasions if there was any displacement affecting his Ward it would be proactively addressed by the department.

7. From Councillor Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Community Services

What action is being taken to merge Health services and the Council services to provide a seamless service for residents?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder drew attention to The Government's White Paper; "Equity & Excellence - Liberating the NHS" which set out an exciting/radical agenda for the future of health and social care services in England.

As well as proposing a significant shift in favour of the clinicians, with GP consortia taking over the responsibility for health care commissioning, it also mapped out an enhanced set of duties and responsibilities for local government in relation to health improvement and commissioning. The White Paper also announced the abolition of both PCTs and Strategic Health Authorities.

Whilst the detail was still to emerge, the current proposal would see Public Health and Health Improvement functions transferring from the PCTs to the Council by 2013.

In addition the White Paper talks about the Council's responsibility for "joining up the commissioning of local NHS services, social care and health improvement" and specifically for "promoting integration and partnership working between the NHS, social care, public health and other local services and strategies."

The White paper also outlined the requirement for each Council to establish a Health & Well-Being Board (by April 2012) charged with joining up commissioning of local health social care services.

In Bromley we have a long tradition of working in close partnership with our health colleagues, and there were many examples of integrated commissioning and delivery of services for both adults and children. We were therefore starting from a good place in our discussions with our PCT partners around how we plan for the future.

Already we have agreed to establish a Shadow Health & Well-being Board made up of Executive members of the Council, Board members of the PCT as well as a number of our local GPs who would be leading on the establishment of Bromley's GP consortia.

Through the work of this Board we would be preparing the ground for the transfer of Public Health and health improvement functions – as soon as the Government sets out the terms and conditions for that transfer. The Board would also be exploring how our substantial experience of joined up commissioning of health and social care services could be built upon as the new GP consortia emerged.

At the same time the moves to establish Bromley PCT's provider arm as a Social Enterprise under the Bromley HealthCare banner proceeded with the PCT Board endorsing the Integrated Business Care last month. We were in discussions with Bromley Healthcare around options for joining up the delivery of a range of services in the future, again building upon our existing experience of delivering joined up services particularly in the fields of disabilities – for both children and adults and intermediate care for frail older people.

In all of these discussions the test would be whether proposals furthered the overall objectives of our Building a Better Bromley vision – in that they promoted the health and well-being of Bromley residents by promoting their independence and ensuring that children and young people were supported to get the best start in life.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Fookes asked whether the Portfolio Holder was aware that Blackburn and Herefordshire had already merged services and not waited for the government.

Reply:

Councillor Arthur said that that was just one example as there were several others who had progressed that far. There were also quite a number that had not progressed as far as we had. Working with other Boroughs across London Councils he could advise that those in the first tranche of this were in many cases regretting the fact that they were and wished that they had held back and do what we were doing i.e. laying proper foundations. This meant not rushing in to take on all sorts of uncostered services on behalf of residents of the Borough without any idea of how they would be financed, or the need

for a consistent approach and accountability through the democratic process. He stated that we would not rush in but take our time and do the job properly.

8. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

How many members of staff have been appointed Special Constables under the 'Borough Beat' scheme?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that there were three staff.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Bennett congratulated the three members of staff concerned. However, he understood that when the scheme was originally suggested it was estimated that between 8 - 12 members of staff would be involved. He asked what steps had been taken to encourage other staff to take part in what was a part of the big society initiative.

Reply:

Councillor Morgan advised that currently there were 116 special constables working in the Borough which was above the target the Police had of 111. In January of this year there was only 48 so there had been a 141% increase already and others in the pipe line. As there was such limited space for special constables it was not the intention to reintroduce a drive to encourage the Borough Beat scheme within the Council. The idea at the time had been to act as a catalyst for others which seemed to have worked very well.

9. From Councillor Julian Grainger of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Amendments to Proposed Orpington Area Parking Restrictions

On 5th August, the Portfolio Holder agreed (amongst others) Resolution 2) that:

- "*further flank wall parking might be added*"

and added Resolution 3 that:

- "*free spaces be found which might...*":

- "*increase the available parking stock*"

- "*... assist in speed management,*"

Did he make these resolutions in order to address concerns about displacement caused by the proposed restrictions and because the absence of parked cars can allow increased speeds?

Reply:

No, I made the decision to mitigate concerns about *possible* displacement but also to address traffic speeds which were more common in roads with no parking.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Grainger asked whether the Portfolio Holder was aware that the latest published drawings fell short of the aims he articulated. Specifically was he aware that restrictions along flank walls were still included; that the parking stock would be reduced whether by the displacement of over 200 cars already identified but also by the deletion of 110 marked bays; and as the yellow lines along the entire length of long side roads would remain this negated any speed management by parked cars. Could the Portfolio Holder explain why there appeared to be continual denial of such a huge displacement.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder stated that as the member concerned had been advised on many occasions if he wanted or thought any of the aspects of the Scheme should be changed he should consult with the local Ward Councillors to ensure that at the relevant 6 month review stage these would be taken into account. He also pointed out that there had been ample opportunity for anyone to engage in the consultation exercise around Orpington and most Ward Colleagues had done so but some had not.

10. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

What Equality Impact Assessments have been carried out on proposed service changes?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder stated that the local authority sought to be an Excellent Council in the eyes of local residents and provide quality services. In that vein we would continue to monitor and assess the impact of all service changes on Bromley residents, although to what extent that objective was served or hindered by Quality Impact Assessments was open to some question. However, we would comply with the law and already had a framework in place to ensure that this happened.

Councillor Fookes did not have a supplementary question.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

25th OCTOBER 2010

WRITTEN QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder Children and Young People

If the Portfolio Holder will list the posts in the Strategy and Performance Division together with their job titles and grades.

Reply:

In response to your question, I suggest you refer to the following documents

- § the Director's Report of 8 September 2009 'CYP Staffing, Business Functions and Funding' ([http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/Data/121/20090930/Agenda/\\$Item5-CYP%20Services,%20staffing,%20business%20functions%20and%20funding.doc.pdf](http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/Data/121/20090930/Agenda/$Item5-CYP%20Services,%20staffing,%20business%20functions%20and%20funding.doc.pdf)) which provided a detailed account of the Department's staffing, associated costs and funding streams together with the business functions and business volumes including the Strategy and Performance division.
- § This report was also referred, on my recommendation, to the Council's Executive for their meeting on 30 September 2009 , where it was acknowledged 'that it would be a good model for other departments to follow'.
- § A further Director's report to the CYP Portfolio Holder on 19 January 2010 'CYP Department Staffing Numbers' which provided a further layer of information on the staffing data and trends for the period 2005/06 – 2009/10.
- § Staffing has reduced in Strategy & Performance since those reports as a result of reductions when setting the 2010/11 budget (1FTE) and grant reductions in-year (2.5 FTE), i.e. a reduction of 3.5 FTE. In addition the Family Information Service has transferred to the Bromley Children & Family Services

Attached as Appendix 1 is a list of posts currently within Strategy and Performance. Appendix 2 outlines the main functions of the Division.

2. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People

If he will give for each Children and Family Centre the following information in table format:

1. Date Centre opened
2. Number of staff employed including post and grade
3. Square footage of premises
4. Number of rooms

5. Capital cost of adaptation to create centre (and any subsequent capital expenditure since opening of the centre)
6. Annual running costs
7. Number of rooms in use
8. Number of individual adult users per week (excluding individuals second or more visits)?

Reply:

The CYP Department has no capacity, in terms of staffing or time, to respond with the level required by these questions, in the time available. However, the forward rolling work programme for the CYP PDS Committee features a report entitled 'Progress on Children and Family Centres' for the meeting on 30 November 2010. I will ensure that the information Cllr Bennett seeks is incorporated within this report and as he is a Member of this Committee he will be able to contribute to a full debate on these services at the meeting.

3. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

How many members of staff are given time off for the following public services:

- Councillors
- Magistrates
- Membership of NHS bodies
- Other public bodies

Reply:

Departments	Councillors	Magistrates	NHS Bodies	Other Public Bodies*	Total
ACS	0	0	0	1	1
CYP	0	0	0	2	2
R&R	1	0	0	0	1
ES	0	2	0	2	4
LD&CS	0	0	0	1	1
Resources	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2	0	6	9

*Some staff (not included in the table above) are School Governors but mainly attend evening or twilight meetings outside of normal hours.

*Also the table does not include number of staff on Territorial Army duties but it includes staff on the Borough Beat Scheme.

4. From Councillor William Huntington-Thresher of the Chairman of the Development Control Committee

- A) Since the inclusion of a renewable energy requirement in the 2006 UDP, how many planning permissions have been granted with a renewable energy requirement?
- B) How many developments with the condition have been completed?
- C) At the completion of the development what was the average renewable energy percentage achieved?
- D) Did any developments fail to achieve the required 10%?
- E) If so what action was taken?
- F) Has any check been made to establish whether the renewable energy percentage achieved on completion has been maintained once occupied for a reasonable length of time (e.g. after one year)?

Reply:

A) The Council has permitted 50 applications with a condition involving on-site renewable energy. An additional 13 appeals have been granted with similar conditions.

Note that Policy ER4 in the UDP, requiring 10% of predicted energy use to be provided from on-site renewable technology, was applied from the adoption of the UDP in 2006 until mid 2009, when the policy expired. From 2009, the more up-to-date policies in the London Plan were used, requiring greater efficiency and aiming for a minimum of 20% reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from on-site renewable technology.

B) Of the 63 developments referred to above, 19 have been fully completed and two phased developments have been partially completed.

C) The potential percentage energy contribution or carbon reduction is shown in an energy assessment submitted with an application and updated for the purpose of assessing the details submitted to comply with the condition. This must occur before development begins. There is no requirement to re-submit information at completion. Looking at the information submitted for the condition involving a 10% contribution, the average percentage is around that stated, i.e. some developments achieve slightly less, others achieve more. In the case of the higher target of 20%, fewer developments are able to achieve the amount, but in these cases carbon reduction is often achieved in other ways such as improved design, greater energy efficiency and use of low-carbon technology.

D) Yes, though this would be known about by the time the condition is agreed. There may be issues of physical feasibility or financial viability and the policies allow these issues to be taken into account. Each development faces unique challenges in meeting the requirement and there are often other technical or planning conditions that need to be met.

E) Any action would be at the “front end” of the process through considering the details of the application or setting bespoke conditions. The desirable result is to produce a good quality development with a significant carbon reduction and this may be achieved by means other than the production of renewable energy on site, as set out above.

F) No, there is currently no budget resource for monitoring after completion. In many cases it would not be possible to find out this information - particularly in the case of hot water producing solar thermal technology on individual residential dwellings. However, in formulating any new local policies on low and zero carbon technologies, survey work would be undertaken to find out what has been successful in recent developments.

5. From Councillor David McBride of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

In the past three years, what Council planning contracts have been awarded to Frankham Architects and at what cost? How many of the planning applications have been:

- a) been given permission straight away;
- b) been deferred and then given permission;
- c) been refused?

Reply:

Frankham Consultancy has made 39 planning applications on behalf of the Council in the last 3 years. Of this total 5 were subsequently withdrawn and 1 was deferred. The total cost of these applications was £26,765.

6. From Councillor Ruth Bennett of the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People

If the Portfolio Holder will list the number of -

- i. Teachers
- ii. Teaching assistants
- iii. Administrative and finance staff
- iv. Maintenance staff
- v. Pupils

in each school in 1998 and 2010?

Reply:

Following the introduction of local management of schools through the Education Reform Act 1988 all schools have a delegated budget. The responsibility for deciding the level of staffing in the school, including teachers, teaching assistants, administrative and finance staff and site managers or maintenance staff, is the responsibility of the Governing Body.

The Local Authority is not required to maintain the detail requested by the Councillor.

However, partial information is available from the Department for Education (DfE) Schools Census undertaken by schools in January each year and the Council's payroll system where schools purchase this service. **Appendix 3** contains the School Census Information for 1998 and 2010 in the format required by the DfE at that time. **Appendix 4** provides the information available (source: Payroll) on maintenance staff for 2010. No information is available for 1998 for any support staff.

It should be noted that since 1998 the Local Authority has reduced its overall number of schools from 100 to 95. This is summarised in **Appendix 5**.

7. From Councillor Ruth Bennett of the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People

- i. What is the square footage of the Education Development Centre site;
- ii. The number of people employed at the centre;
- iii. The annual running costs in 2010-11; and
- iv. The capital expenditure since 2000?

Reply:

The Local Authority (LA) has a statutory duty to assure standards of education for pupils attending maintained schools in the Borough and for intervention and support with under-performing or failing schools. There are currently 94 maintained schools in Bromley. The LA is also responsible for standards of education in alternative provision such as the Pupil Referral Service and respite centres. In addition, the LA also has a statutory duty to ensure standards across pre-school settings; there are currently 170 settings of which 12 are LA maintained nurseries.

The Education Development Centre (EDC) is the principal location for the services and training support programmes relating to the LA's school improvement strategy and promotion of standards across pre-school settings. It also serves as the central location for the LA's meetings with head teachers and governors and is used as a cost-effective alternative base, to supplement the Civic Centre, for meetings and training for Council departments. It is also widely used by the voluntary sector and other agencies. This additional usage brings income to the service.

In a typical year over 1500 professional development events and courses are delivered at the EDC for mainstream schools involving over 35,000 participants (head teachers, teaching and non-teaching staff and governors). In addition, training programmes are delivered for staff associated with the 170 early years providers which contribute to accreditation via NVQ and graduate level qualifications. The LA's safeguarding and child protection training programme for all agencies, is also delivered largely through the EDC. These programmes are supplemented by the peripatetic work in schools as provided by senior advisers who also cover the statutory school improvement partner duties.

In response to the four specific questions:

- i. The square footage of the Education Development Centre is 1,337 sq.m
- ii. The number of people who are based at the Centre employed within CYP Services is 61.1 FTE
- iii. Annual Running Costs for 2010-11 of the Learning and Achievement Service is £1.3m net of grant and income from schools and other agencies. The running costs include staffing, premises, supplies and services, and commissioning of external training consultancy support. These exclude Dedicated Schools Grant funded services. The details are shown in the table below:

	£m
Employee cost	1.993
Running Cost	<u>0.571</u>
	2.564
Income	<u>(1.257)</u>
	1.307

iv. Capital expenditure since 2000: £269,548.55

8. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

What action is he taking to ensure that the railway bridges in Beckenham Rd/Elmers End Road and Blakeney Road are fully netted to ensure that pigeons are not nesting?

Reply:

It does not sit within the Council's gift to "ensure" such matters unfortunately.

Network Rail hold responsibility in this field, and all such complaints and enquiries should be directed to them via their National Helpline number 08457 114141.

I would encourage members to also ensure that the Council's Head of Area Management, Mr Peter McCready, is made aware of any issue to enable him to try and prompt action from Network Rail in instances where their response is deemed to be tardy or non committal, likewise to enable the Council to monitor and record the Audit Trail.

9. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

How many vacancies are there for PCSO's in the borough and in which wards?

Reply:

Using data provided by the Metropolitan Police service (Bromley) from Thursday 21 October there are currently a total of 9 vacancies at Police Community Support officer level within the Borough. A ward by ward breakdown shows 3 vacancies in Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom, 2 vacancies in Bickley, and 1 vacancy in each of the following wards: Bromley Town, Bromley Common and Keston, Darwin, Petts Wood and Knoll, Cray Valley West and Penge and Cator. The Crystal Palace Team have 2 additional PCSOs, due to operational reasons.

10. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Following the question last time round from Councillor Nicholas Bennett, how many posts in each department have been lost since 1st April 2010 and how many posts are currently frozen?

Reply:

	Total	ACS	ES Ftes	R&R Ftes	CE	LDCS	Res	R&R Property	CYP Ftes
Management overheads (part of central contingency)	46.05	4.59	7.00	2.60	6.50	2.20	7.60	11.56	4.00
	46.05	4.59	7.00	2.60	6.50	2.20	7.60	11.56	4.00
Posts deleted as part of 2010/11 budget options	24.61	1.2	0.00	13.74	0.00	0.00	3.67	1.00	5.00
Posts deleted as a result of fallout of grant	7.34		0.00	4.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.50
Total posts deleted	78.00	5.79	7.00	21.18	6.50	2.20	11.27	12.56	11.50
Frozen posts as possible deletion in 2011/12	38.40	6.4	7.50	1.00					23.50
Posts held vacant to offset shortfall of income within planning & building control	8.60		0.00	8.60					
Total 'frozen' posts	47.00	6.40	7.50	9.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.50
Total posts deleted	78.00								
Total posts frozen	47.00								
	125.00								

NB – please note that the figures above do not include the potential redundancies in 2011/12

11. From Councillor Russell Mellor of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

At a recent IT presentation the presenting Officer stated that a feasibility study would be undertaken of the Microsoft Office 2007 software with a view for use by the Council. I would appreciate confirmation as to the practical use of such a study and the advantages to the Council as I understand that the software is no longer commercially available.

Reply:

We will not be undertaking a feasibility study of Office 2007, but will be working with the new IT contractor on the feasibility of rolling out Office 2010. There are issues with both Office 2007 and Office 2010 in terms of compatibility with line of business systems as the providers of those systems still only integrate with Office 2003. The compatibility issues are theoretically much less with 2010 as Microsoft built in a higher level of backward compatibility given the complaints they had over 2007 (and the associated lack of take up in the Corporate environment). However

there will be a significant training overhead for staff as the look and feel is different from Office 2003.

12. From Councillor Russell Mellor of the Leader of the Council

The number of staff employed by the Council as at the year end 30th September 2009 and 30th September 2010 showing the numbers engaged in the respective grading and the relevant salary/wage bands.

Reply:

As the question asked for an analysis by grade, the data has been collated on the basis of employees multiplied by the number of posts held. This is to take into account that some employees hold more than one post which may be at a different grade. The table below sets out the various grades referred to in the grade tables for 2009 and 2010.

Grade	Explanation
BR1 – BR14	Bromley Officer grades following Single Status
MG6 – MB	Bromley Management Grades
UNQUAL	Unqualified Teacher Grade
MAINNEW	Main Teacher Grade
UPPER	Teacher Post Threshold Grade
HT1 – HTO	Teacher Leadership Grades
LOCAL	Grade does not fall into any other category, locally agreed i.e. TUPE from other organisation
PA13 – PA24	Connexions Grades
SOUL.....	Soulbury Grades i.e. Education Advisors/Educational Psychologist
YS1A – YS6	Youth Service Grades

Information as at 30.09.2009

Information excludes casual and supply staff.

Grade	Min Sp Pt	Max Sp Pt	Min Salary	Max Salary	Total
BR1	4	5	14697	14814	17
BR2	6	7	14940	15216	7
BR3	8	11	15615	16482	105
BR4	11	13	16482	17196	62
BR5	13	17	17196	18582	383
BR6	17	21	18582	20877	394
BR7	22	25	21375	23277	197
BR8	26	28	23970	25455	151
BR9	29	31	26400	28032	233
BR10	32	34	28800	30390	100
BR11	33	36	29601	31761	183
BR12	35	38	30987	33510	126
BR13	38	41	33510	36306	210
BR14	41	44	36306	38961	55
HT1	6	18	34542	46422	27
HT2	8	21	36291	49959	4
HT3	11	24	39144	53769	2
HT5	18	31	46422	63825	2
HTO	1	5	30531	33699	3
LOCAL	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	67
MAINNEW	1	6	25117	35116	15
MB	n/a	n/a	92635	204546	6
MG1	n/a	n/a	79688	119531	3
MG2	n/a	n/a	67069	100621	14
MG3	n/a	n/a	57503	86253	15
MG4	n/a	n/a	48983	73479	26
MG5	n/a	n/a	43028	64541	59
MG6	n/a	n/a	35507	53260	138
NAC1	6	15	14940	17808	13
PA13-22	13	22	23596	29949	1
PA13-24	13	24	23596	31359	1
PA14-22	14	22	24291	29949	5
PA18-24	18	24	27118	31359	1
SOUL3	19	25	45648	51126	1
SOULBURYA	1	49	28704	75753	10
SOULBURYC	1	16	28821	43608	3
SOULBURYD	1	19	37752	55392	1
SOULEPA	1	11	33934	50243	9
SOULSPEPB	1	18	42544	62942	3
SOULY2	4	7	34671	37854	3
UNQUAL	1	10	18789	27992	6
UPPER	1	5	37599	40433	71
YS1A	1	1	13299	13299	9
YS1B	2	3	13854	14409	17
YS2	3	6	14409	16080	32
YS3	7	10	16641	18465	28
YS5	15	18	22725	24711	3
YS6	19	22	25365	27600	12
Total					2833

Information as at 30.09.2010

Information excludes casual and supply staff.

Grade	Min Sp Pt	Max Sp Pt	Min Salary	Max Salary	Total
BR1	4	5	14697	14814	15
BR2	6	7	14940	15216	9
BR3	8	11	15615	16482	81
BR4	11	13	16482	17196	50
BR5	13	17	17196	18582	363
BR6	17	21	18582	20877	393
BR7	22	25	21375	23277	203
BR8	26	28	23970	25455	143
BR9	29	31	26400	28032	223
BR10	32	34	28800	30390	114
BR11	33	36	29601	31761	170
BR12	35	38	30987	33510	114
BR13	38	41	33510	36306	195
BR14	41	44	36306	38961	56
HT1	6	18	34542	46422	19
HT2	8	21	36291	49959	5
HT3	11	24	39144	53769	1
HT5	18	31	46422	63825	2
HTO	1	5	30531	33699	2
LOCAL	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	92
MAINNEW	1	6	25117	35116	19
MB	n/a	n/a	92635	204546	6
MG1	n/a	n/a	79688	119531	3
MG2	n/a	n/a	67069	100621	12
MG3	n/a	n/a	57503	86253	16
MG4	n/a	n/a	48983	73479	24
MG5	n/a	n/a	43028	64541	54
MG6	n/a	n/a	35507	53260	126
PA13-22	13	22	23596	29949	1
PA13-24	13	24	23596	31359	1
PA14-22	14	22	24291	29949	5
PA18-24	18	24	27118	31359	1
SOUL3	19	25	45648	51126	1
SOULBURYA	1	49	28704	75753	8
SOULBURYC	1	16	28821	43608	1
SoulePA	1	11	37752	55392	8
SOULSPEPB	1	18	33934	50243	3
SOULY2	4	7	42544	62942	3
UNQUAL	1	10	34671	37854	6
UPPER	1	5	37599	40433	74
YS1A	1	1	13299	13299	21
YS1B	2	3	13854	14409	18
YS2	3	6	14409	16080	36
YS3	7	10	16641	18465	25
YS5	15	18	22725	24711	2
YS6	19	22	25365	27600	13
Total					2737

13. From Councillor Fawthrop of the Chairman of the Development Control Committee (to be asked at each subsequent Council Meeting)

What pre-application meetings have taken place since the last full Council Meeting between Council Officers and potential planning applicants? Can these be listed as follows:-

The name of the potential applicant, the site address being considered.

Reply:

There have been 109 pre-application meetings between 24th June and 19th October 2010, 64 of which were for residential proposals; 41 were for commercial proposals; 3 were for a residential home for the elderly and 1 was for a primary school extension.

Details of the individual applicants and sites at present is exempt information and not disclosable in response to a Council Question.

Children and Young People Services: Strategy and Performance Division.

Posts (fte) at 1 October 2010.

	Assistant Director, Strategy and Performance	MG3
Strategic Planning and Commissioning	Strategic Planning & Commissioning Manager	MG5
	Principal Partnerships and Planning Officer	BR14
	Partnerships and Planning Officers (1.8 fte)	BR10-BR12
Research and Statistics	Performance & Statistics Manager	MG5
	Research & Statistics Operations Manager	MG6
	Principal Research & Statistics Officers (2 fte) (Children's social care, pupil attainment/place planning)	BR10-BR12
	Research & Statistics Officers (2fte) (Children's social care, pupil attainment/place planning)	BR6-BR8
Information Systems	Information Systems Manager	MG5
	Principal Information Systems Officer	BR13
Workforce Development & Business Support	Workforce Development & Business Support Manager	MG5
	Partnerships and Planning Officer (workforce)	BR10-BR12
-----Secretariat	CYP Secretarial support team (to Director, Assistant Directors, Heads of Service):	
	Principal Officer (1fte)	BR11
	Secretary/Admin officer (1fte)	BR8
	Secretary/Admin officer (2fte)	BR7
-----Office Services	Office Services Supervisor	BR8
	Senior Admin Officer	BR6
	Admin Assistants (1.8 fte)	BR4
-----Information & Document Management (IDM)	IDM Coordinator	BR11
	Information Coordinator	BR9
	Document Management Assistants (2.8 fte)	BR5
Total:	27.4 (fte)	

Children and Young People Services: Strategy and Performance Division

Summary of Functions:

Strategic Planning and Commissioning:

- CYP Plan & BBB Community Plan
- CYP Partnership – Board, Forum and multi agency strategy groups; CYP Partnership website.
- Voluntary & community sector development including SLA with the C&F Voluntary Sector Forum
- CYP strategic commissioning functions: Providers include schools, private, voluntary and other statutory sectors: £151.5 million from DSG to commission places from Bromley schools and early years providers, £18.6 million contracts/SLAs and £2million internal spot purchasing for fostering and adoption placements.
- Communications:
 - With 94 schools (+ 1 Academy) and 170+ pre-school settings
 - Press releases (working with central communications team)
 - Member visits / schedule of CYP events.
- Active involvement strategy: children & young people (72,000) and parents/carers – feedback on service evaluation to inform forward planning
- Consultation processes to support the Director and Lead Member on major policy changes: school re-organisation (closures, amalgamations, new provision), SEN, children's social care.

Research and Statistics:

- Collation & management of data re 72,000 CYP.
- Data interrogation and analysis to inform statutory responsibilities for:
 - Monitoring standards in pre-school provision and schools i.e. by individual pupil performance (by cohort and Key Stage)
 - Aggregated school performance data
 - Post 16 school and college performance outcomes
 - Children's social care, including: contacts, referrals, initial and core assessments, children in care.
 - Pupil place planning and school organisation
 - Service performance across CYP, which contributes to internal performance management and reports to Members and to external validation by Ofsted.
 - Government allocation of funding including the Dedicated Schools Grant and other grants.
- Performance management reporting framework:
 - Internal– weekly and monthly reports to operational managers; monthly and quarterly reports to senior managers and Elected Members.
 - CYP Partnership Board – quarterly reports
 - Schools (including performance packs on attainment) and Pre-School settings
 - External validation and inspection: DfE, Ofsted.

Information Systems:

- CareFirst, Capita ONE, YOIS, systems integration, E-business support, Data cleansing/validation

Workforce Development & Business Support:

- Secretariat for Director, 4 ADs, & Heads of Service; FOI requests, Members questions + complaints co-ordination.
- Information and Document Management providing over 150 information circulars re LBB policy and strategy annually to schools and other stakeholders, two CYP web sites and CYP intranet, coordination of PDS/PH committee reports, production of large documents/publications; standards and guidelines for all CYP publications.
- Centralised office services including admin support to Education Welfare Officers and Educational Psychologists.
- Strategic developments across the CYP workforce (statutory, private and voluntary sectors): including: information sharing, coordination of learning and development opportunities.
- Business continuity and emergency planning co-ordination for CYP.

January 2010 School Census																		January 1998 School Census															
School Number	School Name	Total pupils on roll	Total of Full Time Teachers	Total of Part Time Teachers	Total of Part Time Hours	Total Number of FTE Teachers	Other admin	Admin/Sec	Bursar	Language Asst	Ethnic support	HLTA	IT tech	Librarian	Medical/nurse	Qualified TA	SEN support	Other Support	TA(Sec)	Technician	Unqualified TA	Total support staff	School Number	School	Full Time School Roll (Mainstream + unit)	Part Time School Roll (Unit + nursery)	FTE School Roll	Part Time Teachers Hours	Male Teachers F/T	Female Teachers F/T	FTE		
2000	Alexandra Junior School	223	7	5	91	9.8		3								2	11	2				10	28	2000	Alex Jnr	255	0	255.0	36	1	7	9.1	
2001	Alexandra Infant School	186	9	3	26	9.8	3	1				1				3	4					1	18	2001	Alex Infants	208	0	208.0	33	0	9	10.0	
2002	Balgowan Primary School	648	21	7	108	24.3	1	4								16	11						32	2002	Balgowan	629	0	629.0	20	4	18	22.6	
2003	Bromley Road Infant School	249	10	5	56	11.7	2	1				1					5	9					18	2003	Bromley Road Inf	270	0	270.0	0	0	10	10.0	
2004	Churchfields Primary School	281	13	0	0	13.0	1	1				2				2	7					9	22	2004	Churchfields	390	44	412.0	71	2	14	18.2	
2005	Hawes Down Juniors	241	7	11	134	11.1	2	1								2	18	1					24	2005	Hawes Down Jnr	280	0	280.0	80	3	6	11.5	
2006	Hawes Down Infant School	189	7	3	48	8.5		3				1						11					15	2006	Hawes Down Inf	204	0	204.0	22	0	8	8.7	
2008	Marian Vian Primary School	616	23	7	120	26.7	5	1						1			9	25					41	2008	Marian Vian	487	0	487.0	36	2	15	18.1	
2010	Oak Lodge Primary School	674	25	7	76	27.3		3	1					1			8	42					55	2010	Oak Lodge	706	0	706.0	32	5	18	24.0	
2011	Stewart Fleming Primary School	303	11	3	53	12.6	2	2	1			2	1			5		1				4	18	2011	Stewart Fleming	341	0	341.0	8	1	11	12.2	
2012	Wickham Common Primary School	432	15	6	96	18.0	1	1	1							8	4	1					16	2012	Wickham Common	457	0	457.0	26	2	13	15.8	
2013	Worsley Bridge Junior School	207	10	3	36	11.1		4			1	2	1				7	4				10	29	2013	Worsley Bridge	380	0	380.0	67	3	9	14.1	
2014	Burnt Ash Primary School	448	17	8	129	21.0	2	1	1			3					5	27					39	2014	Burnt Ash Primary	500	0	500.0	153	3	14	21.7	
2017	Pickhurst Infants' School	358	12	4	59	13.8	3	2				4					3	17					29	2017	Pickhurst Infants	372	0	372.0	106	2	9	14.3	
2018	Pickhurst Junior School	458	14	1	24	14.7		11														20	31	2018	Pickhurst Junior	480	0	480.0	30	6	12	18.9	
2019	Princes Plain Primary School	388	20	2	36	21.1	2	1	1			10					24	3					41	2019	Princes Plain	331	46	354.0	91	1	12	15.8	
2022	Southborough Primary School	414	14	8	140	18.3	1	2				3					7				8	21	2022	Southborough	416	0	416.0	84	2	11	15.6		
2024	Valley Primary School	420	18	2	42	19.3		5													13	18	2024	Valley	356	0	356.0	6	1	13	14.2		
2025	Mead Road Infant School	84	4	1	12	4.4		1				1				1	1					1	4	2025	Mead Road	84	0	84.0	0	1	3	4.0	
2026	Red Hill Primary	598	24	5	75	26.3		3	1			4				1						17	26	2026	Red Hill	603	0	603.0	39	2	19	22.2	
2028	Mottingham Primary School	253	15	3	54	16.7		4				2				8		2				5	21	2028	Mottingham	447	0	447.0	0	4	14	18.0	
2029	Castlecombe Primary School	240	10	2	46	11.4	1	4								1	7	7				7	27	2029	Castlecombe	228	0	228.0	0	1	7	8.0	
2030	Dorset Road Infant School	62	3	3	34	4.0		1				1										4	6	2030	Dorset Road	61	0	61.0	33	0	3	4.0	
2034	Chelsfield Primary School	88	4	2	32	5.0	1		1								4					3	9	2034	Chelsfield	81	0	81.0	7	0	4	4.2	
2038	Crofton Infant School	547	20	9	162	25.0	2	6				3				9	23					3	46	2038	Crofton Infant	581	0	581.0	61	2	19	22.9	
2039	Darrick Wood Junior School	366	14	3	39	15.2	2	1														11	14	2039	Darrick Wood Jnr	350	0	350.0	103	2	10	15.2	
2040	Darrick Wood Infant School	326	13	4	63	14.9	2	1				1				6	2					5	17	2040	Darrick Wood Inf	271	57	299.5	86	0	11	13.6	
2041	Downe Primary School	78	3	4	75	5.3		2								1	1					1	5	2041	Downe	61	0	61.0	18	2	2	4.6	
2042	Farnborough Primary School	211	7	2	42	8.3		1	1				1									7	13	2042	Farnborough	206	0	206.0	30	1	6	7.9	
2043	Green Street Green Primary	428	18	6	99	21.0		5	1				1	1			14					12	34	2043	Green St Green	473	0	473.0	39	4	14	19.2	
2046	Pratts Bottom Primary School	59	3	5	57	4.8		1								1	3	3				2	10	2046	Pratts Bottom	59	0	59.0	36	1	2	4.1	
2051	St. Mary Cray Primary School	126	6	2	36	7.1		1	1			2						1				8	13	2051	St Mary Cray	296	0	296.0	98	3	5	11.0	
2053	The Highway Primary School	203	9	3	27	9.8		2				1					3					7	13	2053	The Highway	228	0	228.0	60	2	5	8.8	
2056	Warren Road Primary School	845	26	7	78	28.4		6								4		34				28	72	2056	Warren Road	674	0	674.0	39	4	19	24.2	
2060	Malcolm Primary School	254	10	2	39	11.2		1	1			5				7	1					7	22	2060	Malcolm	277	0	277.0	12	1	14	15.4	
2061	Royston Primary School	412	16	4	72	18.2		3				9					2	11					25	2061	Royston	421	52	447.0	122	0	13	16.8	
2062	James Dixon Primary School	319	11	5	97	14.0		2	1			8						25					36	2062	James Dixon	210	0	210.0	20	0	8	8.6	
2063	Grays Farm Primary School	427	16	3	53	17.6	1	2			1	1				5		6				10	26	2063	Grays Farm	425	0	425.0	18	6	9	15.6	
2064	Leesons Primary School	204	11	1	16	11.5		3				2						12					12	2064	Leesons	217	0	217.0	33	1	7	9.0	
2066	Midfield Primary School	243	12	0	0	12.0		1	1							3	5	3				6	19	2066	Midfield	334	64	366.0	0	4	13	17.0	
2069	Edgebury Primary School	224	7	6	92	9.8	2	1	1							5	3	6					5	23	2069	Edgebury	231	0	231.0	52	1	6	8.6
2071	Scotts Park Primary School	393	16	3	27	16.8		4														17	21	2071	Scotts Park	481	0	481.0	45	3	14	18.4	
2072	Oaklands Primary School	365	15	4	59	16.8	5					2						14				1	22	2072	Oaklands Inf	214	0	214.0	20	0	9	9.6	
2074	Clare House Primary School	210	6	5	76	8.3	2	1				2					3	6					14	2074	Clare House	213	0	213.0	38	1	6	8.2	
2079	Perry Hall Primary School	416	15	2	33	16.0		2				1										16	19	2079	Perry Hall	436	0	436.0	30	2	13	15.9	
2080	Poverest Primary School	200	12	0	0	12.0		3									7	1				13	24	2080	Poverest	304	0	304.0	64	1	11	14.0	
2082	Bickley Primary	269	10	5	34	11.0		1	1														13										
2083	Hillside Primary School	368	17	2	30	17.9	2	1				2					5	13					23										
2084	Manor Oak Primary School	189	11	2	15	11.5		2				1				2						6	11	2084	Kevington	117	0	117.0	35	0	8	9.1	
3000	Keston C.E. Primary School	220	7	6	84	9.6		1	1									15					17	3000	Keston	235	0	235.0	6	2	6	8.2	

Page 27

January 2010 School Census																				January 1998 School Census													
School Number	School Name	Total pupils on roll	Total of Full Time Teachers	Total of Part Time Teachers	Total of Part Time Hours	Total Number of FTE Teachers	Other admin	Admin/Sec	Bursar	Language Asst	Ethnic support	HLTA	IT tech	Librarian	Medical/nurse	Qualified TA	SEN support	Other Support	TA(Sec)	Technician	Unqualified TA	Total support staff	School Number	School	Full Time School Roll (Mainstream + unit)	Part Time School Roll (Unit + nursery)	FTE School Roll	Part Time Teachers Hours	Male Teachers F/T	Female Teachers F/T	FTE		
3001	Parish C.E. Primary School	429	12	12	171	17.3		3				2					14					10	29	3001	Parish	428	0	428.0	33	3	12	16.0	
3002	St George's CE Primary	291	12	5	72	14.2	1	3									6					11	21	3002	St Georges	303	0	303.0	11	2	10	12.3	
3003	Unicorn Primary	220	7	4	50	8.5		2	1			1	1			4	7	1					2	19									
3004	Cudham CE Primary School	68	4	2	30	4.9	1	1									4					3	9	3004	Cudham	73	0	73.0	0	0	4	4.0	
3005	St Paul's Cray CE Primary	218	9	2	30	9.9		3				5						20					28	3005	St Pauls Cray	257	36	275.0	33	1	9	11.0	
3300	St Mark's C.E. Primary School	430	15	6	52	16.6	2	3				6					10	12					33	3300	St Marks	423	0	423.0	36	2	13	16.1	
3301	Chislehurst (CofE) Primary	218	6	6	122	9.8	1	1									3					7	12	3301	Chislehurst	221	0	221.0	20	2	6	8.6	
3303	St John's CE Primary School	300	10	2	33	11.0		2										3				18	23	3303	St Johns	275	0	275.0	60	2	6	9.8	
3500	St Joseph's R.C. Primary School	213	6	3	42	7.3		1										11					12	3500	St Josephs	211	0	211.0	0	0	8	8.0	
3501	St Vincent's Catholic Primary	225	9	4	24	9.7		1										10					11	3501	St Vincents	205	0	205.0	9	2	6	8.3	
3503	St Philomena's RC Primary	217	8	1	6	8.2		3				3	1				3	1				6	17	3503	St Philomenas	226	0	226.0	0	1	7	8.0	
3504	St Anthony's R.C Primary	213	9	2	34	10.0		3										17					20	3504	St Anthonys	325	0	325.0	58	1	10	12.8	
3505	St Peter & St Paul R.C.	210	7	4	48	8.5		1	1								5					6	13	3505	St Peter & Paul RC	194	0	194.0	33	0	7	8.0	
3507	St James' RC Primary School	215	5	5	71	7.2		2	1	2												4	9	3507	St James	215	0	215.0	6	0	8	8.2	
3508	Blenheim Primary	184	8	3	40	9.2	2		1			3					3	7					16										
3510	Biggin Hill Primary School	431	15	5	84	17.6	2	1					1				9	2				15	30										
4002	Cator Park School for Girls	1176	67	18	369	78.4	14	6	1	1		2	4	2			1	25	15	12			83	4002	Cator Park	1238			260	13	47	68.0	
4604	Bishop Justus	1035	59	22	268	67.2	11	7	1		1		3	1			6	16	9	7			62										
5200	Crofton Junior School	707	28	10	185	33.7	2	1	1								20						24	5200	Crofton Junior	746	0	746.0	158	4	21	29.9	
5201	Holy Innocents Catholic Primary	211	8	2	24	8.7	2	1									1	1				6	11	5201	Holy Innocent's RC	331	0	331.0	24	2	12	14.7	
5202	St Mary's Catholic Primary	431	13	8	120	16.7	1	1	1			2					5	7			1		18	5202	St Marys RC	236	0	236.0	30	1	7	8.9	
5203	Highfield Infant School	271	9	3	39	10.2	1	1	1		2					4	3	1				7	20	5203	Highfield Inf	290	0	290.0	30	0	9	9.9	
5204	Highfield Junior School	380	13	6	97	16.0	2	1	1							6	2	10					22	5204	Highfield Jnr	371	0	371.0	46	1	11	13.4	
5205	Hayes Primary School	631	24	4	3	24.1	1	4	1								5	17				17	45	5205	Hayes	428	0	428.0	34	3	12	16.0	
5206	Raglan Primary School	439	18	11	150	22.6		3	1					1			20					8	33	5206	Raglan	454	0	454.0	71	3	15	20.2	
5207	Tubbenden Primary School	606	24	5	109	27.4	4	2	1			1	1				23	4				17	53										
5400	Bullers Wood School	1439	92	21	369	103.4	22	5	1	6		2	5	1	1		18	13	18	11			103	5400	Bullers Wood			1170	344	15	40	65.6	
5401	Coopers Technology College	1503	85	15	296	94.1	15	15	1				3				4	11	9	8			66	5401	Coopers			1444	110	37	49	89.4	
5402	Langley Park School for Boys	1681	113	19	282	121.7	5	11	1								28	12					71	5402	Langley Park Boys			1185	17	62	14	76.5	
5403	Ravens Wood School	1508	108	20	371	119.4		17				5	6	2			4	3	7	8			52	5403	Ravens Wood			1109	123	50	16	69.8	
5404	Kelsey Park Sports College	928	62	6	117	65.6	4	13	1		1	1	3	2			11	8					50	5404	Kelsey Park			726	135	31	16	51.2	
5405	Newstead Wood School for Girls	987	55	26	346	65.6	16	4	1			1	2	2			2	4	3	8			43	5405	Newstead Wood			826	245	12	30	49.5	
5406	Kemnal Technology College	1109	73	10	165	78.1	1	8	2				4	4			12	6			7		44	5406	Kemnal Manor			860	39	29	23	53.2	
5407	Hayes School	1628	105	8	140	109.3	6	9	2				4	1			16	12	5	6			61	5407	Hayes			1256	79	33	33	68.4	
5408	Beaverwood School for Girls	1318	66	22	400	78.3	4	3	1			1	2	2			1	6	17	4			41	5408	Beaverwood			1164	230	17	49	73.1	
5409	Charles Darwin	1314	79	24	456	93.0	7	5	3				2	1			24	10	2	12			66	5409	Charles Darwin			1136	269	30	35	73.3	
5410	St Olave's Grammar School	957	51	19	270	59.3	9	10	1					4	1		2	16			5		48	5410	St Olave's			689	85	31	8	41.6	
5412	Langley Park Girls School GM	1622	98	32	622	117.1	10	9	1	3		1	6	3	1		17	5	4	11			71	5412	Langley Park Girls			1351	421	21	52	86.0	
5413	The Ravensbourne School	1447	93	6	78	95.4	10	7	1	3			2	3			7	12	16	6			67	5413	The Ravensbourne			1207	96	36	42	81.0	
5418	Darrick Wood School	1715	104	20	289	112.9	20	3	1				5	1				38		12			80	5418	Darrick Wood			1424	283	34	45	87.7	
5419	The Priory School	1281	80	31	358	91.0	4	15	1			3	4	2			3	19	13	8			72	5419	The Priory			1177	338	34	29	73.4	
5950	Glebe School	151	22	3	60	23.8	1	1	1			2	2				23	4			2		36	5950	Glebe School			181					
7005	Marjorie McClure School	89	13	7	82	15.5		3	1							11	25	14			2		56	7005	Marjorie McClure School			73					
7011	Burwood School	35	11	0	0	11.0		1	1			2									1		15										
7012	Riverside School	179	25	5	107	28.3	1	6	1				2		21	4							69										
Grand Total		46822	2364	645	10013	2672.1	228	316	50	15	6	120	67	36	39	134	556	657	118	146	483	2971			23330	299	39219.5	5811	604	1210	1992.8		

Source: School Census

Source: School Census

School roll in 1998
 Primary mainstream 23977
 Primary Units 389
 Part time 304
 Secondary 19055
 Special 407
 44132

SCHOOLS BY HR PAYROLL SERVICE (RESOURCE LINK)

School	No. of Maintenance Staff	Maintenance FTE
Alexandra Infant School	3	1.46
Alexandra Junior School	1	1.00
Balgowan Primary School	1	1.00
Bickley Primary School	1	1.00
Biggin Hill Primary School	1	1.00
Blenheim Primary School	1	1.00
Bromley Road Infant School	1	1.00
Burnt Ash Primary School	1	1.00
Burwood School	2	1.24
Castlecombe Primary School	5	1.93
Chelsfield Primary School	0	0.00
Churchfields Primary School	1	1.00
Clare House Primary School	1	0.83
Crofton Infant School	2	1.56
Cudham CE Primary School	1	0.56
Darrick Wood Infant School	1	1.00
Darrick Wood Junior School	1	1.00
Dorset Road Infant School	2	0.63
Downe Primary School	2	0.78
Edgebury Primary School	3	1.48
Farnborough Primary School	1	1.00
Green Street Green Primary School	1	1.00
Hawes Down Infant School	1	0.50
Hawes Down Junior School	1	0.50
James Dixon Primary School	2	1.61
Keston CE Primary School	1	1.00
Leesons Primary School	5	2.21
Malcolm Primary School	1	0.65
Manor Oak Primary School	3	2.11
Marian Vian Primary School	2	2.00
Marjorie McClure School	5	2.28
Mead Road Infant School	1	0.90
Midfield Primary School	2	1.69
Mottingham Primary School	5	2.66
Oak Lodge Primary School	2	2.00
Oaklands Primary School	1	1.00
Parish CE Primary School	5	2.51
Perry Hall Primary School	1	1.00
Pickhurst Infant School	1	1.00
Pickhurst Junior School	2	1.69
Poverest Primary School	1	1.00
Pratts Bottom Primary School	1	0.44
Princes Plain Primary School	2	2.00
Riverside School	16	6.62
Royston Primary School	1	1.00
Scotts Park Primary School	4	2.18
Southborough Primary School	8	3.58
St George's, Bickley, CE Primary School	4	1.59
St Mary Cray Primary School	4	1.87
St Paul's Cray CE Primary School	4	1.78
Stewart Fleming Primary School	1	1.00
The Highway Primary School	2	1.11
Tubbenden Primary School	2	2.00
Unicorn Primary School	1	1.00
Warren Road Primary School	9	4.03
Wickham Common Primary School	1	1.00
Worsley Bridge Junior School	1	1.00

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

No of Schools:

	1998	2010
Primary	78	74
Secondary	17	17
Special	5	4

Summary of Changes:

	Primary	Secondary	Special
New Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bickley • Unicorn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishop Justus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burwood
Closures		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St John Rigby/All Saints 	
Amalgamations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsden Infant and Junior amalgamated to Hillside Primary • Blenheim Infant and Junior • Biggin Hill Infant and Junior • Oaklands Infant and Junior 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rectory Paddock and Woodbrook
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anerley Primary closure and James Dixon Primary expansion • Kevington renamed to Manor Oak (Fresh Start) 		